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INTRODUCTION

On my retirement from the Colonial Administrative Service in Tanzania in 1960, after previous work in the Burma Frontier Service I had acted as a First Class Magistrate for nearly fifteen years. Towards the end of the period I had become interested, not so much in the judicial assessment of guilt, but in the nature and purpose of the sentences.

Prior to this magisterial work overseas I had no experience or knowledge of judicial processes in the United Kingdom but had passed the required law examinations of the Tanganyika Government. While on the bench I had given sentences which I considered to be appropriate for the crime, based on my own personal understandings and prejudices concerning the need for punishment.

More out of curiosity than from any feeling that I ought to know more about punishment, I asked the Home Office in the United Kingdom during a leave in the mid 50's, for an attachment to various courts and penal institutions. During this period I visited courts for aldults and juveniles, remand homes, approved schools, borstal institutions and prisons.

The main conclusions were very obvious to me that I had been giving sentences of imprisonment substantially heavier than their equivalent in Britain for the same crimes, and that imprisonment was being used far more widely for both crimes and specific criminals than was the case in Britain. I returned to Tanganyika with my whole conception of judicial work radically changed and from then on experienced considerable difficulty in combining my judicial duties with my intellectual understanding of the nature of punishment and its limitations in different social and cultural milieu.

After my retirement and the taking up of a second career as a university lecturer I was able to give more attention to these problems, and indeed to attempt some degree of specialisation in the field of East African criminology.

In connection with my work in adult education I sort out any opportunities for teaching adults where I might be assured of a regular, intelligent and interested audience. Evening classes in the tropics probably impose a greater strain than in more temperate climates so I
looked for day-time opportunities. Accordingly early in 1961 I approached the Superintendent of the local prison for an opportunity to teach there. I continued to do this regularly for some time. My interest then was entirely educational and I knew little of the institutional and personal problems of prison administration.

While on leave after reading Dr. Terence Morris 'Pentonville' in draft form, I visited him at the London School of Economics. He suggested that it would be both interesting and important to undertake a study of an East African prison administered under Western penological principles in order to test whether Africans reacted in the same way as Americans, Britains and Germans to approximately similar conditions. I returned to East Africa determined to undertake some type of prison research if circumstances permitted.

As a result of the experience of teaching in a prison and my contacts with both staff and prisoners, I was able in 1963 to decide to do research work on the social organisation of an East African prison containing largely African prisoners. The Commissioner of Prisons gave his permission, subject to the signing of the Officials Secrets Act. Consequently he and his subordinates gave every assistance by not covertly opposing me, facilitating access to prisoners, staff and daily running records, also my movements about the prison, allowing my convict informants considerable latitude in the production of written work, and in making them available whenever I was able to carry out interviews.

As this research project was to be without direct financial backing beyond my salary as a lecturer in the Extra-Vocal Department of the University of East Africa, some office assistance and transport costs to and from prison, it had to be carried out as near as possible to my home. There was only the one prison nearby holding a maximum of about one thousand convicts, mostly first offenders in which I had previously been teaching. The next prison available was over 100 miles away so that the research had to be done in this one institution or not at all.

As the three East Africa territories had been British dependencies for many years and their prison administrative systems basically similar in form and policy, I have decided not to disclose either the
country or the prison concerned.

I reached this decision because many persons helped me in my research and it would be unfair to both them and the officials among them to personalize their contributions. From my experience as an administrative officer in charge of district prisons in Tanganyika I was also sure that my conclusions would be applicable to all three countries to a very large extent, and concluded that this work would have a wider and greater utility if it could be read in the context of the three countries together rather than of one particular prison in one country.

This research would not have been possible without the co-operation of many prison officers, non-commissioned officers and warders and I would like to thank them not only for this but for their contribution towards my greater understanding of their work under difficult conditions. I must also thank the prisoners for their co-operation and tolerance in accepting me into their confidence and for teaching me the human aspects of their lives as convicts. In all I am in the personal debt to some 120 persons in and around that prison during the period of my work, to whom I express my gratitude and best wishes for their legal or illegal careers.
Chapter 1
The organisation of the prison

1. Architecture and surroundings of the prison

The prison, a few miles north of an important town and port, was built in the middle fifties because the previous prison now a scheduled national monument because of its historic origin, was not suitable for the modern treatment of offenders and the growing prison population.

The prison stood beside a main road surrounded by its own farm and the houses of senior and junior staff. It was bounded on the north side by a creek and on the east by the grounds of a boys' secondary school. The prison farm was guarded by a wire fence on the road side (but not on the other sides) which became a wall near to the outside gate some 200 yards from the prison itself.

The prison itself consisted of a block-house (with steel security windows) and an administration building pierced by a gate, from which a tall wall surrounded the inside prison buildings, topped by floodlights. The prison was on both electricity and water mains administered through the Municipality within whose boundaries it was situated. Outside the walls were wooden watch towers erected after the prison had been constructed but only manned during the day.

Except for the administration block of two floors, all the buildings were single storied so that it was not possible to see out of the prison unless the convict was able to reach the upstairs floor of the administration block which contained the officer-in-charge's office, his clerical staff and the wireless room.

The walls were either unfaced grey concrete blocks or whitewashed, and were set back from the centre courtyard which was asphalted but contained a few trees on grass lawns, which did little to relieve the general appearance of brick and concrete. Because of the arrangement of the buildings, the walls were more obvious from the outside than the inside. The spaciousness of this central courtyard prevented any appearance of overcrowding, and was used for cinema shows and games.

Although from the plan (Fig. 1) the prison appears to have a radial design, it was not possible from any central point to see into the cell blocks, although the courtyards between them could be kept under observation. From a security point of view, the design had several obvious
drawbacks; firstly that the cell blocks ran onto the outside walls and although the walls there had been covered with barbed wire, the presence of sisal sleeping mats in the cells and rope in the workshops made this an escape route; secondly the arrangement of the block-house made it possible for attacks to be made from dead ground in the inner courtyard which cannot be enfiladed and thirdly that the range of the shotguns held in the block-house was not within effective reach of the back wall of the prison, which would accordingly be the main route of any escape. These facts are mentioned as the block-house had been built with the intention of resisting any internal disturbance, and the high walls to prevent escape.

The prison had been designed under conditions and according to laws which were changed almost as soon as the construction was completed. Originally Asian and European prisoners were segregated so that blocks A and B contained kitchens and were self-contained. Increase in the department's policy of productive work and industrial training as well as the growth in the country's prison population, meant that the original industry compound proved too small, and a further workshop was constructed in the courtyard adjacent to block C. This still proved inadequate and plans had been approved in 64/65 for the erection of a third workshop in the central courtyard. This prison was not an execution centre and condemned prisoners were transferred immediately after sentence.

The climate of the prison, situated near to the Equator, was round about 85° all the year with few overcast or rainy days. As there was no heating problem the ventilation had been increased by barred open windows in the cell-block doors as well as an overhang from the roofs which shaded the windows. The heat could be oppressive in the afternoons as the walls prevented much breeze from entering the prison itself but the prison could be described in general as light and airy. The ventilation of night latrines in the main cell-blocks (Fig.2) was adequate and it was only in the single cells with no lavatories and only a lavatory bucket at night, that the ventilation was inadequate.

The sanitary facilities were exceptionally good, both adequate in numbers and equipped with running water. Prisoners were issued with a
weekly allowance of toilet paper. The prisoners in small cells with
one or three occupants felt the absence of lavatories. The washing
facilities were also good with running water available in all the
cell blocks as well as an allowance of soap to convicts who had
mostly come from areas in which there had never been much water available for their personal use.

It was the policy of the prison authorities to house as many
prisoners as possible in large cells which were called 'clubs' and to
use single cells for prisoners who were difficult. This category in-
cluded aggressive homo-sexuals, capital remand, civil lunatics and
those under mental observation, prisoners thought to be in danger
(such as European convicts after one had been murdered in 1963 in the
Nairobi prison by a deranged fellow prisoner), certain long-term
convicts who have earned or manipulated the use of a single cell and
those under punishment.

Although the number of persons in each cell was limited by prison
regulations, the officer-in-charge was bound to accept every prisoner
delivered to him from the courts after sentence or on remand. This
meant that his prison population fluctuated and at times exceeded
the permitted number. Also a sudden increase in remands, possibly re-
lated to a political disturbance, who had to be kept separate on
security grounds, would mean that prisoners in block A would have to
be moved to accommodate them. Similarly problems of overflow occurred
in the new admissions, segregation and capital remand blocks also the
number of punishment cells which may have had to contain lunatics
under observation, limited the number of convicts who could be pun-
ished at any one time. There were no special cells padded for the
self-protection of lunatics.

The cells themselves were high and light with electric light in
the ceilings which burnt all night, and had wooden doors pierced by
an observation hole. In the multiple cells, it was not possible to
see the bed spaces to the immediate left and right of the door from
this hole and these spaces were accordingly preferred. Each multiple
cell contained a canteen box from which the prisoners drew their
tobacco and other purchased articles which were kept in cloth
bags during working hours. Beds and tables were only to be found in
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the Special Stage cell. In the remainder the only other articles were the rolled-up bed mats and blankets. No private personal articles other than books were allowed and the cells had the general appearance of barrack-room neatness. Each cell block was fitted with a loudspeaker through which the normal local news and music programmes were broadcast from the wireless room. Special announcements were also made this way and convicts were called by their numbers when they were required for administrative purposes.

The existence of multiple cells meant that in the three main blocks, there were only eight internal keys and one external key so that there was no difficult problem of locking and unlocking throughout the day. During the time when the door was locked, the attention of the warder was obtained by banging on the door and shouting.

The workshops were divided into two groups. The industries compound to the left of the central courtyard contained prisoners working on the rolling of twine from coconut fibre and its weaving into matting. This required little skill and contained short-term convicts to whom it was not worthwhile giving specialised work. The other workshop contained industrial machinery and tools for wood and metal work which was used by a small group of trainees, supervised by a works superintendent and warder- artisans. There were work areas outside the prison itself such as the farm and pigs as well as various maintenance and sanitary gangs. There was also a hand laundry against the outside wall adjacent to a football field.

The kitchen contained modern steam cookers and their attendant boiler which were cut off from the central courtyard by a steel bar grid, but even with this extra ventilation, it was the hottest area in the prison. The administrative block contained on the left the Chief Warder's office, in which convicts were interviewed on reception, charged with offences and had their private applications heard. The corridor had in it the main prison equipment stores, the steward's and welfare officer's offices in which the night duty officer slept as well as the main welfare office dealing with prisoners' earnings and letters, and the stand-up cubicles in which visitors talked to convicts standing on the inside.

On the right of the entrance was the duty office in which were
recorded all comings and goings, and out of which lead the armoury.
The right corridor had the reception offices and prisoners' property store and record room and the warrant office in which a locked cupboard contained the documents legally empowering the officer-in-charge to hold each prisoner for a specified period. There were no rooms for interviewing so that lawyers and probation interviews with convicted prisoners and remands had to take place in the duty office in the presence of the duty officers and any other officials there. The same applied to religious interviews although services and instruction took place in the recreation and library cell in block C. The outside wall of the duty office contained an outside window at which visitors asked for visitors' passes and for information about their imprisoned friends and relatives, who were dealt with by a special warder.

The hospital block and dispensary was outside the prison together with the women prisoners' block, a pre-release hostel and a barbed wire camp for short-term prisoners. The last three institutions largely came outside the compass of this study.

The warder staff had no space allocated to them within the prison, eating and sleeping in their lines on the other side of the road. The officer staff tended to congregate in the duty office. The warders in their lines had a recreation building as well as a primary school for their children.

II. Prison administration and work

The prison buildings stood on a level area of cleared African bush. There was nothing to parallel it in pre-colonial African life and it obstructed as something alien to the countryside and culture of which it is now forcibly a part. For all the fact that it was a prison in an independent African state, it remained an alien institution, not only administered according to British rules and ideas imported and imposed on the country, but the end product of a judicial system at variance to traditional African concepts of justice.

Attention has been drawn to the obvious clash (1) in English penology between basic aims and the administrative demands of the prison's daily functions, but here there was a third clash between the implicit requirements of the prison administration and the public
opinion of the country itself. The prison was not symbolic of justice, but of the separateness of the central government ideas of justice and the protection of the criminal from the community which he had injured.

There was an acute split between the desire of the prison administrations in East Africa, all of which were founded on British principles, for the humane and progressive treatment of offenders and the public and government's call for increasing severity against offenders. The progressive prison administrator fought on two fronts with his own senior officers saying "we have been instructed to have an entirely different approach — the introduction of penology, but I am unashamedly of the old school", and the parallel but more severe political tendencies reflected by outside public opinion.

"The failure to keep pace with recent social changes on the outside" has been suggested as a characteristic of total institutions and this was particularly noticeable here. Any highly formalised and bureaucratic institution based on laws, rules and orders coming from higher in their own hierarchy as a result of contact with other political and economic hierarchies, was bound to react slowly to change. The changes here would be slower than in Western countries because newly independent countries had immense problems of organizing change through institutions which were themselves in a turmoil, including a marked shortage of legal draftsmen. The reform of prison institutions would have had little priority in the eyes of government and even less in those of the general public.

Thus the convict may well have been faced with residues of colonial type behaviour from the authorities which were no longer present elsewhere in society. For some time uniforms bore a crown and the gate carried the sign of "H.M.Prison". The expected behaviour of convicts to senior officers was essentially based on authoritarian patterns peculiar to cross-racial situations and political demands were treated to the same type of discipline that had been appropriate ten years previously.

While the country as a whole was in a political ferment on the attainment of independence, the prisoner community seemed to feel no change and not to be surprised at the continuance of these pre-inde-
pendence patterns. It was possible that the criminal community with its experience of the judicial and police systems would not have been interested in such political changes, but the majority of prisoners were not professional criminals. They may however have come generally from an underprivileged section of the community and as such seen political changes with a clear eye and realised that independence might have meant for them no more than a change of political masters.

The manifest functions of the prison was to contain criminals sentenced by the courts until they were to be released according to law. The buildings showed this purpose and the staff were preoccupied throughout their work with questions of security; the officer-in-charge's order book in which he recorded special instructions, which had to be signed by all officers, had entries of which nine out of every ten related to security.

Both staff and prisoners saw the prison primarily as providing punishment, and they rarely mentioned the policy of training for rehabilitation or alternatively that they were confining prisoners for the protection of society. The preamble to the Prisons Ordinance Cap. 90 stated that the law is "to consolidate and amend the law relating to prisons; to provide for the organisation, discipline, powers and duties of prison officers" but contained no mention of the purpose of imprisonment. The Prison Rules of 1963 made by the Minister for Social Services under section 74 of the Prison Ordinance, also did not state the purpose for which the prisoners were imprisoned and the prisons administered, but gave (4) "the manner in which these rules should be applied, due allowance having been made for differences in character and amenability to discipline of various types of prisoners, in accordance with the following principles:

(a) discipline and order should be maintained with fairness but firmness, and with no more restriction than was required for safe custody and to ensure a well-ordered community life;
(b) in the control of prisoners, prison officers should seek to influence them through their own example and leadership, so as to enlist their willing co-operation; and
(c) at all times, the treatment of convicted prisoners should be such as to encourage their self-respect and sense of personal
responsibility, so as to re-build their morals, to inculcate in them the habit of good citizenship and hard work, to encourage them to lead a good and useful life on discharge and to fit them to do so."

In support of this preamble, the Annual Report 1962 (5) stated that the new ordinance "brings the treatment and training of adult prisoners in this country in line with recommendations made by the Second United Nations Congress on the prevention of crime and treatment of offenders, held in London in August 1960". It was nevertheless interesting to note that the rules refer only to treatment and not to training which was first referred to in these rules (6) with reference to the classification of prisoners "with a view to facilitating the training of prisoners".

It can be seen that the prisons were directed towards goals which had the acceptance and support of many prison administrations outside the country, but there was an inevitable gap between the theory and the practice. The staff forgot these principles not because they consciously chose an alternative policy and practiced a system in deliberate variance to that of their department, but because the minimum demands of their work made it impossible for them to pay them no more than and often not as much as ordinary lip-service.

The principles listed above were extremely difficult to follow under the ideal conditions of the home and become increasingly difficult in any sort of institution in which discipline was a dominant consideration, so consequently familiarity with the convict was discouraged without which it would have been impossible to assist the growth of these virtues. It came below to their dominant concern for security and again below the demands of the day to day administration of the prison as the control and feeding of a constantly changing convict population left very little time over for the niceties of personal influence. Perhaps a convict (7) summed up the prison administration's dilemma saying "the government had no sense at all in mixing up everyone in a prison. The man who was not a thief on entering prison would come out a thief. Everyone is contaminated by their companions. After all, outside they told those on licence and probation not to associate with criminals but inside they enforced it", 
A further difficulty was that the rules referred to training and the habit of hard work, specified (8) that "every convicted criminal prisoner should be required to engage in useful work" and further that "the officer-in-charge should allot to each prisoner the labour for which he was best suited, the first consideration being to give each prisoner the best training which his sentence, his capacity and the resources of the prison would permit". Given administrative and security demands the possibility of following both these requirements was severely limited. Training was limited by the number of the facilities available, the time available for training and the work available from which the prison could profit.

There was no doubt that for a limited number skilled training was available and exceptionally good work was produced. But for the vast majority who were short-term convicts, there could be no such training and they had to be employed on piece-work on the farm or in the rope-making shop. This was monotonous work which taught them nothing and far from inculcating hard work, provoked complex systems of idling and cheating. Through the fault of the sentencing courts and not the prison administration, the convicts came in unskilled and went out unskilled. The reception board for allocating any prisoner to the work for which he was best suited had not the facilities to do more than rubber stamp their distribution into unskilled work.

The distribution of work (Table 1) which was carried out in association (8) with other prisoners or by a prisoner alone outside his cell, showed that the majority of work was carried on inside the prison under security conditions. The field workers, building gang, and sanitary detail for the warders lines, as well as specially privileged workers such as the mechanics and fishing prisoners, were allowed to work outside, and were serving either short-term or long-term sentences and not considered to be a security risk, these totalled 33.6% in 1960 and 36.5% in 1962. The allocation of prisoners to outside gangs was done on the personal assessment of the officer in charge to exclude troublemakers and those who had long periods of their sentence still to serve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Work Distribution</th>
<th>July/60</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>April/62</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total in prison</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfit (sick, lunatics)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was stated that every prisoner would be required to engage in useful work. Useful work was not defined except that no prisoners may be employed on any work not authorized by the Commissioners or the officer-in-charge. No prison gangs were used on contract work to private firms outside the prison grounds, and assistance to the Public Works Department was limited to work in the immediate neighbourhood of the prison, such as clearing the site for a new school.

Although this prison was classified as a 'star class' training establishment, the work which was available to the prisoners can be divided into three classes: (a) work necessary for or associated with the day-to-day running of the prison; (b) work needed for the long time welfare of the prison which was productive but did not involve training in the sense of prisoners being engaged in work to fit them to lead a good and useful life on discharge, and (c) work which was both productive and trained prisoners for outside employment.

The first class contained the work without which the prison could not run - those directly responsible for the feeding, laundry and cleaning. The number of cleaners was high in relation to the amount of work required but it was a privileged position closely related to the control of difficult prisoners, the rewarding of others, and the prevention of thefts while the cells were empty during working hours. It also included the old and infirm who were not capable of doing hard work. The cooks were selected without any particular regard to their skills since African cooking is widely known by men and
did not involve much variety. Cook work was coveted but involved longer hours of work under conditions of being constantly under suspicion.

There were also a limited number of special jobs, such as store and office assistants, main office cleaners and mechanics, which carried special privileges, who were subject to a few security restrictions and on whom the staff depended. This group totalled 32.7% in 1960 and 23.9% in 1962 as against 18% in Pentonville, London.

There were also those on light duty for medical reasons.

The second class of work contained the farming of the prison field system and the mat-making shop, and contained 23.7% of the 1960 prisoners and 37.3% in 1962. Almost all the agricultural work was repetitive and involved the learning of no skills which they were not already conversant with from their own homes. The mat-shop involved the rolling of coconut fibre into twine and the use of the twine in the making of ropes and mats; this similarly was monotonous work which involved the learning of no new skills which might have had a commercial value outside. This was in no way to decry the economic importance of this work, but to the prisoner it was merely labour which had to be got through.

The final class of work involved the learning and practice of skilled trades in tailoring, carpentry, building and metal-work. In this work a balance had to be kept between the need of the prison department to get revenue from the sale of their work, or savings from not having to employ outsiders for prison building, maintenance and improvements, and the requirements to train convicts in useful trades. Thus these departments tended to take in prisoners who had already learnt and practiced a trade outside in order that the prison's productivity could be maintained and thus to restrict the training of new prisoners to a number which would not interfere with this productivity.

A works superintendent (11) stated that he tried to take in for training those who had sentences of longer than 3 years so that he could use them to the prison's greatest economic advantage. Thus the workshops tended to contain a limited number of quite highly trained persons serving very long sentences from which the benefits
to society in reforming criminals were obviously limited. The
prisoner with a shorter sentence and an equally high potential cri-
minality on his release was rarely trained. He also said that in his
choice he had no interest or knowledge of their crimes until he saw
their records when they came up for stage promotion. The number of
prisoners with any sort of previous training was about 1%, but many
pretended to have such experience not only to give them status in
their own eyes and in those of their associates but to obtain work
which was less monotonous. The possibility of using such training
after their discharge did not seem to be a major consideration in
their eyes because it was so far ahead. As in other matters they
tended to think in terms of immediate benefits, particularly since
they were not likely to have personally known anyone trained in this
way who had consequently kept free of crime, on whom they could model
their expectations.

The training period for a skilled trade was 6 months in which
such prisoners were kept separate but the money available for training
materials in 1964 was only 2000/- which itself limited the range of
training that could be given. Thus they had to be trained on odd jobs
within the prison when or where they arose and these usually did not
coincide with the training stage which they had reached. They should
not have proceeded to work on outside orders until they had passed a
standard trade test. The same superintendent considered that "train-
ing was spoilt by the compulsion to fulfill contract orders so that
the trainees could not now do all the tests they should in order to
be qualified for outside employment. More people were needed in the
workshops to handle the work in hand but they could not be obtained
at short notice. If there was a rush order, it was a question of stop
this and stop that and get on with the new job".

It is significant that he referred in this interview to people,
not prisoners, and that the records were available showed that these
workshops showed less loss from sickness than other sections. In one
month (12), April, 1962, the workshop lost 6 working days to 906 days
worked, while a general department lost 52 working days to 982 days
worked. Almost all the days lost through sickness rather than hospi-
talization were concentrated at the end of the month when canteen
issues had been calculated.

Another difficulty was the creation of a pre-release prison in the farm area where long-term prisoners lived under more open conditions in order to accustom them to the responsibilities and difficulties of freedom. This was a well-conceived idea but to the trained craftsmen, it meant being cut off from his work for the last 6 months of his sentence. An even more important reason for disliking this move was the cutting off of those trained prisoners from the afternoon handicrafts session in which they could make articles for sale and credit (13) to their own accounts for use on their release which averaged 97/- for 24 released prisoners. This opportunity was available to about 20 prisoners of whom about 13 worked each afternoon.

Another great problem for the correct running of the workshops and the training of new craftsmen was the turnover. In an examination (Table 2) of the shoe repairing and tailoring shops, it could be seen that in a period of 14 months these two workshops gained 52 new workers and lost 76 workers more because of transfers between prisons rather than through the appearance of new convicts and the discharge of old ones. In February, 1963, the tailoring shop was drastically reduced in size by the transfer of 22 prisoners to other work within the prison because work was not available for them in the tailoring shop.

TABLE 2. Mobility of workers in skilled trade workshops

(A) Shoe repairing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Transfer In</th>
<th>Transfer Out</th>
<th>Released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Tailoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The prison administration had to transfer prisoners from overcrowded prisons and fill up those whose numbers were unusually low or had a demand for larger general work gangs. Such drafts from prisons were made up with little consideration for training and work requirements. An example was quoted (11) in 1964 in which a draft was received from the central prison in the capital and contained 44 tailors which almost stopped the tailoring section in the donor prison and for whom there were not enough jobs available in this prison, resulting in these men being put onto rope-making. The same officer estimated that in 1965 he would lose 64 of his trained men within seven months. A further difficulty was the post-independence practice of granting amnesties to prisoners to celebrate special days of political importance such as the declaration of independence (three months off for first offenders, one month for recidivists) in which the prison lost 280 prisoners in ten days, of whom one third came from the workshops. Perhaps for the officer in charge an even more irritating interference with work in the shop was that the day's task could not commence until the discipline officers were satisfied that the security count was correct, and of course any form of trouble in the prison stops work, as well as the attendance of convicts at any sick or administrative parade or interview.

III. The maintenance of the prisoner

The regulations stated (10) that every prisoner should be entitled to a sufficient quantity of plain, wholesome, food according to scales laid down and these scales were properly followed. Indeed the scales along with other prison regulations, had been translated into Kiswahili and posted onto the notice boards in each cell block. At 06.35 each
morning a bowl of porridge was issued before the prisoners went to work and the main meal was served between mid-day and one o’clock. The evening meal was served at four o’clock.

The majority of the prisoners came from peasant families where the food was monotonous but bulky and there were comparatively few complaints. These were usually associated with the meat ration for which they had an almost insatiable desire. Extra rations could be obtained by trading and influence and sufficient remained from the food to adequately maintain the prison pigs in affluence. There was no evidence of any undernourishment, and the vast majority of convicts gained and maintained a heavier weight during their sentence. Weights were recorded regularly and any loss of weight was inquired into by the prison administration.

Prisoners who had been used to other diets prior to sentence such as Arabs, vegetarian Indians, Europeans and previously well-to-do Africans could apply to the medical assistant for Scale C which used to be known as Asiatic diet, and Scale D, the one-time European diet, on the grounds that to continue with the standard diet would affect their health. As these diets showed a wider variety of foods and allowed for a daily issue of fresh meat instead of twice weekly, there was considerable effort to get permission for such a change, and the blame for refusal usually fell on the medical assistant or doctor.

The distribution of diets (Table 3) shows the extent and opportunities provided by these varieties in available food.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3. Diet distribution April 1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Diet Scale A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale B, Penal Diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale C, Arabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians - Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special medical diets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale D, European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The explanation of many food difficulties were explained by an educated convict (14) who stated "the Arab diet was the best because of the frying oil which could be used for so many other cooking purposes. Convicts only said that the European diet was better because of its variety (Table 4). Arabs didn’t apply for European diet. Any
convict here on a fixed diet would not lose weight. He did little work. He hadn't got women. No drinking. Regular eating at the proper time. In effect, he had no worries."


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basic Diet on 4 days in week</th>
<th>Scale C. Daily</th>
<th>Scale D. Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Carbohydrates and vegetable proteins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Rice or other cereal plus (b) Beans or ground nuts</td>
<td>14 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread or wheaten flour</td>
<td>8 7</td>
<td>6 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>5 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oatmeal (or rice)</td>
<td>- 2 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Animal Proteins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh meat or dried fish Liquid skimmed milk (or reconstituted dried milk) plus Egg</td>
<td>- 2 8 10</td>
<td>10 (fluid) - 15 (£1)</td>
<td>- 1 (unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Fats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortified vegetable oil or fortified ghee Butter Cooking fat</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Fresh vegetables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Green leafy vegetables or carrots plus (b) Potatoes or sweet potatoes</td>
<td>2 2 10 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Capsicum</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Salt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Tea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Curry powder</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A convict (14) described the selection of a cook saying that "when there was a discharge from the kitchen, the Chief Warder might want a cook but the prison officers in general looked on such a movement to a position of privilege not in terms of their expertness as cooks but what would benefit the prison as a whole. A corporal went to the rope-making section and nominated a prisoner – just looked and picked. Some got these jobs unexpectedly. Once I was sent to help with the kitchen boiler – anyone could have been sent and yet there was I in a position of affluence. I suppose by and large the fit and large men were chosen."

The main cooking was carried out in large steam cookers worked from a central boiler while the special diets were cooked on subsidiary stoves fired with wood. On one occasion when the boiler broke down,
cooking had to be carried on outside the kitchen in the main court-
yard in cauldrons over firewood.

There were complaints against the corruption of the kitchen
staff but very little against the quality of the food or the cooks' abilities. The prison had a kitchen committee of convicts organised by the authorities of which a senior officer (15) explained that "the prisoners elected five members - I have no say in it at all. They attend all the ration issues and the cooking in the kitchen. Complaints must be made through this committee and they could see me at any time. One of this committee was supposed to be the biggest fiddler in the prison - he was always very polite. I like two or three of them very much. He had been of considerable assistance to me once or twice in quietening things down when there had been trouble over rations." This effectively showed the dilemma of the need to reduce agitation and the compromises which resulted from this situation (16).

After this explanation a long-term convict with many previous convictions (17) gave his views stating that "prisoners who had left the prison disclosed staff and prisoner illegalities, and this knowledge fed back into the prison caused agitation. I think the kitchen committee had three members. We must not forget that these members were still convicts and also had their own needs. They were probably imprisoned for theft outside and did just the same inside. Warders had the money and they could soon pull the prisoner away from his duty of looking after our food. We voted for these committee members but only a very few actively supported them and the rest followed. In the prison situation to vote for or to be voted for was not to trust or to be trusted."

It can be said that the food was adequate in quality and quantity but that its availability in the prison was a constant stimulus to illegal activities of a persistent minor nature which could not be effectively controlled even if it was considered advisable in such a closed institution. Preoccupation with food and its manipulation gave many individuals an interest in their prison lives.

The clothing scale (Table 5) was not specified in the rules (18) but laid down in an annexure to prison service orders. No difficulties
over the issue, quality and exchange of these clothes or the main­
tenance of adequate stocks was apparent. Prisoners felt very gener­
ally that the costume was intended to degrade them by making adults
wear clothes which were very like the normal issue for primary school
children. The shorts were particularly resented and Moslems could
obtain slacks for their use during the Holy Month of Ramadan when
they would be praying regularly. The appearance of the prisoners in
numbers was a neat uniformity. In a convict community whose outside
clothing had on the whole been rather run down European clothing, or
just a cotton sheet, questions of quality and size were not very im­
portant.

TABLE 5. Scale of clothing and equipment — prisoners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clothing</th>
<th>Scale A</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirts, duck, white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorts, duck, white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirts, denim, blue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorts, denim, blue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suits, dungarees, blue Special</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caps, duck, white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caps, denim, blue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towels, prisoners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handkerchiefs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandals, rubber type, pairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale B. (In addition to Scale A if Medical Officer ordered)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale B</th>
<th>Stage 6</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Special</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trousers, long, duck, white</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes, leather, pairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underpants, cloth, white, short pairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Blankets, wool, prisoners</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pillows, stuffed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cases, pillow, duck, white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mats, sisal, sleeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Mattresses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Beds, prisoners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maybe increased by 1 at discretion of officer in charge.
*Maybe extended to Stage three at discretion of officer in charge.

Equipment for Prisoners

Pan, feeding, or two plates, aluminium

Cups, aluminium

Bins—Nests, or jugs, aluminium or enameled

Buckets, night-soil, with lids

One pan, or two plates/prisoner, to be issued for meals, and collected
after meals.

One per prisoner, to be retained by him.

To be provided at the rate of one gallon of water per prisoner in
dormitories or cells where no running water is laid on.

To be provided in dormitories where there is no flush sanitation, One
bucket, 4 gallons, per every 4 prisoners.
Pots, chamber, with lid
Paper, toilet, in sheets or rolls
Forks, table
Spoons, table
Soap, yellow, or carbolic, washing
Brushes.
Dentifrice, powder
Knives, table
Bags, canteen

One each to be provided for prisoners located in single cells.
One per prisoner, according to orders of officer in charge.
One per prisoner, according to orders of officer in charge.
One per prisoner. To be supplied at the rate of 42 sheets per prisoner per week.
One fifth of 12oz. bar per prisoner for personal use per week in addition to soap issued for washing clothes.
One per prisoner. To be provided at the rate of 42 sheets per prisoner per week.
One per prisoner, according to orders of officer in charge.
One per prisoner.

There was provision in the rules (16) for the issue of additional clothing for medical reasons which took the form of hats with brims for European prisoners, and boots for any prisoner who did not usually walk bare-foot before imprisonment. Such a prisoner received an authority for one pair of boots and the convict store clerk (14) stated that "when I issued shoes on the doctor's orders – I gave out any size. Inside the prison afterwards the convicts bartered amongst themselves so that the wrong sizes sorted themselves out. No one took the trouble to sort them out first. To get a pair of the right size was a privilege which you got from me. It had to be earned. A prepayment – the return on an investment."

Despite the fact that the clothing, personal equipment and bedding was standard and adequate, it was in short supply in relation to its use in trading and in the attempts of the prisoners to individualise themselves either by using extra shorts as underpants or by having extra clothing suited to their sizes or for greater cleanliness. A convict (19) stated that "many had extra clothes. The ones with which I had been issued by the authorities had my number stencilled in them, but the extra clothes which I had scrounged were clear and I had a spare number label which I pinned on whenever I wore a contraband shirt."
The blankets could be exchanged with warders, and the coloured threads woven into the coloured stage stripes on the clothing used for sewing clothes for sale or exchange to the warders for their families.

In the prison the greatest attention was paid to hygiene, not only to ensure good health but in order to keep the prison neat. The cells were regularly sprayed with insecticide to kill vermin which may have been brought in by prisoners. Personal clothing was removed
from prisoners on the day after admittance when they were provided with prison clothing so there were opportunities for vermin to get in. After admittance, rules (20) required the changing and washing of clothes weekly and bedclothes when directed and the prisoner received disinfected clothing on admittance. The rules did not require (21) the shaving of heads, only for hair to be cut or shaved so as to preserve a clean and decent appearance unless the doctor gave an order for cutting on medical grounds. In the outer compound, there was a group of two or three barbers working full time on cutting the hair of convicts and warders.

As there was running water in the prison, most prisoners took regular showers during the afternoon and evening, although there was provision (22) for compulsory bathing on admission or when considered necessary. There were no restrictions on cleanliness other than personal inclination - showering could take as long as the prisoner wanted as they were available in the cell blocks and did not require a warder's permission. The distinctive prison smell came from a combination of food, sweat and disinfectant odours which were not the result of any administrative failings in hygiene.

Exercise in a prison where the weather was almost always sunny was not a problem, although provided for in the rules (22). The majority of prisoners worked outdoors almost every day and the construction of the cell blocks with their long central corridors and areas between them were available for movement between the mid-day return from work, and the evening lock-up. The prisoners even in the workshop were in the open air as there were no windows or doors to block out the fresh air. There were football parties going out to play on most weekday afternoons whenever there were warders available for escort.

Medical care was covered by ten sections (23) of the rules. At the beginning of this research period, the prison had its own medical officer but this was not possible to maintain owing to staff problems associated with independence, so the everyday medical work became the responsibility of a trained medical assistant. He took the daily sick parade and cases too serious for him to examine or which required specialist treatment were forwarded to the local
General Hospital under escort. Prisoners who had to be hospitalised were usually sent there as well which created problems of providing additional guards and escorts.

Mental illness was a difficult problem for this prison where they were required to keep civil lunatics as well as suspected criminal lunatics under observation before their trial. There was no special accommodation reserved for lunatics and the medical assistant had no qualifications for assessing such cases, with the result that his observations were no more than can be obtained by looking through the cell peep-hole, asking questions of the man and questioning the warder on duty as to whether he had been troublesome. The possibility of mental illness among convicts who had not been assessed as lunatics was accepted with reluctance, usually in relation to violence rather than depression.

Organised religion was dealt with in the rules (24) on much the same lines as the British rules, particularly in its assumption that every prisoner had a religious denomination. This created certain difficulties as the varieties of Christianity were recorded, but Moslem were lumped into one group, although both Shia and Sunni sects at least were always present in the prison. (25) A substantial number of prisoners had no organised religion in this sense and adhered to traditional beliefs. The rules required ministers of religion to be permitted to visit prisoners and for arrangements to be made for the holding of religious services and the giving of religious instruction to the prisoners.

At the beginning of the period under review a Protestant prison chaplain was at work full time in the prison, but afterwards the prisoners were dependant on outside ministers who came as often as they could but not every Sunday for the holding of denominational services. These visitors were not available for giving personal counselling which is usually associated with prison chaplaincies. No Moslem teachers were available during the period, possibly because there was no centralised organisation which could be approached. The rules would, it appeared, permit the practising of traditional rites should any prisoner press on application.

Education within the prison was encouraged (26) and included
handicrafts and games. Literacy and primary classes were conducted every weekday afternoon by prisoners who were either educated enough to act as teachers or who had been professional school teachers prior to conviction. Education for those above this level was a difficult problem as there were few qualified teachers and the arrangement of correspondence courses required a great deal of official support and bureaucratic tolerance as well as money before they could be arranged. The provision of writing materials and books for this class of prisoner was a constant difficulty to the prison authority as however carefully they were guarded or even carried about these articles were constantly liable to be stolen for their value either for writing purposes or for the paper to be used for smoking. The officer in charge was already too overloaded with work to be able to pay anything more than nominal attention to the administration of education which should in practice have involved several hundred prisoners; there was need for a specialist organiser who was eventually provided with the posting of a Welfare Officer.

The rules contained no policy directives on the need for the maintenance of relations between the prisoner and his family, although they did allow an extra letter in and out for the serious illness of a near relative, business or family affairs of an urgent nature, and the arrangements concerned with employment or assistance on release. The convict could also write and receive a reception letter when he was on transfer to another prison. Prisoners who had served three years without a visit because of the distance from their homes might be transferred, as a temporary measure, to the prison nearest to his home so that he could receive accumulated visits.

Long-term prisoners appeared before a Discharge Board within three months of their release to decide on whether any, and if so what assistance would be granted to help his rehabilitation. A grant of 80/- towards the purchase of tools was allowed for exemplary prisoners who had served over 4 years inside. The Board contained the local representative of the country's Prisoners' Aid Society. Discharged prisoners were provided with free transport to their home districts and clothing if their own was unsuitable or insufficient. Officers in charge were specifically enjoined to do everything in their power
to ensure that prisoners on release were in a position to lead honest lives by finding suitable employment and providing food for their journey home.

Prisoners were usually aware of their legal rights, particularly the right of appeal as they were informed by the magistrate after sentence. It was also written into the case record and they were informed again during the admission interview before the officer in charge. Provision (30) was also made for him to communicate in person or in writing with an advocate under confidential conditions. Prisoners might petition (31) the President of the Republic and make complaints to the Visiting Justices. Petitions had to be presented on a special form, commented on and passed to the Ministry of Home Affairs. Many prisoners took the opportunity to petition, especially in connection with what they considered to be a political offence. A convict stated (32) that "many Kikuyu who had done time for offences during the emergency expected special concessions at Independence and they were angry when they got nothing special". To give different remissions to first offenders and residivists they thought unfair as they were all criminals. A senior officer (33) also explained that "in the old days when a prisoner requested a petition form we would say - look, old lad, this is hopeless, don't waste our time but nowadays, no matter how ridiculous a petition he must be allowed to do so - you dare not stop him. So now there was a serious danger of a clerical clog-up." As far as could be ascertained the failure of appeals and petitions were attributed more to fate than to the malfunctioning of the prison, police and judicial systems.
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Chapter II
The strategy of the survey

1. The system of recorda.

The prison authorities were required by their headquarters to maintain large numbers of registers in order to check on the allocation and spending of funds for the running of the prison, to maintain records of each prisoner in order to ensure that the requirements of the law were complied with and to make certain that the convicts were protected from any illegalities by the staff and the latter protected from false accusations by the former.

There were thus registers containing records for every activity including entering and leaving the prison, sentence, weight, letters, prisoners property, rations and clothing, special applications, work distribution and attendance, punishment of staff and prisoners and canteen purchases. If anything there was a superfluity of information available on paper in current use or in the prison record room, but it was information recorded to conform with prison regulations and no accuracy was required beyond this. Thus in the prisoners' personal records where it was not possible to leave a blank as for example under the section dealing with the personal recommendations, replies were stereotyped.

Also while the officer in charge did considerable counter-signing of these registers, it was not possible in terms of his available time for him to check before signing in most cases. In some ways the use of these registers became a form of bureaucratic ritualism; their use was not tested against their efficacy in achieving the ends for which they were designed. It seemed often that any administrative problem was solved by instituting another paper control. A register was maintained of property found during searches inside the prison presumably to keep the officers informed and to prevent the staff from misappropriating such property, but most of the entries referred to "miscellaneous rubbish".

In another instance the issue of stores to prisoners was recorded in a ledger in order to prevent misappropriation and unfairness. It satisfied the auditors because the ledger usually corresponded with the stock. Beyond this the ledger achieved little of what it set out
to do as there was a warder storeman with a convict assistant who
were usually involved in the manipulation of stores within the socio-
political internal environment of the prison.

The Fentonville study (1) refers to the need for constantly
referring to these records and that they were often "unreliable, some-
times inaccurate and very frequently unsystematic. That information
was lacking or inaccurate was not for want of clerical effort. Infor-
mation laboriously written out in long-hand - was duplicated on in-
umerable flimsy paper shits and in a multiplicity of old-fashioned
ledgers".

The situation in this prison was parallel to the Fentonville
experience but worse because it was a system designed for a literate
society, and needed this literacy to be at least partially functional.
In the first place the registers and forms were in English, so other
than the few senior officers who were English by nationality or who had
passed Cambridge School Certificate in English, they were filled in by
warder clerks of rather low literacy in English. Thus there must have
been many cases in which they did not have the necessary vocabulary to
do their work fully.

Only the register recording the daily inmate population total
was accurate because it was subject to three daily checks and any dif-
ference in the total recorded and the numbers reported, alerted the
whole prison to repeated recounts and searches until it was established
whether or not a prisoner was missing.

Out of this information it was necessary to survey and find out
as many sociological and criminal characteristics of the prison popu-
lation as possible, and to establish its average daily or monthly
characteristics. This was difficult to do because:

a) There were daily discharges of prisoners in the morning the major-
ity of whom had been in the prison for a very short time. There
were also remands who had been to court and found not guilty or had
their charges withdrawn who may not have returned to the prison for
formal discharge. Dealing with these persons was an important part
of the prison's work but the majority were never there long enough
for their personal characteristics to be established.

b) Daily admissions from the courts in the area either on conviction
or remand which could in fact take place at any time in the day, but was usually in the late afternoon.

c) Absences from the prison during the day of regular outside working parties, sick prisoners going to hospital for treatment which could not be given at the prison, and those going to court for trial or the renewal of their remand warrants.

d) The record office in the prison which contained the personal records of every prisoner under sentence was never complete at any one time as files might be in the offices of the Superintendent, the Welfare Officer, Admissions and Discharges clerks or in current use out of their order in the filing cabinets for the recording of details about the prisoner’s weight, letters, visits and special requests. Even a census at night would not have covered all records.

e) The record office did not maintain files on remands and these records were only in registers.

f) The court warrants held separately in a locked cupboard were also never complete for the reasons given a), b) and c) above, and contained no information other than enough to identify the prisoner, the charge under which he was held and the date of the warrant’s expiry.

g) The prison authorities knew the number of prisoners held within the prison but did not know very accurately where they were at any one time. Daily returns of prisoners by types were maintained. They knew the numbers out and in on the various work details but not who they were. The prison population, except after lock-up, was in constant movement; official movement on work and unofficial negotiated movement between cell blocks or into the kitchens, work yards and offices. It was never still long enough to enumerate and survey.

h) The prison authorities did not know the occupants of the multiple cells, but only those in isolated single cells. The only way of knowing the occupants of multiple cells was to make up lists with the help of the unofficial convict leaders and to relate the names to records elsewhere. This would only apply to convicted prisoners as remands were virtually without any prison identity.

It was decided therefore not to attempt an enumeration of a typical daily or even monthly prison population but to take all convicted prisoners admitted to the prison for the calendar year of 1963.
For these it would be possible to record details of tribe, sentence, age, offence, corporal punishment, multiple charges, employment status before imprisonment, whether imprisoned as a result of failure to pay a fine, type of court convicting, previous convictions, religion, time held in the prison before transfer and prison serial number as these were entered in the principal register. This would exclude from the research all occupants of the prison who had not been currently convicted. It was felt that to study them would entail special difficulties since the shortness of their stay prevented any personal contacts being established and maintained. They were thus only a part of this study when they became convicted prisoners or when their movements in and out of the prison became a part of the convicts lives.

It was decided to enlist the help of convict leaders in each block and record the distribution of all convicts by cells during September, 1964, since they knew accurately who slept where and to provide their prison numbers, and from this it was possible to obtain information relating this to tribe, previous convictions and offences. Finally it was decided to extract the personal records of a series of prisoners in 1963 with previous convictions so that the extent and persistence of their crimes relating to type and time could be examined together with the personal details already obtained, and finally daily lists of prisoners by types for a three year period.

It was not possible to have a one-day census because it would have either disrupted the work of the prison on a working day or necessitated special duty for certain officers if done on a public holiday. Also if done in such an official way the convicts would have made it inaccurate by queuing up twice, wearing shirts with other persons numbers on them and by hiding in wash-places and latrines; its very officialness would have made it inaccurate.

II. The accuracy of prison records

The details from the register for all convicts admitted under court sentence other than adults for corporal punishment only, were thus recorded for the first survey. These recorded details were accurate as regards:

a) sentence - actual period and remission allowed under law on that
sentence (2)
b) offence or offences for which convicted
c) court convicting
d) imprisonment in default of paying a fine (3)
e) time held in prison prior to conviction

The remaining details recorded in the registers might have been inaccurate for the following reasons:

a) Tribe - the broad groupings may have been accurate but children of mixed marriages would stress the most prestigious or useful tribe for prison use. Others would try and assume Arab race because it might get them a better diet on medical grounds, and others might have had political reasons for changing tribes. The convict gave his tribe to the authorities which they accepted since there was no legal definition and proof of such affiliation which they could examine.

b) Age - notoriously inaccurate but the details recorded were those accepted by the court (4) and there was no reason to assume that they were more inaccurate than most African demographic surveys. Age was of no concern to the prison authorities except where they were required to keep younger convicts separate from the others (4).

c) Religion - very much a question of prison convenience according to the prisoner's assessment of the privileges he could obtain by adherence - fasting benefits over the Muslim month of Ramadhan, or the minor value of being one sort of Christian rather than another because of the attention paid to the prisoners by a priest of a particular sect. Towards the end of the research period the Commissioner of Prisons was known to have a personal interest in and conviction that a criminal had to be spiritually saved in the revivalist sense before his social reform could hope to be successful. This knowledge might have biased some recidivists towards having themselves recorded as Pentecostals.

d) Employment category - there were substantial inaccuracies as the groupings of employment, unemployed, and self-employed were not defined to cover piece-work or underemployment or any other categories. In general "employed" was taken to mean receiving money for work, "self-employed" as farming and "unemployed" as those who were not living at home in a family locality and had not yet got a paid job. A police informer for instance classified himself as employed - a status self-
evaluation although payments, if any, were both small and irregular.

e) Previous convictions - these were accurate only for convictions in
this country from courts administered by the Judiciary, and then only
if the records of previous convictions from subordinate courts had
been sent to the police. Convictions before African tribunals which
were not administered through the Judiciary, unless they involved
imprisonment or corporal punishment, would not have been recorded as
they were not sent to criminal records.

Similarly many convicts moved over unmarked international borders
with the greatest of ease and personal convenience, particularly from
the two neighbouring countries and Zanzibar. Convictions outside
the country were only recorded if that information had been vouchsafed
by the police elsewhere for their own purposes or in reply to a query
from this country's police. Many convicts told of convictions else-
where which were not listed in their records, so some were recorded as
first offenders for the purposes of this prison administration whilst
being recidivists as regards their overall prison experience.

f) Imprisonment in default of a fine. This involved two categories -
those serving a short sentence of imprisonment in default of a fine,
no other sentence of imprisonment having been imposed, and those sen-
tenced to imprisonment and a fine in addition, which they were unable
to pay and had their sentences increased by up to six months in de-
fault (5). These two classifications were not differentiated.
NOTES


(2) *Penal Code, section 28/2.* In the absence of express provisions in any ordinance relating thereto, the terms of imprisonment ordered by a court in respect of the non-payment of any sum adjudged to be paid for costs under section 32 or compensation under 31 of this code, or in respect of the non-payment of a fine or of any sum adjudged to be paid under the provisions of any ordinance shall be such terms as in the opinion of the court will satisfy the justice of the case, but shall not exceed in any such case the maximum fixed by the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not exceeding Sh.10</td>
<td>14 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding Sh.10 but not exceeding Sh.20</td>
<td>1 month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding Sh.20 but not exceeding Sh.100</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding Sh.100 but not exceeding Sh.400</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeding Sh.400</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) *Penal Code, section 28/2.* For the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of subsection (l) of this section, each prisoner on admission should be credited with the full amount of remission to which he would be entitled at the end of his sentence if he lost no remission of sentence.

(4) *Prison Rules (1963)*, section 1(a). Young prisoner class, which shall consist of convicted prisoners under the apparent age of seventeen years or young convicted criminal prisoners of whatever age who in the opinion of the officer in charge should not, having regard to their age and character, be classed with adult prisoners.

(5) *Penal Code, section 28/3.* The imprisonment which is imposed in default of a fine shall terminate whenever the fine is either paid or levied by process of law.
In sociological field work with communities it is usually possible, when there was lack of success with one particular group or in one particular subject, to change to equivalent groups in another part of the community or to develop a different approach to obtain the necessary information. In an anthropological study of kinship or land tenure rejection by one group would not involve the cancellation of the whole project as there was almost certainly a very similar group nearby with whom it might well be much easier to work. Also in this type of field work the researcher's personality and method of work does not at least initially come up for examination as to its suitability for the work in hand. The subjects of research are often commented on for their co-operation or lack of co-operation, and for not fitting in with the so-called disinterested needs of the researcher and his sponsors.

If on the other hand research was to be undertaken for a narrowly defined project, for instance when the group to be studied was small in numbers, prescribed in function or limited geographically, different problems arise. There might not have been an alternative object for this type of research, only one institution might have been suitable for the research projected, or only one geographically available.

The fact that this research had to be done in the one institution meant that instead of the research being dependent on me, I was, in fact, dependent on the demands of the one institution. Success or failure would have to be on the terms of this particular prison, fitting in to what the convicts and staff had agreed to do and making use of what facilities and records were available as I could not have gone elsewhere. As an Englishman in civilian clothes inside the prison I was not only visibly different from everyone around me who were either in uniform as members of the Prison Service or in the white prison dress as convicts, but seen by and known to everyone as someone out of the ordinary. Through the orders of the Commissioner of Prisons I had to be accepted by the prison staff, but with the convicts I had to be accepted or rejected on their terms. Accordingly my role in the prison as the research continued went through five stages.
I. Stage of setting accepted by the prison community

The majority of the convicts were illiterate. While most were able to understand simple Swahili, the language used by the prison staff, most used tribal dialects between themselves. The literate minority used mostly Swahili although a number were able to write their tribal dialects as well. English was written and spoken by a smaller minority who were mostly school teachers, trade union officials and government servants. I was bilingual in English and Swahili.

Only three prisoners out of the 2,142 who entered the prison during 1963 had had any contact with post secondary education, and only one had had any experience of research work or research workers outside the prison. He might have acted as a link between me and the convict community but his personal problems involved the possible need for psychiatric help, which made it impossible to attempt to use him as an intermediary.

Convicts contacted were unable to agree that there was any need for research on either them or their community, or that the university would have any use for such research if it were done; it was difficult at all times for them to consider abstract matters concerning which they had had no personal experience. In effect they were prepared to accept that something called research was going on and that they had participated in it as a diversion from the boredom of their prison lives and for any material advantages that they might have got out of the relationship with me. Since they were not able to accept that I was what I said I was, it was necessary to consider what alternative roles were available to be assumed. I could not have been considered as a prison chaplain nor as a social worker of whom there were none working independently in this prison, and these roles in any case would have been taken as an offshoot of authority rather than as independent agencies. Therefore, it was apparent to the prisoners that I must have been working for either the police or the prison authorities.

In the eyes of the prisoners their world was a functional dichotomy between prisoner and prison staff which gave me very limited opportunities for role manoeuvring, since I was not able to take up an independent position. If not on the convicts' side in a material way or in support of some challenge to authority, then I must have been government,
since even if what I said about research was true, I must have got permission from government to be in the prison at all and that would effectively have prevented me from acting in any way in the interests of the convicts in their troubles either inside or outside the prison. The fact that I was able to move about within the prison implied conformity with custodial rules since I obviously could not have been there illegally.

The prison authorities on the spot also had considerable trouble in accepting me as an individual or that there was a need for research at all. An organisation such as a prison which was doing an unpleasant job, must always be a target for the criticisms of convicts, whilst the general public, particularly in an underdeveloped country, remained completely indifferent to the difficulties of the work undertaken. These problems in East Africa were even more complex where concepts of prison, authority and crime were still heavily overlain with pre-independence political difficulties which had made the prison authorities the potential target of criticism from both within the country and overseas.

The senior staff then had the same difficulty in giving me a role which would have fitted me into their official work, as I was not on the staff and yet had been injected into the prison by their higher authority which they interpreted initially as evidence of political or departmental pressure to investigate accusations which had been made against them by outsiders. They had had no experience of and did not recognise under their circumstances the object of or need for pure research. If there were no political undertones connected with me, then such detailed enquiries and the resulting report, subject to the Official Secrets Act, would merely have stirred up criticism both within and without government circles. Life for them was already difficult enough.

Beyond these considerations they doubted that any research on the convicts within the prison would possibly be worth the trouble and time spent. Already at that stage the stereotype of the unintelligent and docile prisoner was making its appearance. In their opinion a necessary prerequisite for research would have been a high intelligence average in the convict population, the absence of which they
appeared to assume by the fact that the convicts had not co-operated intelligently with the authorities. The authorities had not found in the past nor anticipated in the future the finding of evidence that some convicts were sufficiently intelligent to attempt to outwit them, or that they might have consistently succeeded.

There was no ostensible trouble in the prison, therefore there would be no grounds for such enquiries. The convicts were rated largely passive or, at the most, belligerent and mildly aggressive; they were seen as a mass of individuals with no organisation independent of the prison. The prison in consequence had in the eyes of the staff no social system other than the statutory organisation which they administered.

I was allowed access to all records within the prison but although they satisfactorily complied with prison regulations, the absence of definitions and details of the actual crimes committed make them of limited utility for planning the approach to a specific convict. Also the record system was devised for a much higher standard of organisational ability and literacy than was possible in the actual circumstances and many details were omitted. Whenever possible I was provided with a cell for interviewing and during one year I was allowed to use a warder clerk for the collection of necessary statistical data.

Initially I had conducted adult education classes in the prison for a limited number of literate convicts, and after that an attempt at group therapy with about twenty-five literate English speaking convicts was undertaken, and for a short time I had also acted as a Visiting Justice and then a Prison Visitor. From this varied experience it would have been possible to have carried on covert research as regards the authorities, but to have done so would have been damaging to the interests and good name of the University even if I had subsequently severed my connection there. For such research to be of value it must be usable, and the circumstances of the work must surely be explained. The only possible justification for such a covert approach would have been that information or experience was unobtainable in any other way. In the circumstances of a social organisation study, such a covert approach would not have been justified and would in effect have resulted in a reasonable accusation of sharp practice.
As regards the convicts, whether the approach was overt or covert, made no difference as I was outside their community and the methods of attempting to enter it was the same in either case.

Contact with staff during the period of research was not extensive. Further it was necessary to prove to the convict population that the researcher was not a government servant and for that purpose it was advisable to avoid prison officers to the extent of not appearing to associate with them too deliberately, except when it was unavoidable or rude to avoid them. During the lunch period in which prisoners were locked up, it was possible to sit in the gate-house for half-an-hour's general discussion with the officer on duty, but it did not take the form of a formal interview. When working through the prisoners' records, it was then possible to talk to the warder clerks, the officer in charge of warrants and have a few minutes conversation with the officer on gate duty when arriving and leaving. Essentially these were periods of looking and listening. It was not possible to talk to warders on duty as it could only have been done in the full view of prisoners, nor in the cell used for interviewing which could not be approached in privacy.

The lack of research contact with prison staff was not damaging to my knowledge of prison administration as the researcher had administered Third Class Prisons in Tanzania for long periods - Kilwa 1948, Songea 1949, Tunduru 1950, Pangani 1955-8 and Ngara 1959 - and there was a basic similarity in prison routine at that time between East African Prisons founded on British principles. I thus started the work with a substantial background of acquired information from my service in the Colonial Administration, the passing of the Higher Swahili Examination and the Tanganyika Law Examination; I was thus able to assume much that would otherwise have had to be gathered through research.

It had been considered whether an approach should be made towards knowing the senior prison officers socially but this was not proceeded with; the researcher's position was ambivalent enough without this further complication. All occasions had to be avoided within the prison where it might have meant that the researcher had to talk to a prison officer in the presence of a prisoner and vice-versa - it was
not possible to develop a public role which would have covered these two extremes.

During the course of the research, both the officers in charge were interviewed at length, as well as the superintendent of the prison industries. When approached all were very reluctant to talk about the prison except in generalities, feeling despite the official permission given for the research that they were constrained by the Prison Ordinance and Rules from talking openly to an outsider and since they were British that they might have jeopardised their compensation and pension rights on retirement after independence.

II. Stage of personal anxiety

Once admission had been obtained to work in the prison each grade in the prison hierarchy appeared to adopt a stereotypic attitude to me from which there were few variations. This did not make the work difficult as the stereotypes allowed for a relationship to be built up in the anticipation of getting stereotyped responses. Only in the case of the Official Secrets Act was the interpretation of officialdom and myself at variance. This act was the British Official Secrets Act with some minor variations in a local amending ordinance and requiring prosecutions to be made by the Commissioner of Police. The intention of this act was to restrict the publication of any information "prejudicial to the safety or interest of the state". This act of course had been used mainly in Britain in connection with defence matters and also for the protection of individuals where the publication of certain details or events in a report might have been prejudicial to their interests. In one study of an English prison this meant the removal of a very small part of a substantial report and the publication of the remainder. This detailed book showed the actualities of prison life to be widely at variance with the rules and orders as well as the intentions of the Prison Commissioners who nevertheless decided that its publication would be of value to the Prison Service and to such interested members of the general public as might bring pressure to bear on the government for changes in the existing system.

Thus I signed the local Official Secrets Act in the anticipation that an equivalent use to that of Britain would be followed and that
the results of the research would be published largely as written
after the excision of such parts as would have related to individuals
and incidents. The Commissioner's statement that "we had nothing to
hide, study what you like, but remember no publication" was taken to
mean no writing for the popular press since the two parts of this
injunction suggested pride in the services achievements and the usual
utilisation of research for teaching and the promotion of wider understand-
ing of the problems involved. Admission, then, provided an
opportunity to study the organisation and working of a prison in which
everyone took up largely stereotyped attitudes (Table 6), but I had
to develop the opportunity into an actuality.

Table 6. Attitudes at Start of Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commissioner of Prisons:</th>
<th>We have nothing to hide. The Service must be protected by the research worker signing the Official Secrets Act.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officer i/c Prison:</td>
<td>I cannot understand the research worker having been given access to all this confidential information. There is a hidden meaning, I am being watched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Staff:</td>
<td>The research worker is all right he has been passed by the Commissioner. I just do my Job. Penology has very little to do with my everyday job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Stores Staff:</td>
<td>I must avoid him. He has the habits of an auditor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warder Staff:</td>
<td>A teacher who can at least make jokes in the vernacular. He has nothing to do with my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicts - literate:</td>
<td>He is a spy but he might be useful to me. I want him to know that I am literate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicts - illiterate:</td>
<td>I don't know who or what he is but he has something to do with authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The views of any convicts asked during the first year of the re-
search as to my identity and work would have been that I was a plain
clothes officer of the Criminal Investigation Department working on
undetected crime and/or working on the recovery of proceeds of rob-
beries and thefts.

This situation was described by a convict (2) who wrote "one of
the prisoners who had been helping the research worker from the Uni-
versity for quite a time told my friend that the researcher worker
was not a teacher but from the Criminal Investigation Department. He
warned us off helping him and said that we would be bitterly sorry
later on". Another convict (3) looked at this issue more logically
saying "if you had been an informant before you had been in the
prison very long there would have been twenty prisoners taken to court
on supplementary charges. Even if you had been a detective nobody be-
lieved that government would have afforded to have you hanging about
the prison for months and months without anything to show for it".

Other prisoners saw in the researcher an opportunity for personal
profit and the same convict said "the book you gave to Musa had no of-
ficial stamp in it so perhaps you had bought it with your own money". Oth-
ers were jealous of him getting the English reading primer and
wanted to get at the same source. If you called for anyone they were
curious as there was no profit in refusing in advance; they wanted to
hear what you said. Thus the researcher was exposed to manipulation
by his convict informants because it was a relationship of trust if he
wanted to work with them at all and if he showed that he did not trust
the informants by for example locking up his brief case when he left
the room they would regard him as fair game to be taken full advantage
of whenever opportunity offered as they recognised that he was dependent
on them. A convict (5) described such a situation by saying "I sold
the ball-point pen you gave me to write essays in order to get some
marihuana and then someone else offered me a pound of sugar for a pen-
cil. On the table you had two pens and I had already seen that you
had others in your brief case so it seemed obvious that you wouldn't
miss one. So when you turned to look out of the window I took one".
Perhaps my presence made this sort of opportunity a challenge. The
same convict described other times when he could have stolen things
when I was out of the room which he regarded as a totally different
situation in that the blame then would rest so clearly on him alone.

The difference between an informant to authority and an informant
for research was very slight in the opinion of the convicts even after
it had been concluded generally that I was not connected with the
police. Essential to this difference was the convicts insistence that
they should be summoned by a warder from their work places in order to
be interviewed. Once a convict appeared for interview under a warder
escort although his name had not been listed for that day and when he
found that he had not been called for interview he said (17) that "he
had certain anecdotes to tell me but since he had not been summoned he
could not tell me. They would have to wait until a time when he
was formally called".

The convicts were also interested in the nature of the rewards
which they received during an interview when I would give a ciga-
ette or share a cup of tea with the informant. A convict (6) asked
"Some one who comes and talks to you about his life and you give him
a cigarette - this cigarette is in return for that work. It is a
small thank you, and if I came here and said nothing you wouldn't
give me anything, is not that so? We have talked together for seven
months now but I would not get a cigarette if I sat and said nothing.
You won't give me something for nothing. Why could I not give you a
smoke when I am smoking. Because you are at work and I am at work".

In the transition from complete suspicion of or indifference to
the researcher to one of limited trust, the earlier informants were
particularly valuable. These prisoners saw nothing in the idea of
research which could possibly benefit them although some saw the
utility of African text-books for African Universities and that policy
making individuals outside should be better informed of judicial and
prison problems before they created new laws or changed old ones.

They saw in the relationship with the researcher possible material
and human benefits for themselves so they were willing to take a chance
because it might have brought beneficial changes. Obviously once they
were convinced that there was no danger to themselves, they felt that
their own position vis-à-vis the researcher could be improved by at
least pretending that they had been using their own influence to pro-
vide more informants or at least quieten any voiced suspicions about
me and my work. A convict (15) described his own actions in such a
situation by saying "I have been in this prison a long time and for
all the time that you have been here I had heard of no one getting any
loss of remission because of you - I haven't even heard rumours of
this". Although such a convict was probably elaborating his own role
to improve his position in my estimation, it did seem to be generally
accepted that the research concerned the difficulties of convict life.
Although this was not enquired into by the researcher, the cases of
prisoners who thought that they had been unjustly imprisoned were ex-
pected to be put forward but this did not occur.
In convicts interviews this first concern was covered widely by enquiries into prison life and for the second no prisoner ever approached the researcher specifically to raise the issue of what he considered to be an unjust conviction and only one prisoner asked advice on the advisability of submitting a petition for mitigation of sentence and another showed his petition for the correction of its grammar. The fact that those approaches were not made after these rumours had circulated seemed to suggest that they accepted that the researcher was not in any way connected with the government.

A convict (5) suggested that trust was a more useful means of control than close supervision and said "Too much watching creates a challenge I am a professional thief and you would never be able to stop me stealing from you, but if you don't keep an eye on me all the time knowing that I am a thief it must be that you trust me and I don't want to steal under such conditions."

Trust was also related to what they considered to be the purpose of the research. A convict (13) said "I know that you haven't changed from when you first asked me to come for an interview, but there is much difference in me. I thought you just wanted to be friends with me as you were a detective in plain clothes. Now I trust you because I asked all my friends in the prison about you especially those who had already seen you and they said it was only a sort of joke. He is just making a book about psychology or something like that. So I thought it was all right that I could come now."

In seeing me many convicts were more curious than distrustful and trust came because largely by good fortune, the prison authorities never took disciplinary action on any matter which the convicts thought might have been attributed to me. This must either have been a pure accident or there was never enough cohesion in the convict community or yard to make such an accusation appeal to more than a single disgruntled individual. While an individual might have felt sure that I had given information to the authorities because possibly not enough sympathy had been shown or felt in an interview, other convicts in the same group would in the majority have been completely disinterested in the matter as it did not relate to them and they were therefore not likely to agree or disagree, or the odd individual also an informant
would not have agreed actively as he might have felt that such an accusation might potentially have damaged his own relationship with the researcher which he found personally satisfying.

While I was able to check the truth of much information coming to me through interviews by personal observation, duplication of data and a knowledge of the prison's function, some convict informants were asked why their stories should be believed. Some (11) reacted with injured innocence and said that "all the information was pure truth and that he was not able to cheat me. He would not cheat because we convicts were happy that I should get interesting and valuable information". Another (16) remarked that "the substance of his information was always solid truth - the foundation was correct but here and there he added the odd word or two. Food without salt was tasteless. Even you don't talk to me without embellishing your language, otherwise the whole thing would be colourless".

This referred in fact to the natural storyteller who could not by his very nature give a recitation of fact and leave it at that. Some convict informants almost acted the incidents which they described and of course made their own role the key to its proper evaluation. As the research proceeded it was possible to evaluate such stories and to question their truth and it seemed that incidents described in the prison were usually essentially true. The explanations of the prisoner's own life outside were usually false in the first telling and probably in the second as well and that after these contradictions were shown, a correct version came out.

At the same time it should be noted that the local prison authorities made no attempt to obtain information from me either directly or indirectly, although it was frequently difficult in conversation with them about current issues to appear disinterested and not to show that I was in possession of the story from the other side. There was always the temptation for me to suggest or imply that there might have been a different explanation. Possibly as a sociologist there was the feeling that the prisoners' explanation diverged as it was from the specific needs of officials, was nearer to the true explanation. In reverse, in conversation with prisoners about matters on which the official side was known, there seemed to be no temptation or need to restrain
oneself about the official side; it did not seem necessary, nor was there any need for me to give away such knowledge because with a known circle of informants my status in the convict world was assured, while my relationship with the prison authorities was always uneasy, not so much because they had made things in any way difficult for me but because I myself was acutely conscious of a conflict of roles.

A convict (19) talked in general terms of these problems, and said "they talk behind your back. There is resentment. African prisoners didn't want to be known, they feared much and didn't understand your position. They swore at you; yesterday I heard someone say as you passed 'bloody detective coming here always'. They preferred to be quiet and kept out of trouble. You are not liking or disliking, you were liking any prisoner who talks to you and that was your standard for liking. Prisoners wanted to gain something, they hide their hearts. Even those whom you had helped - it doesn't get around as they didn't want even to say that you had talked to them. They had realised that you can be used but you used them much more".

Since their appeared to be no overt opposition to me as I had no shortage of informants who were willing to give information in person or by writing diaries, I could conclude that I was tolerated both as a person and in my role of researcher. A convict (14) said "there was no resentment against you in prison, African prisoners did not show this as everybody fears much. They didn't want this to be known. For example if they made a sort of enquiry no one would stand in front of the officer and challenge them. They would talk after the officer had gone. They talked behind your back as you passed, one said 'look out for that old-style oppressor, bloody fool that C.I.D.' They preferred to be quiet as they didn't want to get into trouble".

While the relationship between the researcher and the convicts might have been thought to be the most difficult to develop into one of confidence, it did seem that conversely it was comparatively simple. I was faced with a large number of convicts each of whom could theoretically participate or not in the research project. This for the convict was a purely individual decision as the prisoner community was not organised to accept or reject such a project on a collective basis. In fact it proved just as likely that a convict who spoke out against
me and said that I was a police spy would encourage others to approach me out of latent opposition to the temporary prominence of the speaker rather than refuse to participate.

In theory role difference between the warder staff and the prisoners should have been so clear that association with the prisoners would have provoked opposition from the warders. Although warder contact was limited more by my conception of my role than any reluctance on the warder staff's part, they seemed to share much of the prisoners views. A convict (15) said "one day I was talking to a warder saying where is that teacher of ours today. I said I was referring to you. He replied that he was not a teacher but someone from the C.I.D."

The opportunity for research meant that I had an official status in my relationship with authority but that every other relationship had to be worked for and would have had positive effects on all the other relationships which I was trying to set up. Familiarity with the Prison Superintendent affected all other staff and convict relationships; he could have effectively blocked me in whatever I wanted to do and disputes over this would have vitiated the atmosphere necessary for research. Neither of the two Commandants did any overt obstruction; the first being near to retirement, was much more expansive, and the second rather derivative of the value and utility of such research, while being openly nervous of his position if he had sullied information which could have been related to him personally.

Experience showed that there were no overall channels of communication by which contacts with a particular convict would result in the information being quickly spread through the whole convict community. The fact that I could still be unknown to some convicts after I had been working there for more than a year can be attributable to tribal and linguistic differences. At the most relationships with a particular convict affected the relationships with the other convicts in his cell and block. I thought, at least initially, that everyone was aware of my presence because the prison was also an alien environment for me. I felt that I was being carefully observed because I was a European in civilian clothes; to offset this suspiciousness I usually wore the same clothes on each visit and went on the same days in each week so that I became a regular and accepted part of the prison scene.
In fact the majority of the staff and convicts neither knew nor cared who I was; I was, in their eyes, someone to do with another department (20). An extreme example of this was the new officer in charge who meeting me at work in the cells took me to be an imprisoned civil debtor.

III. Stage of familiarity

The stage in which I became familiar with the prison staff and prisoners and they became familiar with me set in comparatively early after I had been given permission to work in the prison. This was not due to any remarkable facet of my character or ability, but to the fact that I had carried out adult education classes for one year in the prison prior to any intention to try to do research there, and consequently my progress was a development of the confidence I obtained from this small group of English speaking convicts who presumably reported to their own sub-groups that I was inoffensive and could be talked to without unpleasant consequences. It was anticipated that this move from the role of teacher to that of researcher would have been a crisis in which a high proportion of all contacts would have been broken off. In fact there was no crisis at all and no one made any observation on the transposition that one role had been used to cloak the other. It was possible that they found in the relationship with me something personal and private to themselves alone and that this had a high value. Everything else in the prison was public; their emotional tensions had to be played out in public and they slept, ate and worked in large groups. The interview with me was private and I was interested in everything which they had to say, true or false, and I did not moralise even when the series of interviews showed substantial lying. They viewed the relationship in a different way to my attitudes, wanting contact on any terms without any specific purpose in most cases, whereas I wanted information relevant to my research for which a particular personal contact was secondary.

This process of working into the community took two years with an average of one day in the prison per week over the period. During that time I was careful not to exceed my rights as a private citizen; asking permission to go anywhere at all, not taking priority through
doors and addressing both warders and convicts as 'mister' in any conversation. This state of potential acceptability to the convicts was not the same as gaining their confidence; it merely appeared to mean that I was not immediately in the service of the authorities and that I was a harmless eccentric. I wished to get to know them to do research into criminal and penal behaviour and they wished to use me for totally different reasons; there was never any coincidence of objectives.

The relationship was essentially a person to person one in which the behaviour of either party in the relationship appeared to have little influence on other persons who might or might not wish to talk to me. One ex-student could address the cell block on the 'proven' fact that I was a police spy and yet it would not affect other prisoners from the block coming as usual to talk about themselves once a week. The fact that such an incident had occurred I found out much later; I had not been told at once in the hope of gaining favour.

This individual relationship with me seemed to be a natural development from convict relationships in general which seemed to be very individualistic and, where they showed positive characteristics, a notable degree of self-sufficiency. Each convict when approached made his own decisions as to whether he would talk in terms of what he would get out of the relationship.

In the first instance the Prison Superintendent was asked to produce a dozen long-term prisoners which might be of interest to me and who might at the same time benefit from a long-term relationship with an outsider on the lines of the British Prison Visitor. Perhaps it typified the prison staff's lack of interest in the research or their sense of humour and their preoccupation with their onerous daily duties, that the first group contained one deaf and dumb convict and another who was to be released within a week.

As convicts, other than special stage long-termers, could not move about the prison without an escort it was not possible to contact them without asking for them at the prison office. I then made a selection of men whose records showed a wide variety of tribal origin, previous employment and education, age and criminal convictions, and they were then fetched by a warder.
They were seen separately and told of my position and programme and asked whether they would talk about their lives. There were only two refusals, and there was always a considerable backlog of men who had agreed but for whose interviews time could not be found. A further five agreed to be interviewed but their responses were so monosyllabic or devoid of interest so it seemed that they had assumed that I was a government official and that to refuse in any other way would have got them into trouble at a later date. Apart from those who refused to talk or who were unco-operative a further sample were of such low intelligence or pretended to be, that they were not approached or similarly dropped after the first meeting. Some ninety convicts were interviewed in depth or contributed written material.

After these initial interviews it was possible to assess those who had a high potential interest either as writers or as talkers; there appeared to be some overlap as some would not talk but were profuse writers and vice-versa. From the convict side there was a constant 'feeling out' process, so although they may have been talking or writing for me, it could have taken as long as a year before they were convinced that I was not a plain clothes policeman.

Convict informants agreed to be interviewed for a variety of overt and covert reasons. These can be listed as:

1. **Material**. The clever convict was adept at seizing and developing opportunities by which he could profit and a strange European was obviously one such opportunity. At the least he could be lured into illegality for smuggling and at the least his name could be used to warders in attempts to retain non-permissible property or obtain ease of movement within the prison. In at least one case a convict was prepared to participate in my work for six months before trying to get me to give him money with which to buy marihuana. He was prepared to provide almost unlimited confidential information to make himself invaluable before making the attempt.

2. **Contact with me provided breaks in the monotony, combined with the odd cigarette, saus or newspaper and a cup of tea from a thermos. In themselves these things were valueless but they were symbolic of an individuality which was denied to them in their usual prison life.**

**Psychological**. 1. Bolstering up their depressed individuality. They
had stories, true or false, which someone, possibly in authority, wanted and which did not involve them in difficult relationships with their fellow convicts. This attitude was facilitated by the fact that convicts had to be fetched by a warder so they were able to say to their fellows that they had been called to the office and were not branded as informers in their eyes.

2. Although I made no remarks in the initial stages which could be interpreted as agreement, the mere fact that I listened and was interested relieved them. The flow of information rarely stopped, perhaps they had never had such an assumedly sympathetic audience before. The Welfare Officer in the prison was clearly a part of authority and the religious services did not provide any personalised method of getting similar relief.

Thus some convicts saw in their association with me a social rather than economic relationship; the need particularly to know someone on the outside on whom they could even tenuously depend. A convict (4) said "I am taking your address so I can write you a letter when I am transferred to another prison. If I see that this letter gets an answer, I can know that no matter how far away I am, I would be able to write you a letter and get an answer".

Others (6) while accepting that convicts wanted friendship, noted that I was not in fact capable of having any such genuine social relationship with prisoners, saying "they realise that you can be used but they are content with what they have. If you were offering something free, that you give your services free without demanding anything in return, they would have come to see you in thousands".

At least one (5) who had stolen from me, felt the need to explain later that he had done so, then ending up by saying "from now on whatever you lose in the prison, you will not think that it might be me".

Although I had explained from the first that I was not connected with any social welfare agency, this need for any one of a variety of possible social relationships was always noticeable. A weekly or fortnightly interview became important for them, not so much because it was a break in routine, but because it was a personal relationship.

A convict (6) said "supposing you had a friend with money and you went and stayed with him - would you leave as soon as his money was
finished? How could you go away when he is your friend. You would
not be sending for me to talk about my life if I wasn't your friend -
is there any more important type of friendship than that. I don't
even want the odd cigarette because if I accept it you will look for
other informants when I run out of stories".

While to me the interviews were largely routine, the convict
informant of intelligence who produced long and interesting details
of his life, seemed apt to claim that his relationship with me was a
very personal one, and in respect to other potential and existing
informants, as exclusive as possible. Some did not seem able to
accept that I might have come to the end of what I could obtain from
a particular informant, and attributed the end of the research rela-
tionship to the malevolence of another convict. At least one case of
a convict informing to the authorities about another prisoner was
attributable to this rivalry.

A convict (7) confirms that those with special problems were
more likely to seek me out saying "your informants are the educated
and escapees who are not quite happy here in the prison",

Some convicts saw in their relationship with me an opportunity
to try and get me to break prison rules. A convict (9) said "I don't
like my letters being read in the office, they know to whom I am
writing and from whom I get letters. Why won't you take out a letter
for me - it is not wrong and it is not a heavy load for the post. It
will get there much quicker".

Others (10) attempted to sell information not related to inci-
dents in the prison but to their whole lives, saying "I want to tell
you all about my criminal activities, even those outside this country,
in fact I have a conviction in another country which no one knows
about. I won't hide anything from you but I want five shillings in
cash first".

Still others (11) talked quite freely about their criminal and
prison lives until they saw that I was interested in what they had to
say and indeed appeared to be looking forward to the next instalment.
They then stated that there had been a financial agreement without
which they would never have spoken at all saying "you said that you
would give me a shilling but you haven't given me it up to now".
This ease in obtaining convicts willing to be interviewed may have occurred because only a certain type were willing or able to talk; a process of self-selection in which I was not involved. The research work was carried out either in English or Kiswahili so that those who did not feel able to express themselves in these languages or wished to pretend that they did not as a way of avoiding involvement, were dropped after my initial talk with them.

The linguistic differences in a country where there were many tribal dialects roughly coincided to a division in the offences for which they were convicted between tribal offences and offences connected with traditional life and offences connected with urban, industrial and western institutions. Thus although some informants were in the first category and imprisoned for cattle theft and game poaching, the majority were serving sentences for theft, embezzlement, forgery, robbery, rape and housebreaking.

The process of gaining the confidence of an informant and then building up a working relationship with him, was necessarily lengthy. Under the conditions of this research it did not seem worthwhile or indeed possible to work up a relationship with short-term prisoners imprisoned for six months or less of which one third was usually remitted for good behaviour.

So my informants probably represented 30% of those willing and able to participate in the research while only representing not more than 5% of the average convict population.

There were some initial difficulties in making the first contacts with a potential informant; neither side was sure of what was being offered and what was being received. I was unwilling to lead too much of the conversation as I did not want to probe too far or too fast. Also in the initial stages the convicts contacted shied away from giving any specific factual data relating to prisoners or prison events.

I was however soon getting large quantities of information either from the interviews or from diaries of daily events and essays on specific topics. The weekly input of information was thus about five hours from the former and fifty pages of script from the latter method. With such a large quantity of information reaching me it was natural to assume that a high proportion of it was lies or inaccurate.
The Prison Officers continually stressed this point stating that the convicts were tricking me all the time as indeed they often tricked those in authority, but there were essential differences.

The prison staff were only in contact with a particular convict for very short periods when they had to judge the truth or falsehood of his statements in relation to possibly one incident or request, and as most of such contacts were verbal it was always extremely difficult to remember correctly what had been said on a previous occasion.

I however tape-recorded every interview and did not erase the tape, while at the same time keeping notes of their attitudes and a precis of any official information available on the interviewed convict. There was thus a running check on the previous information supplied which could be quoted back to disclose lies. This seemed to cause little embarrassment and few argued this challenge with me. They were usually able to explain why they had not told the truth and to provide alternative versions. It seemed that the earlier mistruths were in the nature of testing out and that their rapport with me increased proportionately with my success in catching them out.

It had never seemed remotely possible that these informants would agree to tape recorded interviews or indeed to the taking of any written record. No one did in fact object when asked, although few tended to whisper into the microphone for fear that they might have been overheard by a warden outside the cell in which I was interviewing. Alternatively those who preferred not to talk were those who would object to such disclosures on a person to person basis and accordingly wrote their information. Those who kept diaries or made weekly reports initially found it difficult to find anything to write until they were asked to record any event in which voices had been raised in argument. Others were given headed sheets of paper on which topics were given asking for descriptions of different types of convicts, criminals and crimes, and then their views of various punishments and the nature of authority in state, prison, politics, tribe and family.

IV. Stage of personal involvement

Following these initial stages a steady flow of information
and a series of interviews and discussions on written work could be carried out on the one day without delays. As a consequence of avoiding comments on the persons or events mentioned, most of these interviews passed beyond the impersonal collection of data on the day to day affairs of the prison and its prisoners to personal problems and to their specific criminal activities. In this the one crime man seemed noticeably reluctant to discuss the matter except in terms relating to his own innocence or the severity of the punishment for his crime.

Another aspect of this interviewing was probably that many of the remaining convicts regardless of the length of their official criminal records, regarded themselves as semi-professional criminals in which the possibility of reform depended very much on post release imponderables. Even the petty sneak thief was to some extent proud of his techniques and recognised in me another who was interested in these same matters, in much the same way as the police and judiciary. This did not appear to be boasting as they were just as keen to explain failure as success. This attitude of professionalism in which crime appeared to be regarded as normality was widespread among interviewees.

There was also the possibility that this ease in the relationship was an extension of the paternalism of the colonial era in which both I and interviewees found paternalistic satisfactions, or alternatively was the stereotyped response of such people in dealing with persons of an assumed higher strata associated with authority and morals.

The ease with which personal relationships were being developed and maintained had twofold consequences to myself and to them. As the meetings were regular I became part of the convict's life. I was probably in many cases the first person outside kin relationships who had taken a personal interest in him, certainly since he had been arrested. The visits were looked forward to as consoling, reassuring and flattering.

I also suffered at this time from reactions to criminals and crimes across a racial boundary and from my previous work as a magistrate which prevented me from making the most, personally, of these contacts (21). There was a constant tendency to make value judgements
much wider in range than in the average cross-cultural and cross-racial relationships. There was an element of shock in meeting face to face such disparate morals and activities as homosexuals and murderers who had been appreciated in the past only in a theoretical sense.

Much effort had to be put into restraining the development of extreme attitudes as a consequence of such close personal contact: the smell of sweat, the heat in the cells, the constant difficulties over meanings expressed in poor English and Kiswahili, the revulsion over the food, smells, latrines and some personal mannerisms of the convicts being interviewed.

At the beginning of the interviewing I had been neutral to whatever they wished to say in telling the story of their lives in which I had tacitly ignored the fact that they were convicts, so that in general there was no clear dividing line between criminal and non-criminal behaviour. It was possible to maintain this attitude of neutrality with the average informant who was seen once or twice, but with certain key informants of high intelligence regular interviews were maintained for months. With these it seemed that an atmosphere of sympathy or non-sympathy developed broadly on the lines that they had committed crimes under social and economic necessity as shown in the wholeness of their narratives and in the process of which I became, whether I liked it or not, a part of the informant's life. A few appeared to have committed crimes under psychological compulsion particularly in relation to sexual offences in which an increasing element of revulsion towards the relationship often led to its termination; these people were in need of treatment or specialised conversation which I was not qualified to give.

In these cases in which I and the informant formed a continuing personal relationship the moral aspects of using an informant for the purposes of research came very much to the fore. The informant came to be dependent and to ask for advice on his problems. Once I had become part of the convict's life and I had obtained almost all the information which I could reasonably have expected from one individual, the moral problem of breaking off the relationship had to be considered. Some realised that the continuation of the relationship depended on
continuing to produce material of interest, while others whose own lives were very impermanent, made no effort to keep it active.

This moral dilemma was fortunately kept to a minimum by the transfer of prisoners, their release or their hiring of the relationship. It was not surprising then that some of these informants after their release called at the University's office in the nearby town for help and stopped my wife and myself for a chat when they passed us in the streets.

I thus found myself in an unusual research situation. Instead of separating research from private life or joining the two together for a defined period away from the family's home, I was involved in the same prison environment and its derivatives both in the research situation and at my home for a prolonged period. Instead of keeping the roles of family man, teacher and researcher at least geographically separate, they were elided together.

In some respects the relationship was the one hoped for between a Prison Visitor and a convict, except that much of the conversation was related to crime which was the only topic that could in fact link both parties once it was seen that I could offer no special assistance in getting employment after release.

During this stage of familiarity I came into possession of more and more criminal information relating to (a) crimes for which the informant had not yet been suspected or convicted, (b) criminal methods of operation, not only for the past and present, but for their future activities on release and (c) the committing of prison offences by both convicts and staff. I thus became an accessory after the fact and potentially capable of being summoned to the court to give evidence where I would have had no privileged position under existing law (22). This difficulty over my research existed under section 132 of the Indian Evidence Act which applied locally and which stated that the witness shall not be excused from answering any question as to any matter on the grounds that the answer would incriminate him. No such answer would subject him to any arrest or prosecution except for giving false evidence.

It was clear therefore that I would not suffer legally as a result of giving evidence should I have been required to do so but that
in doing so I would have broken the implicit trust which my criminal and prison service informants had shown in talking to me in the first place. It was possible that they may not have recognised the implications of much of their information but I was acutely conscious of my ambivalent position.

If such an eventuality had developed it would have been possible to have asked the judge for relief on grounds which had to be stated (i) but the climate for academic research by non-Africans was not such as to presuppose that the matter would come within the jurisdiction of the courts and be confined to the case in question, rather it would be dealt with summarily by means of the Immigration Ordinance and the cancellation of my work permit and right to remain in the country. If such a situation had developed and I had to give evidence it would have meant the immediate loss of all contact with convict informants.

Within these extremes there were still possible variations in the manner in which I could act. I could select information for passage to authority; just as it was essential to maintain contact with the prisoners it was equally essential to keep in reasonable contact with the officer staff. It would not have been prudent to avoid them, and this need was met by talking in general terms and to refer to incidents and facts having been obtained with difficulty, which authority was known to have already possessed. This served the additional purpose of improving the relationship as it showed that I was always later than the staff in finding out such matters while confirming to the staff that their own sources of information were reliable.

The second alternative was to have reached an understanding with authority as to what they should be told and it was probable that authority, at least at the senior level, assumed that there was such an understanding. Probably on mature thought they would not have assumed this understanding because it would have made them in a very similar way accessories after the fact concerning information which they had tacitly agreed should not be told to them (23). At the same time it was necessary to protect convict informants who had shown considerable trust in talking at all. They were cautioned never to use specific names in essays or conversations, nor to relate events in
such a way that they could be easily connected with actual occurrences. No attempt was made to lock-up papers when out of the room, and straightforward explanations were given on any matters about which these contacts were suspicious.

In the issue I decided that no information of any type should be passed to authority unless it could be estimated that physical violence was imminent. No such cases arose during the research and the one planned protest was foreseen as confined to a small group and that there was little possibility of such dangers developing.

Information relating to criminal activities outside the prison came principally from the long-term informants who were giving the histories of their lives, while information related to the breaking of prison rules was common to all informants.

V. Stage of Superiority

After six months work in the prison on this research enough statistical information, written essays and tape recorded interviews had been obtained to make the research complete. On this basis I was no longer dependent on the staff and convicts in such a fundamental way. I was able to reduce the quantity of interviewing to particular convicts with valuable views, and to confine the project within the scope of this quantity of information rather than to extend the work further.

I became less on the defensive towards the authorities and to assume that some of the various privileges extended to me were rights. A transformation from a passive to an active interest in prison affairs.

This change of role was accompanied by an overall understanding of the prison social system and its day to day running as I had received information from both staff and convicts. It became very important then to be guarded in conversation because of the consequences of disclosing information from one set of informants to the other. There was a constant temptation to talk too much when opinions were cited which were not based on facts known to me. In fact this proved to be the time when it was best to withdraw from this research before a further series of role conflicts developed.
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Chapter IV - The Prison Population

1. The length of imprisonment and the prison population

The length of sentence for those who were imprisoned during the year is given in Table 7; this discloses a number for whom the length of sentence was not recorded in the main register, although it would have been entered on the warrant accompanying the prisoner which was retained in the warrant office. Imprisonment was only of one type (1) and there were no references to hard labour. The total shows that 63% of the prisoners served sentences of less than six months. The calculation of remission (2) thus means that only those who were serving sentences of one month or under served the full period and that every sentence above that received an automatic one third remission; therefore these 1,144 convicts served no more than four months if there was no loss of remission for prison offences, and therefore they were not eligible for the industrial training available in the prison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7. Length of sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 month ... ... ... ... ... 339 ... ... ... 16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 months ... ... ... ... ... 424 ... ... ... 20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 6 months ... ... ... ... ... 381 ... ... ... 18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 12 months ... ... ... ... ... 411 ... ... ... 20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 18 months ... ... ... ... ... 164 ... ... ... 8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 months and above ... ... ... ... ... 270 ... ... ... 13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known ... ... ... ... ... ... 65 ... ... ... 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2,054 100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the number of short-term prisoners was 63% of those admitted during 1963, the prison was not prevented from working effectively as an administrative unit although prevented from achieving its training purposes for the benefit of most criminals sent to it. The hard core of the prisoners serving sentences of more than six months supplied the cooks, those under training and specialised workers. There was thus considerable stability in the prison as an organisation and ample opportunity for continuing relationships to form. Recidivism did not contribute greatly to this stability as recidivists sent to this prison were mainly those sentenced for petty offences and serving short sentences. Those with longer sentences tended to be transferred up-country if they were not long-term convicts classified as Star class.

Although during 1963 the prison received no prisoners with sen-
tences of imprisonment of over 3 years either direct from the courts or on transfer from other prisons, it contained a small number of long-term prisoners who were identified through the subsidiary surveys. These prisoners had been admitted to the prison before 1963 or had been transferred on humanitarian grounds so that they could be near to their families for visits or because they requested transfers on the grounds of being tired of one prison where they had been for a long time. Thus it can be deduced that the prison community was dominated by long-sentence prisoners.

As the prison was classed as a training prison for Star class or first offenders it meant that numbers of prisoners (Table 8) had to be transferred as soon as vacancies were notified in other prisons and the transfer organized. Some transfers were ordered when the assessment of the officer in charge as to the suitability of a convict for a Star class prison changed because of his post-imprisonment behaviour.

**TABLE 8. Period in prison before transfer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period in Prison</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 month</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 months</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 months</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 12 months</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 18 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 to 24 months</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 2 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>261</td>
<td><strong>12.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases these transfers were requested and known in advance but in others a decrease or increase in numbers in another prison would result in a telegraphed transfer order and the more or less arbitrary weeding out of prisoners to fill the quota probably based on the need to vary the tribal composition of the receiving prison and the length of time before completion of sentence.

The prison was also required to hold persons who had failed to pay a fine either with or without a sentence of imprisonment in addition, as well as those for whom their friends or relatives were collecting the fine money. The tendency of courts particularly those not administered directly by the judiciary (3) to give sentences of fines either as a means of raising revenue through the courts, or such so high fines with regard to the circumstances of the accused that it would stand no reasonable chance of being paid, gave increased work
to the prison and involved 1,335 or 65% of the 1963 prisoners. The
details of those imprisoned for failure to pay fines and compensation
(Table 9) suggested that these were not small fines or the numbers
serving sentences of under one month would be noticeable. These
figures are predominantly consistent with fines of over 100/- so the
courts order fines which in the local circumstances would very often
not be paid as they represented the equivalent of a month’s wages for
minor crimes, usually in connection with revenue and drink.

TABLE 9. Sentences of imprisonment including a period for
failure to pay a fine.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was legal for the court to allow the convicted person time to
pay (4) and failure to do this involved the prison in receiving con-
victs (Table 10) who had to be fully documented, clothed and put to
work for very short periods. This would have had no value or utility
in any prison much less one administered for training purposes. These
numbers of transfers combined with short-term sentences and the re-
lease of prisoners whose fines had been paid kept the prison staff
working hard to maintain the records, and to process these prisoners
administratively which was the same amount of work whether the sentence
was one day or ten years.

TABLE 10. Time held in prison before payment of fine.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers of persons (Table 11) remanded in custody (5) may also
have affected the ability of the prison to function correctly, and
added considerably to the work of the prison staff and could not be
classed as any part of the function of a training prison. The details show the total number remanded in any one calendar month and not the total daily average on remand. This varied from 687 in July, 1961 to 166 in December, 1962. These were substantial increases on the convicted numbers in prison and meant more work in relation to rations and documentation; they were not a problem for discipline or security since they were housed in the one cell block up to a total of about 60 persons.

TABLE 11. Persons on remand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>1961</th>
<th>1962</th>
<th>1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The turnover of remands (Table 12) over a three month period shows that this was concentrated on lengths of remand from 1-3 days and at 13-17 days, which involved considerable administrative work. The first concentration was caused by the legal requirements to take a suspected person before a magistrate within 24 hours of arrest and the fact that the police lock-ups could not hold large numbers of suspects at one time.

TABLE 12. Remands between 23rd October and 30th January, 1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.of days</th>
<th>Before Release</th>
<th>Before Conviction</th>
<th>No.of days</th>
<th>Before Release</th>
<th>Before Conviction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In normal circumstances there might have been a steady flow, but Monday morning was likely to bring a higher number into remand since magistrates do not sit over the weekend. Also any particular political incident would bring a large number of individuals into remand in order to get potential trouble-makers out of the town, and to give the police an opportunity to sort out the suspects against whom they wished to proceed in court. In Table 12, 43 of the remands who were released after one day related to one incident; it was in these circumstances that the prison came under strain as a further cell block had to be emptied at short notice as this large batch of remands was to be kept separate.

The second peak period, from 13-17 days, related to the usual 14 days remand period (6), which was asked for by the police so that they could prepare their cases or decide not to proceed and allow the suspects to be released, so that those remanded for the 14 day period tended to be those charged with serious offences.

An additional point was that only 48.5% of the remands were convicted and sentenced to imprisonment; a further proportion would have been fined, put on probation or discharged so that a high proportion, probably as much as 75%, were convicted after being on remand. This suggests that the police, except for the first point mentioned above, did not ask to remand suspects unless they had reasonable grounds for recommending his detention in custody.

Also the prison staff had to deliver remands to the court by a specified time and date and to reclaim them again at the end of a day's hearing. This work had priority because of the demands of the magistrates and judiciary for planning their calendars and involved warrant documentation, transportation and escorts for which no regular planning could be made because of the daily varying numbers. This obviously was a necessary part of any prison service to guard those whom the police, with the concurrence of the courts considered were...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Under 1 year</th>
<th>1-3 months</th>
<th>3-6 months</th>
<th>6-12 months</th>
<th>12-18 months</th>
<th>18-36 months</th>
<th>Over 3 years</th>
<th>Life</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 20 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30 years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 45 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 50 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 51 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 1 year</th>
<th>1-3 months</th>
<th>3-6 months</th>
<th>6-12 months</th>
<th>12-18 months</th>
<th>18-36 months</th>
<th>Over 3 years</th>
<th>Life</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2056</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14. Length of sentence by number of previous convictions

| No. prev. convictions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |
| Not known             | 32| 5 | 7 | 5 | - | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Under 1 mth           | 172| 61 | 32 | 31 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 3 | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - |
| 1-3 mths              | 211| 71 | 69 | 23 | 17 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | - | 2 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 3-6 mths              | 170| 53 | 46 | 19 | 21 | 22 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 6-12 mths             | 160| 80 | 47 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 9 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 13 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 13-18 mths            | 64 | 32 | 11 | 14 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | 3 | - | 4 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 18-36 mths            | 98 | 43 | 21 | 18 | 18 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | - | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 270|
| Over 3 years          | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Life                  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Death                 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total                 | 907| 345| 233| 130| 97 | 74 | 50 | 37 | 27 | 30 | 31 | 15 | 16 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2,056|

| 16.8 | 11.4 | 613 | 417 | 316 | 2.4 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
either a danger to the public and the future administration of justice in the case or were likely to disappear. This latter category was seemingly higher than in western and U.S.A. Police experience as the population was much more fluid and addresses hard to trace since they were not known outside their immediate neighbours and neighbourhood.

II. Age and convict criminality

Not only was the prison community centred round convicts serving sentences longer than six months but it was dominated by younger men (Table 13). The average age for the prison was 27.9 years which was possibly higher than the western average (7). Prisoners under 25 years constituted 44.9% and under 35 years 84.4% of those admitted during the year. The older multiple offender who might have been expected to have had influence constituted 15.6% of the prisoners of which 57 or 44.5% had had no previous convictions. The length of sentence related to age shows that the core of the prison community was a group from 21 to 35 years of age, serving sentences of between 18 months and 3 years.

Although this was a prison for Star class prisoners, the youngest age group, between 16-20 years, contained only 14.7% of the convicts, with a further 0.7% between 17 and 18 years. Prisoners under 17 years were not confined in this prison except immediately after sentence while they awaited transfer to the prison designated for young offenders. Since the prison received 44.1% first offenders it could have been expected that this age group would have been much more dominant. In the 1962 census 52% of the population (8) was under 16 years and if crime was related to the age structure of the population and therefore to theoretical first offenders, the average prison age should have been much lower (9).

The age groups of persons convicted (10) showed 14.2% in 1961 and 12.2% in 1962 to be between 16 and 20 years. The criminal age structure of this prison was probably about the same as that for the country as a whole and showed a relative absence of juvenile delinquency.

The dominance of first offenders (Table 14) was very noticeable, although there may have been qualification to this relating to convicts from other countries whilst 34.5% had had one to three previous
convictions. Men with over 12 convictions totalled 64 or 3.6% of the prison population with the highest number of convictions recorded being 28 for one convict over 51 years. From these figures it can be seen that this prison population had had a limited experiences of crime as far as was known to the police and prison authorities.

Previous convictions did not mean previous sentences of imprisonment. This category included probation, binding over, repatriation to home, discharge on conviction and release to custody of parents as a juvenile out of control and the imposition of fines. The prison records stated the sentence of a fine in a previous conviction but did not record whether the fine was paid or that the person was sent to prison in default.

The details recorded of 303 recidivists (Table 15) were thus the minimum number of sentences of imprisonment experienced by those prisoners and might in fact have been substantially more in number although the duration of such sentences would always have been less than six months. If the previous sentence was given as imprisonment and fine, this had been taken as imprisonment.

### TABLE 15. Previous prison sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Conviotions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 14 16 17 18 20 Prev. pris. sentences</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this classification of previous imprisonment were included sentences to an approved school and to detention camps as vagrants. This may not be classed as imprisonment since the purpose behind these
| No. prev. conv. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | Total | Per cent age |
| Under 18 yrs. | 12 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 15 | 0.7 |
| 18 to 20 yrs. | 164 | 52 | 32 | 9 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 5 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 303 | 14.7 |
| 21 to 25 yrs. | 258 | 85 | 65 | 59 | 43 | 31 | 26 | 14 | 12 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 1 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 605 | 29.5 |
| 26 to 30 yrs. | 232 | 108 | 69 | 28 | 18 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 5 | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 546 | 26.6 |
| 31 to 35 yrs. | 114 | 43 | 28 | 25 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 264 | 12.9 |
| 36 to 40 yrs. | 69 | 39 | 23 | 14 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 188 | 9.1 |
| 41 to 45 yrs. | 28 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 65 | 3.2 |
| 46 to 50 yrs. | 13 | 5 | 2 | 5 | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 32 | 1.5 |
| Above 51 yrs. | 18 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2 | 1 | 38 | 1.8 |
| Total | 908 | 345 | 233 | 130 | 97 | 74 | 50 | 37 | 27 | 30 | 29 | 15 | 16 | 13 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2056 | 100.0 |

Percentage

Total 44.1 16.8 11.4 6.3 4.7 3.6 2.4 1.8 1.3 1.3 1.3 1.3 0.7 0.7 0.8
institutions was to keep certain types of offenders out of maximum and medium security prisons. On the other hand many of the sentences to long-term imprisonment, especially first offenders, would have been served in open prison camps.

The experience of imprisonment started from the moment of arrest even if there was release on bail after 24 hours or more. Also a prolonged period of remand on a serious charge which might have been more than six months, would have given an experience of imprisonment which might have been only marginally different from that of a convicted prisoner (11).

The details of recidivists (Table 15) showed that 81 or 27.2% had not been in prison before and 91 or 30.6% had been in prison once only. Above that there were only a comparative few who had had prolonged but intermittent experience of imprisonment. If the total convictions was the same as the total sentences of imprisonment for multiple recidivists, it would be assumed that the offenders might have been seriously imprisoned but the number was very small.

The details of age related to previous convictions (Table 16) shows that there was a marked dying out of criminality with increasing age in so far as it was shown by imprisonment. This feature, apart from being lower than the national average (10) illustrated that the officer in charge could class a convict as a Star class prisoner who had had several previous convictions. Also that a convict with a professional record could stay in such a Star class prison by being inconspicuous and causing no trouble either to the authorities or to his fellow prisoners, so that once he had been through reception, his record might be forgotten either through the forgetfulness of the staff or the deliberate action of a warden who was friendly to him.

It is now necessary to consider the types of crime for which these men were serving imprisonment. In the total prisoners accepted in 1963, 89 were imprisoned for double offences, 20 with three and 1 with five. These crimes were usually very disparate so that they could not be described as one type of crime.

Such convictions on multiple charges appeared to be in three categories; firstly minor charges tacked onto the main charge so that if the latter failed, they could at least get convictions for the
lesser charges - examples were illegal liquor and cart without light at night, death by dangerous driving and no driving licence, conveying stolen property and riding a bicycle at night without a light, assault and failure to pay personal tax. Secondly, connected offences such as attempted burglary and the possession of house-breaking implements by night, house-breaking and stock theft, theft and malicious damage, assault and wrongful confinement - charges which related to the same set of facts but were framed in different terms. Lastly, charges which were only interconnected in that one developed from the other - examples were disturbing a religious assembly and obstructing police, theft and assaulting police, possessing of marihuana, burglary, driving without a licence and giving false information to the police.

Also although the charge sheet in court might have listed ten or more specific charges, these details would not have been recorded in the acceptance register. The only details recorded would have been if the charges were different and received different consecutive or concurrent sentences (1.2). There was therefore no ready means of ascertaining the degree of criminality except by an examination of a sample of recidivists' records. No cases were found in which convicted persons had asked for other cases to be taken into consideration and these details recorded.

III. The crimes of the convicts

It was found necessary to group crimes under different headings.

The Penal Code (Table 17), other ordinances and customary law offences connected with women (Table 18) and traffic and allied offences (Table 19). These totals show that offenders against property make up 796 or 36% of the total charges, violent offences 206 or 9.3%, then marihuana offences 195 or 8.8%, offences against liquor licensing 190 or 8.6% and lastly drunk and disorderly charges 177 or 8%.

TABLE 17. Penal Code offences (including double charges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offences against public order and lawful authority</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escape section 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful oaths sections 59 - 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful society section 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contempt of court section 121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobedience of lawful orders section 131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False information to police section 129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption section 127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimidation section 238</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructing the police.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rioting section 83</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisting arrest section 253</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive weapon section 88</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusing to be finger-printed</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful possession of firearms section 89</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstructing tax collection section 253</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False identity card section 347</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False information to public servant section 129</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to obey summons section 131</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbing religious assembly section 135</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting modesty of woman section 144</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross indecency section 162</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libel section 195</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonating a public officer section 105</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening breach of peace section 94</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 143

B. Offences against the person

| Assault sections 250 - 251 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 124 |
| Indecent assault section 144 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 18 |
| Unnatural offence section 162 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 2 |
| Attempted defilement of girl section 145 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 5 |
| Manslaughter section 202 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 21 |
| Grievous harm section 234 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 15 |
| Wrongful confinement section 259 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 13 |
| Murder section 203 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 7 |
| Rape section 139 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1 |

Total 209

C. Offences against property

| Theft sections 267 - 285 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 411 |
| Offences allied to stealing sections 286 - 294 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 8 |
| Robbery and extortion sections 295 - 302 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 50 |
| Burglary, housebreaking etc. sections 303 - 311 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 296 |
| False pretences sections 312 - 321 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 20 |
| Receiving stolen property sections 322 - 326 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 66 |
| Fraud and false accounting sections 327 - 331 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1 |
| Malicious damage to property sections 332 - 344 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 12 |

Total 796

D. Other Penal Code offences

| Forgery sections 345 - 348 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 9 |
| False documents section 353 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 16 |

Total 25

**TABLE 18. Other ordinances (including double charges)**

| Traffic and allied offences Cap. 403 - 405 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 81 |
| African Liquor Ord. Cap. 122 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 190 |
| Municipalities Ord. (Drunk and disorderly) | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 177 |
| Vagrancy Ord. Cap. 58 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 26 |
| Failure to report (criminal Procedure Code) | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 41 |
| Personal tax Cap. 270 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 26 |
| Stock theft Cap. 355 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 102 |
| Bye-laws - Municipality | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 23 |
| Immigration Ord. Cap. 172 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 37 |
| Game and National Park Offences Cap. 376 - 377 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 47 |
| Dangerous Drugs Cap. 245 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 195 |
| Trading licences Cap. 437 | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 13 |

**Customary Law Offences (including double charges)**

Adultery | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 4
Taking married woman from husband... 19
Removing unmarried girl from parents... 3
Recieving bride-wealth from two persons... 1

Total 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic and allied offences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle without light at night ...</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-cart without light at night...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unroadworthy vehicle...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causing death by dangerous driving...</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No driving licence...</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not giving traffic signals...</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No licence plate...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving while under the influence of drink...</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninsured vehicle...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving without due care...</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad parking...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed vehicle...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defective speedometer...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving without 'L' plates...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlawful use of motor vehicle...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to display vehicle licence...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No road transport licence...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to follow transport licence...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving without consent of owner...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving hand out when driving...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle without licence...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding bicycle while drunk...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to carry bus licence...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving up one-way street...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless bicycle riding...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlicensed Public Service Vehicle...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle obstruction...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting unlicensed person to drive...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to stop...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding...</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to engage taxi meter...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong> 81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of the Penal Code (Table 17) shows the following features of note. The number of escapes under offences against public order did not mean escapes from police stations and prisons and usually referred to the almost unguarded lock up attached to Local Courts in the country and to running away while under the escort of a local court policeman. There was also a small group of essentially political offenders related to membership of unlawful societies and the taking of unlawful oaths, rioting, carrying offensive weapons and obstructing the police, as well as the wrongful confinement of others under offences against the person.

Under offences against the person there were charges unconnected with criminal activities for gain, heterosexual offences involving
young or unmarried girls, which would in the majority of cases not have been offences under customary law - bringing penalties other than compensation, and had resulted from the aggrieved person complaining to the police rather than the local court authorities. The cases of assault would have resulted in many cases from petty beer hall bar fights and inter-personal quarrels which occurred everywhere. The persons who committed such assaults totalled 85 or 4.1% of the prison population, with only 7 receiving sentences over 12 months. 52 or 61.2% came from local tribes and 58 or 68.2% had had no previous convictions. 66 or 77.1% were under 30 years of age. The violent man received a sentence of less than 12 months, was slightly older than the average and had little criminal record. The very small number of homosexual offenders was not any indication of the prevalence of homosexuality within the prison.

Offenders against property show the dominance of ordinary theft followed by house-breaking and burglary which potentially involved violence but did not in fact do so according to the charges. Violent crime here again was in the minority. The absence of obtaining credit, fraud and embezzlement is very noticeable, while the forgery and false document charges usually involved simple methods related to identity cards and personal tax receipts.

House breakers and burglars comprising 129 or 6.3% of the prison population, with the exception of 19 men, they were all serving sentences of more than six months. 53 or 41% were from local tribes. Only 32 or 24.8% had had no previous convictions, 51 or 39.5% had from one to three previous convictions and the remaining 46 and from four to twenty-four convictions. 78 or 60.5% were under 25 years of age. All except two had been fined in addition to imprisonment and had had their sentences increased by their failure to pay. The burglar was usually a young local man about the average age for the prison, with such known criminal experience.

The thief, comprising 285 or 13.9% of the prison population, received sentences from between three and twelve months in 181 or 63.5% cases. 88 or 30.9% came from local tribes and a further 44 Kamba or 15.5% and 39 Tanzanians or 13.7%. Only 71 or 24.9% had had no previous convictions, 95 or 33.4% with one to three previous convictions.
Although 155 or 54.4% are under 25 years of age, there was a spread into middle age. All but 18 had received fines and failed to pay them. The thief received short sentences despite a long known criminal record and he was often above the average age for the prison.

In the charges under ordinances other than the Penal Code (Table 18) a very high proportion involved offences for which imprisonment was of doubtful use. A high proportion of traffic offences (Table 19) came within this category and involved fines which could not be paid. The same applied to offences under the Native Intoxicating Liquor Ordinance which made it an offence to brew even the smallest amount of beer without a licence (13). It was both customary and cheap for the African family to brew its own beer both for regular weekend consumption, for the support of family festivals and for sale in support of family income. The ordinance was thus in support of bottled beer from which the government drew a revenue both on the bottle and from licences to sell.

Offenders against the African Liquor Ordinance comprised 181 or 8.8% of the prison population with 159 or 88% serving sentences of less than three months, of which only 9 were in default of paying a fine. Their tribes showed the same composition as that of nearby towns. 123 or 68% had had no previous convictions and 33 or 18.2% only one previous conviction. 78 or 43% were over 31 years of age. Liquor offenders were imprisoned for short periods without the option of a fine, and were over the average age for the prison but had small previous criminal records.

Drunk and disorderly charges made up a high proportion of the short-term prisoners. These totalled 88 or 43.3% of the prison population with 71 or 80.7% serving less than one month. Fines had been imposed and not paid only in three cases. Non-Africans with 15 or 17.1% and Arabs and Somalis with 21 or 24.4% made up the main offenders. 40 or 45.5% had had no previous convictions and 39 or 44.4% had one to three previous convictions and 51 or 58% were over 31 years of age. Drunks were thus in prison for short periods without the option of a fine, and were older than average for the prison and came noticeably from the richer communities which may reflect the police's greater readiness to arrest.
Failure to report convictions related to recidivists who had been ordered to report at stated times to the police (14), an interesting result of this measure intended to keep serious criminals out of trouble after their release from prison which may not have been related to their criminality, but to their personal and social problems.

The large number of charges under the Dangerous Drugs ordinance related to the strongly held views of the police that marihuana is habit forming and a prime cause of crime (15). Marihuana smoking appeared to be common and as such, convictions tended to be the result of police action directed towards other crimes. Its general prevalence particularly among the under-privileged and insecure, made it likely that police searches would disclose marihuana although initially they may have been searching for stolen property or illegally brewed beer. Since it was thus accidental that they were in prison and they were not addicted nor even involved in its smoking to any discernable degree, it could not be assumed that these persons were the prime cause of the marihuana smoking inside this prison.

The analysis showed that for marihuana smokers 113 out of 185 served sentences of imprisonment between 1 and 3 months. Out of the total sentences only 35 or 19% were in default of paying a fine. Tribally Arabs and Somalis were 30 or 16.2% and local tribes a further 68 or 36.8%. 65 or 36% had had no previous convictions but a further 81 or 43.8% had had one to three previous convictions. 110 or 59.5% were between the ages of 21 and 30 years. This class of offender comprised 9% of the prison population and were adult men serving short sentences with a high proportion of previous convictions with which the use of marihuana had no proved connection.

Stock theft, game killing and poaching in the National Parks were traditional activities for which the offenders felt no guilt, although the new national government was enforcing these laws with increasing severity. In the former cases because of their social background of aggressive tribalism and its effect on the creation of a nation and in the latter cases because of the economic value of game to the national economy as tourism was now a very major part of the national economy and the animals had to be preserved. These offenders tended to form their own social groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell Nos.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
<th>S10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kamba</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kikuyu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arab</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Luo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Masai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kisi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Taita/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taveta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tanganyika</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Kipsigis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage of convicts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 20 B. Tribal origins and compositions of local population

**Population census 1962**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Prisoners 1964</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Non-African</td>
<td></td>
<td>45,184</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(European, Cona, Indian,</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakastani, Seychellois/</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sumali/Arab</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,391</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Luo</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,195</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kikuyu</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,355</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kamba</td>
<td></td>
<td>40,622</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Taita/Taveta</td>
<td></td>
<td>228,504</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Digo/Swahili</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,234</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Giriana, Damuva, Pokomo</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tanga/yika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Massi</td>
<td></td>
<td>381</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Maragoli</td>
<td></td>
<td>568</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Luhya</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,962</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,830</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All races Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>322,400</td>
<td>2,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td></td>
<td>67,229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversion Table for Tribal Origin:

- Non-African
  - European
  - Cona
  - Indian
  - Pakastani
  - Seychellois
- Sumali/Arab
- Luo
- Kikuyu
- Kamba
- Taita/Taveta
- Digo/Swahili
- Giriana, Damuva, Pokomo
- Tanga/yika
- Massi
- Maragoli
- Luhya
- Others
Cattle thieves comprised 96 or 4.7% of the prison population, 40 received over 18 months, 12 one year to 13 months and 24 six months to one year sentences. Again local tribes predominated with 44 or 46%, with 14 Kamba or 14.5% coming next in numbers. The very high number of 60 or 62.6% had had no previous convictions and 29 or 30.2% had had one to three previous convictions. Their ages were high, with 33 or 34.4% between 25 and 30 years and 35 or 36.4% over 31 years. 89 out of 96 had been fined and failed to pay. Cattle thieves were thus older men with longer sentences and little previous crime recorded against them.

IV. The tribal composition of the prison

The tribal composition of the prison population during 1953 did not reflect the population structure of the nearby municipality or the province in which it lay (Tables 21 A and B). Apart from the distortion because of transfers into and out of other prisons within the province there was also the despatch of recidivist prisoners to up-country prisons and the receipt of Star class convicts from the same sources.

The extent to which this prison received prisoners from outside the local area was considerable as out of 244 consecutive admissions for long sentences only 109 came from the nearby town, 35 from the province in which the prison was situated and the remainder from elsewhere in the country.

The homes of these convicts were as equally varied and had no relationship to the court sentencing, with homes recorded from Somalia, Sudan and all over East Africa, with the common feature that their homes never appeared to be where they were sentenced. This prison therefore could not show social characteristics attributable in the main to the province in which the prison was situated.

V. Convict distribution in the prison

The survey of the convict distribution by blocks and cells which was carried out in October 1964 by a warder clerk with the assistance of the leaders of each cell and block, was able to show the convict groupings as they actually were, and not as the prison administration would have had them.
## Table 21. Cell distribution and length of sentence - October 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell Nos.</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>D3</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>D6</th>
<th>D7</th>
<th>D8</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
<th>E10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 6 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-18 months</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 18 months</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stage of Convicts

- Stage I
- Stage II
- Stage III
- Stage IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convicts</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>ES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The progressive stage system (16) through which all convicted criminal prisoners passed had made it the practice, both from convenience and the fact that prisoners with the same length of sentences passed up stages together, for certain wards and cells to be reserved and to contain prisoners of a certain stage. The cell distribution (Table 21) shows that cells 61-5 contained Stage IV, 61-8 Stage III and so on. Cooks were housed separately because of their irregular hours for looking and unlocking as were escapees so that they would be specially observed and confined (17), because of which they were not able to benefit from the stage system.

A short sentence prisoner, serving less than six months, was always Stage I, but the distribution between cells showed that these prisoners, in 14 out of 23 cells are in association with prisoners of another grade. Similarly no one could be in Stage IV unless they had served 18 months, but lower stage prisoners were in cells with Stage IV convicts. This might have occurred because the prison staff in an emergency filled up half empty cells at the top stages when there was a particularly high number of short sentence convicts entering the prison.

The convenience of a cell distribution by stages was that the staff could act towards a group of prisoners according to the privileges which they were entitled to receive. First and second Stage convicts, for instance, (18) were not allowed to attend school classes, and IV Stage prisoners were allowed 'to have approved means of recreation in his cell'. Once stages were mixed, this became impossible to enforce and indeed first Stage prisoners attended the researcher's adult education classes without apparent difficulty.

This mixing of stages was supposed to be prevented by the distinctive colour markings on each prisoner's shirt (19) but this also could be circumvented by taking it off or borrowing the shirt of another convict for a particular movement. The circumstances of this prison showed that the prisoners were not effectively segregated administratively by Stages.

The cell distribution by tribes (Table 20A) also suggested that there was movement between cells and blocks which was not associated with length of sentence and Stage status. Cells 55 - 7 had large
TABLE 22. **Cell distribution by offences - October 1964**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Robbery with violence</th>
<th>Stock theft</th>
<th>Theft and stealing</th>
<th>Burglary</th>
<th>Assault</th>
<th>Drunk and disorderly</th>
<th>Indecent assault - rape</th>
<th>Forgery - false pretences</th>
<th>Escape</th>
<th>Manslaughter</th>
<th>Game offences</th>
<th>Theft</th>
<th>Traffic</th>
<th>Unlawful oath</th>
<th>Arson</th>
<th>Immigration</th>
<th>Receiving stolen property</th>
<th>Liquor</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Stage of convicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of convicts</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage of convicts</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 +</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
numbers of Kikuyu convicts in Stage III, but cells B3, 4 and 6 had none; this could have been attributable to the numbers of that tribe in the prison. However the census showed that there were small groups of the same tribes localized throughout the prison, such as Kembas in D6 and 7, Arabs in BC, Kisi in Z4, lipaigs in D7 and 4 and E1 and 4 and Magai in D3 and 4. Convicts had described the ease with which it was possible to move from one cell to another - it only required the agreement of the receiving cell (21) probably its leader, and then to move over bed-sheets and blankets when the move was within a cell block. Between cell blocks, it was not much more difficult as it was probably only necessary to move over when an official group was on the move and his inclusion would go unnoticed. The convicts therefore tended to move into tribal groups in their cell accommodation.

Cell distribution by offences (Table 22) also shows some significant groupings. Cell D4 contained 16 cattle stealers, D7 and E2 men with sentences for manslaughter, burglars in D3, robbery with violence in D5 and 6, rape in D5 and 4. It seems probable that affinity by crime for certain types of offence which were specialized such as burglary and cattle theft, was a stronger attraction for convicts than tribes.

While a principal aim of the treatment of offenders was the classification of offenders (21) to minimize 'the dangers of contamination with regard to their age, character and previous history', the cell distribution of convicts by ages (Table 23) showed some significant contradictions. The prisoners under 20 had a significance for homosexual purposes and their presence in cells with Stage IV cells was unlikely to have been because of their criminal records alone. Movement between cells could also be assumed to be arrangeable for homosexual purposes as well as because of crime and tribal association.

It was clear therefore that the policy of the prison authorities to separate different classes of prisoners and the ability of the staff to enforce this, had limited success. The size of the prison population and the necessary architectural divisions within it combined with some overcrowding, the exigencies of court work and the ingenuity of the prisoners themselves, meant that there was little hope of maintaining such separation even if it was initially possible.
NOTES

(1) Penal Code, section 24. The following punishments may be inflicted by a court: a) death b) imprisonment c) detention under the Detention Camps Ord. d) corporal punishment e) fine f) forfeiture g) payment of compensation h) finding security to keep the peace and be of good behaviour.

(2) Prison Ord. Cap. 90, section 46/1. Convicted criminal prisoners sentenced to imprisonment, whether by one sentence or consecutive sentences, for a period exceeding one month, may by industry and good conduct earn a remission of one third of their sentence or sentences. Provided that in no case shall (i) any remission granted result in the release of a prisoner until he has served one calendar month, (ii) any remission be granted to a prisoner sentenced to imprisonment for life or to be detained during the Governor's pleasure.

(3) The Chief Justice administers the Courts Ord. Cap. 10 covering the courts of the Resident Magistrate, both for civil and criminal cases and the Isiolo courts for civil cases concerning Moslem. He also administers the High Court in the town through the Criminal Procedure Code Cap. 75 and the Appellate Jurisdiction Ord. Cap. 9. Courts not administered by the Chief Justice alone but together with the Provincial Commissioner through consultation, are the township African courts constituted under the African Courts Ord. Cap. 11.

(4) Criminal Procedure Code, section 36(1). When a convict person has been sentenced to a fine only and to imprisonment in default of payment of the fine, and whether or not a warrant of distress has been issued under section 33 of this code, the court may suspend the execution of the sentence of imprisonment and may release the convicted person upon his executing a bond, with or without sureties, as the court thinks fit, conditioned for his appearance before such court on a day not being more than 30 days from the time of the executing of the bond.

(5) Criminal Procedure Code, section 33. A police officer making an arrest without a warrant shall without unnecessary delay and subject to the provisions of this Code as to bail, take or send the person before a magistrate having jurisdiction in the case or before an officer in charge of a police station. Section 35. When any person has been taken into custody without a warrant for an offence other than murder or treason, the officer in charge of the police station to which such person has been brought may, in any case and shall, if it does not appear practicable to bring such person before an appropriate subordinate court within twenty-four hours after he has been taken into custody, inquire into the case.

Section 108. The police officer or other persons executing a warrant of arrest shall (subject to the provisions of section 103 of this Code as to security) without unnecessary delay bring the person arrested before the court before which he is required by law to produce such person.

(6) Criminal Procedure Code, section 205 (1). Provided that no such adjournment shall be for more than 30 clear days, or, if the accused person has been committed to prison, for more than 15 clear days, the day following that on which the adjournment is made being counted as the first day.

(7) T. and P. MORRIS, Pentonville (London 1963), p. 48. The modal age was 25 years.

(8) Population Census (1962) volume 1. p. 4


The age groups of persons convicted during the last two years were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>under 18</th>
<th>16 to 18</th>
<th>18-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-50</th>
<th>Over 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>4072</td>
<td>7881</td>
<td>15,605</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>4148</td>
<td>8,911</td>
<td>19,262</td>
<td>1144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11) **Prison Rules (1963), section 102. Unconvicted prisoners**

(1) May exercise together

(2) Employment may be provided if they wish

(3) allowed to see own doctor.

(4) may wear own clothing.

(12) **Penal Code Cap.63, section 63.** Where a person after conviction for an offence is convicted of another offence, either before sentence is passed upon him under the first conviction or before the expiration of that sentence, other than a sentence of death or of corporal punishment, which is passed upon him under the expiration of the former sentence unless the court directs that it shall be executed concurrently with the former sentence or any part thereof.

(13) **African Liquor Ord. Cap.122, sections**

3 (1) No person shall be in possession of, manufacture, consume, sell or supply any African spirituous liquor

9 (1) No person, unless he holds a licence issued to him under the ordinance, shall manufacture for the purpose of sale or sell African intoxicating liquor, or shall in a municipality, township or trading centre, possess or use sprouted grain, liquid yeast or any other process for the manufacture of African intoxicating liquor, whether such liquor is for his own use or otherwise.

(14) **Criminal Procedure Code, section 343 (1).** When any person, having been convicted of any offence punishable with imprisonment for a term of three years or upwards, is again convicted of any offence punishable with imprisonment for a term of three years or upwards, or of any offence under section 345 of this code, the court may, if it thinks fit, at the time of passing sentence of imprisonment on such person, also order that he shall be subject to police supervision as hereinafter provided for a period not exceeding five years from the date of his release from prison.


(16) **Prison Rules (1963)**

Section 10. All short sentence prisoners shall be and remain in the first stage for the whole of their sentence.

Section 11. On admission to prison, a long sentence prisoner shall be placed in the second stage and shall remain therein for three months.

Section 12. A long sentence prisoner shall enter the third stage and shall remain therein for fifteen months.

Section 13. A long service prisoner shall enter the fourth stage and shall remain therein for eighteen months.

Section 14. A long service prisoner after serving eighteen months in the fourth stage or such longer period as he may be required to serve therein, shall be eligible to enter the special stage.

(17) **Prison Rules (1963), section 35 (1)**

(18) **Prison Rules (1963), section 17 (2)**

(19) Costume distinctions for prisoners were:

1st stage White uniform

2nd stage Red stripe round sleeve
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Color and Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd stage</td>
<td>Green stripe round sleeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th stage</td>
<td>Blue stripe round sleeve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special stage</td>
<td>Blue shorts and shirt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapes</td>
<td>Brown stripe round chest and down shorts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(20) Informant 2/2/17 - Trans.

Chapter V  
The Prison Staff

I. Service Structure

The Prison Service was a para-military organisation which until April, 1962, was controlled by the Ministry of Defence (1). The service had to develop along such lines because the majority of the warders had no or only primary education. The educational structure of the service was related to that of the country as a whole at the time of the warders' recruitment with the younger the recruit the better the education. In their training they received a basic course to instil the simple military skills without which the administration of their prisons could not, in the opinion of the government, have been possible. The prison staff at all times wore uniform (2), the warders marched to duty, attention was paid to saluting (3), guards of honour (4), and to neatness on parade, kit inspections were carried out from time to time, and they carried weapons when on escort duty outside the prison and fired an initial and periodic musketry course.

The Prison Service Standing Orders were long and detailed and amending them so that they were up-to-date was a lengthy job. During the years of this research and prior to it, so many changes had been made in the regulations that this prison had not been able to keep a set up-to-date. There was thus no means of knowing whether a particular rule was still in force or not. The officer in charge acted on memory for most issues and had his attention drawn to particular orders during inspection trips to the prison by headquarters personnel.

The salary scales (Table 24) at the time of the start of this study allowed for free quarters, uniform and health services (5). The basic pay for warders of 160/- per month apart from free benefits and pension provident fund gains was well above outside wages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 24. Salary scales - Prison Service per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief warder (1) ... ... ... £278.14s. to £357.18s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief warder (11) ... ... ... £231.18s. to £270.18s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant warder ... ... ... £175. 4s. to £216.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal warder ... ... ... £138. to £159.12s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warder Clerk/Artisan ... ... ... £111.15s. to £159.12s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Corporal Warder ... ... ... £111.15s. to £136.19s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Warder ... ... ... ... ... £96. to £127.10s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While these salaries were adequate by local standards, it must be remembered that the prisons themselves had a standard of living in line with the recommendations made by the Second United Nations Congress on the prevention of crime and the treatment of offenders, held in London in August 1960 (6). The standard of living of warders was thus above that of the outside community but comparable to that of the prisoners.

Authority had been given to study the prison and prisoners but this was not taken to allow research into the staff and the work carried out by the prison staff concerned. However it was possible to enquire from some warders certain questions relating to joining the service and the points and losses of such work (Table 25).

TABLE 25. Attitudes to prison service

(A) Reasons for joining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To help government</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get money</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get on - ambition</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty at home</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help parents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help wife and children</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To educate children</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To help country</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) Benefits from joining prison service

1. Personal Benefits

- Promotion: 3
- Regular salary: 2
- Help when in trouble: 1
- Pension: 3
- Money to educate children: 7
  - Buy land: 6
  - Marry: 3
  - Buy clothes: 1
  - Build house: 2
  - Help family: 4

2. Non-personal benefits

- Reducing unemployment: 1
- Increasing productivity: 1
- Helping independence: 1
- Knowing government's progress: 1

3. Other reasons: 3

(C) Losses from joining prison service

- Not enough increments: 1
- Not enough promotion: 3
- Far from home: 2
- Away from wife: 2
- Little cash profit: 5
- No than-s for work: 1
- Too much punishment: 1
- No help to travel home: 1
It can be seen from these replies that the primary reason for joining the prison service was economic. There was a generalised idea of helping the country for which government service was attractive but it was very significant that there was no mention in any reply of prisons, imprisonment or their obligation to assist in the treatment of offenders. A senior officer stated (7) that "with virtually illiterate warders it was not possible to explain the treatment of offenders and that it was enough to expect them to keep the prisoners under control without confusing them with penology". He was not against the use of social science but thought it impossible to utilise it with his existing staff.

At the beginning of the research period, the senior staff were British and they were required only to pass the Standard Swahili (written and oral) examinations within five years of appointment (8). This examination was a simple test of elementary knowledge and did not mean that they had reached bilingual standard.

It may have been considered that Swahili was not sufficiently a lingua franca in the country to justify enforcing a higher standard on senior officers and that in any case officers would be posted to prisons where Swahili speakers would be in the minority. Nevertheless Swahili was the working language of the Prison Service and indeed rules for the conduct of prisoners in Swahili translation were posted on the notice boards of each cell block. Also the transfers between prisons prevented a y tribal dialects becoming dominant in any one locality.

It had been impossible to develop English as a lingua franca with such a high proportion of illiterates and Swahili had become widely used at least as a language for trading and employment outside its main areas of dominance in the form of a dialect with simplified grammar which because of its use by European farmers had come to be known as 'kisestilla'.

Penological issues could not be discussed and utilised with the existing staff. This was not because of their low standard of
intelligence or literacy but because senior staff apart from their own personal difficulties in accepting penology as a necessary and possible science did not have sufficient command of the language to communicate anything more than routine instructions and to understand personal matters and disciplinary statements. Because of language there was a fundamental block in communication between senior staff and their subordinates.

Some subordinate members of staff had acquired a rudimentary knowledge of English and passed departmental English examinations to this effect but their knowledge and use in passing ideas upwards was no more effective than the senior officers' linguistic ability in communicating downwards.

The difficulties over language were not entirely solved by the replacement of British by national senior officers who themselves were often members of non-Swahili speaking tribes and thus had a similar problem in communication.

If a junior member of the prison service had a request to make, it was made to the officer in charge of the prison and these requests were analysed for 1963 (Table 26.)

**TABLE 26. Warder applications 1963**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave—accumulated</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to near home district</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer away from this prison</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave for personal problems</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals against punishment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debts of another warden problems</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to Govt about land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowances for extra duty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from requests for entitled leave which was a formality, it can be seen that their major preoccupations related to being away from their own home areas. 32 wanted to be posted nearer to their homes and 36 wanted leave for urgent personal affairs. There was at least one application each week about matters which could not be solved at the prison in which they were serving. While warders did not accept service away from their homes any more readily than people elsewhere, the situation was made worse by the huge distances as well
as the time and cost of travel and the fact that with partial illiterate tensions cannot be explained and reduced in letters.

II. Staff of this prison

On 31 May, 1964, the authorised establishment of this prison was 197 all ranks and an actual strength of 214, in addition to which there were established clerical posts for 22, and an actual strength of 33 (Table 27). In addition there were a Superintendent of Prisons in charge, two Assistant Superintendents of Prisons, a Steward and a Senior Technical Instructor. A Welfare After-care Officer joined later in the year. This increase of actual strength over establishment may have been due to the strain imposed on the prison service over the independence period by the retirement of the British Officer establishment. This meant the rapid promotion of junior officers and possibly a preparatory promotion of a larger establishment of non-commissioned officers as a preparation for possible further promotion later. It may also have been thought necessary to give these newer officers this additional support.

TABLE 27. Non-Senior Staff Establishment/Strength

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorised Establishment</th>
<th>Strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Officers I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Warders II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeants</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporals</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L/Corporals</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warders</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warder Clerks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Clerks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warder/Drivers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warder/Artisans</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warder/Operators</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access was allowed to the records of the non-gazetted staff and a sample of 150 warders were examined. The length of their service at this prison (Table 28) showed that 55% had been there for less than a year while 16.7% had been there for over two years, of which 3 had served over four years. While this suggested a rather high mobility and short service, an analysis of length of service related to the number of prisons in which these warders had served (Table 29), showed that only 25.4% had served in more than four prisons.
TABLE 28. Length of service at prison
Sample of 150 warders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Number of Warders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3 months</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 months</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 9 months</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 12 months</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 months</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 3 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 4 years</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 4 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 29. Length of service related to number of prisons in which served
Sample of 150 warders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service (years)</th>
<th>This Prison only</th>
<th>Prisons</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 +</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this sample showed only 14% to have served more than 10 years, there was some evidence that there was a high turn-over in the Prison Service (9) but that it was steadily being slowed down. This conforms to a general understanding that the prison service was attractive to its staff particularly at a time of growing countrywide unemployment and land shortage in some areas. These details also suggested that there were ample opportunities for promotion within the service for any warder of average intelligence and application who had decided to make the Prison Service his career.

The age of the sample (Table 30) also suggested that this is a young service in which a high proportion leave by the time they are 35 years and do not serve until the normal retirement age of 50 years.

The average age of the warder staff was 30.9 years, two years above that of the prisoners. The reason given for joining suggests that one or two periods of enlistment gave the average warder sufficient money to settle down. The average expectation of life at birth was probably not more than 30 years at that time, but the expectation of life for an African might have been higher for those in government...
service. This however was not in itself sufficient incentive to
serve on when deaths outside the service might have gone towards en-
riching him socially by becoming the head of his family as well as
economically by the inheritance of cattle and land from his father
and brothers.

TABLE 30. **Age of Warder Staff**
Sample of 150 warders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aged under 20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25 years</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30 years</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35 years</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40 years</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 45 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 50 years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 51 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tribal composition of the same sample showed Kamba 26%, Kikuyu
18.7%, Luo 12%, Kipsigis 10.7% with the remainder belonging to twenty
tribes from other countries. Kamba serving in the prison were more
than their proportion of the country's population which was 10% (10).

It should also be noted from this tribal breakdown that only 5
out of 150 warders came from areas in which Swahili was spoken in the
home and that only 15 had passed a departmental Swahili examination
entitling them to additional allowances.

This continuing interest in their home affairs may have been
accentuated by the isolation of this prison and the inability of the
warders to take part easily in the social life of the nearby town
where they might have been able to develop a non-tribal way of life
in association with other government and industrial employees. Whilst
they took what opportunities they could to get on prison transport
going into and out of the town, the bus service was irregular and
expensive.

The Prison Service was well aware of the difficulty in having
their prisons isolated for security reasons and a recognition that
the staff as well as the prisoners were imprisoned was general among
the senior staff (7). The Prison Service stressed the importance of
welfare and stated that the care of the warders was one of the most
important duties of an officer in charge (11). Welfare was taken to
include the discovery of reasons for any discontentment and poor morale,
and their comfort, water supplies, sport, visits to sick personnel, and domestic and financial difficulties (12).

III. **Staff discipline**

Discipline in the Prison Service came under two separate headings - offences under the Prisons Ordinance which carried penal sanctions passable only by a court (13) of which no cases were known to have occurred during the period of the research and offences under the Prison Rules 1963, section 124.

It was not possible to keep a check on charges brought under the Prison Rules during the research period but the records of 150 warders were examined and their offences analysed against these rules (Table 31).

### TABLE 31. Warders offences against Prison Rules

| (a) | absent from duty | 49 |
| (b) | sleeping on duty | 31 |
| (c) | neglect or disobedience of orders | 53 |
| (d) | under the influence of alcohol or drugs whether on duty or off duty | 14 |
| (e) | insubordination | 0 |
| (f) | wilful destruction of or careless loss or injury to government property | 2 |
| (g) | neglect of duty | 0 |
| (h) | malingeriing | 0 |
| (i) | using personal violence to any prisoner | 2 |
| (j) | instigating or permitting any prisoner to commit any crime or offence against prison discipline | 0 |
| (k) | allowing unauthorised person to communicate with prisoner | 0 |
| (l) | borrowing money from or lending money to another prison officer | 0 |
| (m) | bringing tobacco or liquor into prison | 0 |
| (n) | being improperly dressed when in uniform | 5 |
| (o) | reporting late for duty | 7 |
| (p) | losing supervision over prisoners | 3 |
| (q) | selling or making away with any part of his uniform or equipment | 1 |
| (r) | destroying, damaging or losing on purpose or by neglect Govt or prisoner's property | 4 |
| (s) | trafficking with prisoners | 0 |
| (t) | using personal violence to another officer | 4 |
| (u) | associating with discharged prisoners | 0 |
| (v) | receiving any fee for having any business dealing with prisoner, discharged prisoner, friend of or visitor to a prisoner. | 0 |
| (w) | making an unauthorised communication | 0 |
| (x) | any other conduct to the prejudice of good order or discipline or the security of a prison | 0 |

- Slovenly on duty | 1 |
- Leaving post | 7 |
- Illegal liquor in prison lines | 2 |
- Idle at work | 1 |
- Failing to salute | 1 |
- Not knowing size of gang | 1 |
- Passing a letter of prisoner | 3 |
- Inattentive to duty | 6 |
- Lying down on guard | 1 |
- Smoking on duty | 1 |
- Breaking out of lines | 2 |
- Flirin, rifle without cause | 1 |
Having prostitute in prison lines 1
Having unauthorised person in prison lines 2
Being in female warder lines 1
Using bad language 1
Taking keys out of prison 1
Allowing convicts into quarters 1

Total 210
offences

It is necessary to stress that the penal sections of the Prisons Ordinance (13) as regards trafficking were essentially the same as the provisions of section 124 of the Prison Rules except that the penalty was higher and might involve the convicted person in dismissal or reduction in rank (14). Thus the officer in charge of the prison had the latitude to lay a charge with the police or to treat the offence as a minor one to be dealt with according to regulations (15).

This table lists all the possible offences by warders under the prison rules but the vast majority of the offences in this sample involved the administration of the prison and not contact with the prisoners. Only using personal violence to any prisoner (two offences) passing a letter of a prisoner (three offences) and allowing a convict into quarters (one offence) involved prisoners and none need to be dependent on a prisoner's evidence. It is noticeable that as far as disciplinary offences show, warders had no illegal dealings with the prisoners.

The total of 210 offences for 153 warders may seem large but 51 warders had had no offences recorded against them and there was an average of just under one offence for every five years of service.

(2) Prison Standing Orders, Chapter 3, section 27(1)

(3) Prison Standing Orders, Chapter 12, section 1

(4) Prison Standing Orders, Chapter 12, section 2. Guards had to be turned out for the heads in the Colony of the Anglican Church, the Church of Scotland and the Roman Catholic Church, as well as for senior government officials.

(5) Government Staff List (1 September 1962), pages ix and x


(7) Taped informants T/Bl/3 and B2/2 and 4.

(8) Prison Standing Orders, Chapter 9, section 14

(9) Treatment of Offenders Annual Report (1962)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment of Warders, L/Cpl. &amp; Cpl.</th>
<th>3858</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left the service</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assuming same establishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(11) Prison Standing Orders, Chapter 10, section 3

(12) Prison Standing Orders, Chapter 10, section 2

(13) Prison Ordinances (1963)

Section 15. Prison Officers not to leave service without permission.
Section 17. Assault on senior officer in rank.
Section 18. Every prison officer who without lawful authority a) knowingly suffers any intoxicating liquor, tobacco, bhang or hemp, drug, opiate, money, clothing, provisions, letter, document or other article to be sold to or received from or used by or on behalf of any prisoners, or b) lends or gives to any prisoners as above, or c) knowingly suffers any letter or document or other article to be brought out of any prison or to be conveyed from any prison, or d) without the permission of the Commissioner informs the Press or any other person of any matter concerning a prison or a prisoner or any matter derived from official sources connected with or related to the Service,
Section 19. Illegal benefits or advantages from prison articles,
Section 20. Prison officers not to be member of trade unions,
Section 21. Prison officers not to engage in dealings with prisoners.

(14) Prison Rules (1963), section 130

(15) Prison Rules (1963), section 126
Chapter VI
Routine and Administration

I. General Routine

Everything in this prison was subordinated to the necessary routine of seeing that the prisoners were fed, worked, admitted and released and this burden was sufficiently heavy to leave very little time for other duties which did not have this fundamental necessity.

The convicted prisoners arrived in groups from the courts in the nearby town at the end of the day's hearings in wired-in lorries run by the Prison Department. This usually meant that the new admissions arrived after the end of the prison's office hours, except for remands which the courts may have dealt with in the morning and entered the prison during the mid-day break, and transfers from prisons within the same province. The lorry stopped outside the main gate and they passed in single file through the wicket gate, squatting down in lines to await attention.

For the first offender or man on remand for the first time, this sight of the inside of the prison may have been a shock. The word "silence" was painted in large letters above the gate, they were squatting, the warders in uniform standing, and over all the restless hum and loud echoes of the prison itself. For the men who had been in prison before, there would have been no such shocks, and in the words of a senior prison officer (1) "they are very full of themselves when they come out of the prison van at night. Few are in any way over-awed. They see people whom they know, both prisoners and warders".

The first night was usually spent in the reception block and it was on the next morning that the prisoner was given prison clothing, and signed for his personal possessions which were kept in a sealed white cloth bag. It may have been a further day before he was given a cloth square on which his number and date of his release had been stencilled, which had to be stitched on the front of his white tunic shirt.

He would also have been seen by the Reception Board consisting of the officer in charge, the work superintendent, welfare officer and the chaplain, which allocated prisoners to the work which was available and not the prisoner to the work which was best suited to his abilities.
and sentence. The allocation of work was almost inevitably to general unskilled duties until length of sentence, general behaviour and assessed intelligence allowed the prison authorities to change the convict to more skilled work. His outside skills would not have been utilised because the opportunity to use them was a reward rather than an obligation on the authorities. A convict (4) said "whether you go to agriculture or the rope section is nothing more than luck, it has nothing to do with what you are".

The prison's day began with the early shift of warders being marched on duty at about 05.45 from the lines and being inspected by the Chief Officer who had relieved the Night Duty Officer just before. The prisoners were unlocked at 06.30 after the keys had been checked, found correct and issued to the warders concerned, counted and then issued with their morning gruel. They were then marshalled in the main yard, checked against the work gang muster rolls and sent to work. The farm gang left the prison at about 07.00 followed by the laundrymen, gardeners, swineherds, line sweepers, outside cleaners, garage mechanics, wood splitters, builders and the sick.

The senior prison officers came on duty at about 08.00 to carry out their general duties; some came earlier and returned home for a quick breakfast, while all remained until 12.30 hours when the mid-day meal was prepared and tasted. The gangs returned at various times during the morning as soon as their tasks were completed and all were back in the prison by mid-day. The mid-day meal started to be issued to the segregation and remand blocks before mid-day but the majority got their meal at 13.30 hours.

At 12.45 hours the afternoon shift of warders marched on duty and were inspected on the asphalt square outside the main gate; the keys were checked and issued and the morning shift marched out and away to the lines. The senior officers returned for their afternoon work which usually went on beyond official office hours which stopped at 14.00 hours. The garage workers and the swineherds left the prison again for an afternoon shift together with field workers who had been given special plots to cultivate, small plots for their own profit. At 17.00 hours the evening meal was issued and the final count and lock-up began at 17.30 hours. At 19.45 hours the night shift marched
on duty and relieved the afternoon shift after receiving their keys correctly.

On Saturdays only the mornings were worked and for the remainder of the day and for all the Sundays and public holidays, the prisoners except for meal-times and the counting of the prisoners three times daily (2) were kept in their cells or cell-dormitories.

II. Routine and contingent activities

The activities of this prison may be divided into the processes related to the keeping, using and serving of the prisoners intrusted to it (3). The routine activities of keeping the prisoners were acceptance and discharge processes and their production in court according to the dates endorsed on their warrants, the organisation of guard duties at static points involved looking and unlocking and on the gangs marching backwards and forwards and at work. There was also the buying, production, cooking and issuing of food and the obtaining, storing and issuing of the clothing and equipment necessary for the prisoners use. These routine activities were essentially bureaucratic and western in inception while having to be carried out by staff who did not have a background attuned to this type of organisational function. A senior officer said (1) "in the six months I have been in charge I have been round the prison four times, and today before I went down to the orderly room to deal with the day's charges and applications I initialled 117 entries in the earnings scheme book. In directives there is the phrase 'the officer in charge will' and there is no delegation allowed in the regulations. Many things will be returned from headquarters because it had not got the officer in charge's signature on it. By signing I am not checking anything - I just sign; it might just as well be the newest recruit warder signing. You need an executive officer for routine. The wireless network cuts down on some correspondence but the number of signals amply balances out this saving. The paper work gets worse and worse; in 1951 there were three headquarters senior staff, six Asian clerks and eight African clerks and orderlies. Now in 1964 there is an enormous headquarters staff and not much difference in the prison population. The system shows that senior officers are not trusted; your actual authority to do anything on your own bat is nil".
The contingent activities originated from the convicts when they staged organised reactions to what they considered to be injustice, escape or attempt to escape or when accidentally or on purpose there were mistakes which immobilised the prison machinery while they rectified the error or found out which prisoner had escaped. There was also the administration of justice related to the breaking of rules by both prisoners and staff which fluctuated from day to day. There were administrative emergencies related to sudden increases in numbers of convicted and remand prisoners and inspection visits by senior officials and auditors for which records had to be made available.

The administrative system of the prison was by necessity bureaucratically based in that the activities of the prison and the prisoner were dependent on records. Nothing was done which was not recorded, and the convict passed through a series of activities which had to be recorded on paper or they were not accepted as having occurred. In order to have an adequately functioning bureaucratic system it was necessary to have both personnel and material working towards a specific end. In this prison the warder clerks were endeavouring to work a record system of some complexity in a language with which they were only marginally conversant, and which knowledge they defended as a specific reason for doing this job; descriptions of convicts were poorly done because they had not a sufficiently large vocabulary to describe what they saw. Faced with record files containing large numbers of questions to be answered, they were filled in without being given detailed guidance as to what was required. For example employment status was often left out because the information was unavailable or because the clerk had not the time to worry about a reasonable answer. There was a constant struggle to keep records up to date and when essential details like alterations to expected date of release due to a sudden amnesty had to be done it was often senior officers who had to do the work and altered the records.

The routine activities in using the prison population were based on the necessity of keeping them occupied within the prison's custodial framework and not with a view to making their work pay for their keep. Routine was thus overloaded with procedural activities related to the
allocation of prisoners to gangs and gangs to work. In connection
with this there was the obtaining of materials and orders, storing
products and the financial accounting to deal with the process. This
was a relatively simple process in this prison as there was only one
small workshop and the majority of the prisoners either worked in the
matting shop turning coconut fibre into string and then into mats
which was easy to obtain and store, or on the prison farm.

The training of convicts was also not a serious administrative
strain since so little could be done in this prison. One of the diffi-
culties of organising prison training was that it was essentially
what the prison was able to provide on limited funds and with specific
markets in mind for their own manufactured goods. The convicts did
not deny that training was provided and that such training could be
of a high standard, but it was not always what the convict wanted to
learn, and he had to choose or be chosen for the training done in this
prison. A convict (5) said "I am not very keen. I just do it for the
sake of doing it, because this line doesn't at all interest me. I
would like to learn advanced engineering, electricity and that sort of
thing".

This statement certainly overrated that person's capabilities,
but there was this difficulty in prison training which could be certain
economic advancement to a previously deprived individual or the illi-
terate long-term convict and would be welcomed. This same training
was status reduction for even a partially educated criminal. He did
not want the training except to relieve boredom as he did not envisage
that he would do that sort of work when he was released.

The contingent activities were almost entirely confined to events
which further impeded the ability of the prison to make itself economi-
cally viable; the transfer of competent trained prisoners and the re-
ceipt of other trained for work not available in the prison, delays
caused by discounts and the shortage of contracted work from the outside.

The routine activities for serving the prison population were
listening to their complaints and family problems, overseeing that the
sick were adequately cared for and arranging classes and games within
the prison. The contingent activities were the emergencies and sudden
illnesses of the convicts' families, and sudden sicknesses in the prison
The contingent activities originated from the convicts when they staged organised reactions to what they considered to be injustice, escape or attempt to escape or when accidentally or on purpose there were incidents which immobilised the prison machinery while they rectified the error or found out which prisoner had escaped. There was also the administration of justice related to the breaking of rules by both prisoners and staff which fluctuated from day to day. There were administrative emergencies related to sudden increases in numbers of convicted and remand prisoners and inspection visits by senior officials and auditors for which records had to be made available.

The administrative system of the prison was by necessity bureaucratically based in that the activities of the prison and the prisoner were dependent on records. Nothing was done which was not recorded, and the convict passed through a series of activities which had to be recorded on paper or they were not accepted as having occurred. In order to have an adequately functioning bureaucratic system it was necessary to have both personnel and material working towards a specific end. In this prison the warder clerks were endeavouring to work a record system of some complexity in a language with which they were only marginally conversant, and which knowledge they defended as a specific reason for doing this job; descriptions of convicts were poorly done because they had not a sufficiently large vocabulary to describe what they saw. Faced with record files containing large numbers of questions to be answered, they were filled in without being given detailed guidance as to what was required. For example employment status was often left out because the information was unavailable or because the clerk had not the time to worry out a reasonable answer. There was a constant struggle to keep records up to date and when essential details like alterations to expected date of release due to a sudden amnesty had to be done it was often senior officers who had to do the work and altered the records.

The routine activities in using the prison population were based on the necessity of keeping them occupied within the prison's custodial framework and not with a view to making their work pay for their keep. Routine was thus overloaded with procedural activities related to the
allocation of prisoners to gangs and gangs to work. In connection with this there was the obtaining of materials and orders, storing products and the financial accounting to deal with the process. This was a relatively simple process in this prison as there was only one small workshop and the majority of the prisoners either worked in the matting shop turning coconut fibre into string and then into mats which was easy to obtain and store, or on the prison farm.

The training of convicts was also not a serious administrative strain since so little could be done in this prison. One of the difficulties of organising prison training was that it was essentially what the prison was able to provide on limited funds and with specific markets in mind for their own manufactured goods. The convicts did not deny that training was provided and that such training could be of a high standard, but it was not always what the convict wanted to learn, and he had to choose or be chosen for the training done in this prison. A convict (5) said "I am not very keen. I just do it for the sake of doing it, because this line doesn't at all interest me. I would like to learn advanced engineering, electricity and that sort of thing".

This statement certainly overrated that person's capabilities, but there was this difficulty in prison training which could be certain economic advancement to a previously deprived individual or the illiterate long-term convict and would be welcomed. This same training was status reduction for even a partially educated criminal. He did not want the training except to relieve boredom as he did not envisage that he would do that sort of work when he was released.

The contingent activities were almost entirely confined to events which further impeded the ability of the prison to make itself economically viable; the transfer of competent trained prisoners and the receipt of other trained for work not available in the prison, delays caused by discounts and the shortage of contracted work from the outside.

The routine activities for serving the prison population were listening to their complaints and family problems, overseeing that the sick were adequately cared for and arranging classes and games within the prison. The contingent activities were the emergencies and sudden illnesses of the convicts' families, and sudden sicknesses in the prison
for which the senior officer had both humane and bureaucratic obligations.

III. The Administrative System

While the work of the prison staff could be divided into routine and contingent activities (6), it was probable that the former gave as much if not more anxiety than the latter to the senior staff. It was not only a western bureaucratic system imposed on certain trained and partially trained staff members from an African traditional background but one which had to succeed in certain immediate objectives. It was probable that the ability of this prison to run itself was not as high as would be the case in an American or European prison.

Thus anxiety for the senior staff which elsewhere might have been confined to contingent activities, extended into the routine ones which were not only performed for their obvious ends but also to limited extent as a necessary fall-back against blame for the administrative failures of any part of the system. The senior staff felt obliged to fulfill their bureaucratic duties as accurately as possible because it was only by doing so that they could be freed from blame if anything went wrong; they followed the rules and therefore if blame should have been attached to anyone, its effect towards them specifically would be limited.

Perhaps attention was also paid to the bureaucratic aspects of the prison's routine because the consequences of a contingent activity which had not been correctly dealt with bureaucratically were much more serious to the officer in charge than in non-service institutions. He was in charge of an institution containing large numbers of men of whom the majority could not be trusted by definition since they were convicted criminals and supported by a staff whose loyalty was much more administrative than personal or ideological. If anything went wrong, he must by definition be very much on his own in which his subordinates would interpret their own actions according to the demands of the rule book and their own positions.

This anxiety may well have been a new trend since this prison and the whole prison service as well as every other civil servant and institution in the country, had been radically affected by the progress
towards and assumption of political independence. That this attention to bureaucratic detail may have approached ritualisation rather than rational necessity, was suggested by the fact that the prisons' standing orders on which all prison routines and contingent activities had to be based, were not kept up to date in this prison and contained important rules which had been superseded.

This uncertainty was principally related to the Africanisation of the prison service, but could only be partially centred on the British Officers who had been faced with the reality of their services being terminated for a number of years from parallels in other states undergoing political change, also with the knowledge of their future security in the form of assured substantial compensation for the loss of their careers. The uncertainty was possibly centred more on African staff who realised that some would be promoted by a selection process which would be a combination of merit and expediency; this led to a lack of confidence in those promoted and a comparable feeling amongst those who had not been selected that they were just as good.

Uncertainty would also have come from the changing structure of the prison population. Prior to the beginning of political agitation, the prisons contained convicts who were quite clearly separated from the staff. They accepted subordination as a feature of their outside lives and the prison staff were thus freed from many of the stresses which now beset them.

The prison staff were no longer members of a dominant minority administering an institution in a colonial dependency in which they could have broadly assumed the support and confidence of their superiors as against the complaints of Africans except in cases when serious criminal acts had been alleged. Previously complaints would be assessed on their contents and in the context of British political and social sovereignty.

The prison staff were now civil servants in an independent African state in which these previous certainties could no longer be assumed. Certainly the Commissioner of Prisons was still a senior government official but his ability to run his department and uphold his subordinates, was much more narrowly defined and subject to the political experiences of the country itself.
Now complaints and contingencies were much more dangerous to
the prison's senior staff if they were not adequately dealt with to
the extent of them not going beyond the prison for their final
settlement. The state's political system worked on a balance of
tribal pressures which allowed almost unlimited manipulation of com-
plaints which might have passed to or through hostile authorities.

While it was not suggested that tribalism in the political super-
structure had any direct and observable influences on the prison's
senior staff during this period, it was certainly a source of anxiety
which remained present but latent in their routine activities.

A further ground for administrative uncertainty appeared to be
absent in this prison service. Prison warders as a group were not
considered to be of low status either in the eyes of the general
public nor of the convicts. There was no vernacular word for a prison
warder which carried suggestions of approbrium comparable to the
English slang word 'screw' as used in British prisons.

Except in exceptional circumstances the needs of the individual
prisoner were subordinated to those of the prison administration in
its attempts to run the administrative machine smoothly. In the
recent past the prison administrative machinery in East Africa was
efficient in the sense that comparatively little was demanded of it
and it was not difficult to achieve this standard of housing convicts
for a defined period, providing them with unskilled work and no parti-
cular reforming policy except that provided by the imprisonment itself.

Now the prison administration is much more complicated not in
the numbers of convicts with which it had to deal since the gross
number of convicts has declined from the peak reached in a long period
of pre-independence, but in its policies. Prior to independence this
prison service was inspired by British penal policies within a general
colonial milieu making it answerable to criticism no further abroad
than the colonial office in London, except possibly to the Inter-
national Red Cross with regard to its detention camps during that
period of political uncertainty and protest.

With the development of penology in Europe and America and the
country beginning to take its place as an independent political entity,
there began to build up pressures to emulate the penal policies of
other far more developed nations but with the administrative machinery of an under-developed country. The prison administration was probably not much less efficient than it was in the past since it was aimed at the reform of the criminal rather than on his containment for the protection of the public.

A senior officer (3) described the problems involved in this change of policy and said "the majority of the warders do their job reasonably well, but their main concern is eating, sleeping and fucking. It is no use talking to them about penology. All he knows is that he has got prisoners who have to stay inside until they are allowed to go. He is not interested in anything else, so one or two senior officers are expected to implement these penological policies. Certainly there is an opportunity to implement such policies if we could get down to very small numbers. This prison was built for 600 but has an average population of 1200 convicts. It has neither the situation nor have we the opportunity".

"If penology is to mean anything I should be involved in the practical side as the officer in charge, not scribbling my name hundreds of times in registers. When I went down to see the 30 releases who were just going out, I had before me 15 to 20 registers for signature. No one can convince me that this is necessary for the efficient running of the prison; that I should have to initial all these entries, I am chair-bound attending to books, papers, signals - rubbish; there is even a special vagrants register for recording the money found on them".

The administrative machine was thus designed for a complex penological policy, admirable in theory but impossible in practice because of circumstances beyond the control of this particular prison department. The prison staff regardless of the singular qualities of particular individuals, could only reflect the general standards and abilities of the country in which it served and it would not be reasonable to expect it to go beyond this to reach standards more easily attributable to but just as difficult for European and American prison staff in certain specialised penal institutions.

The educational and administrative standards of a developing country did not allow too much bureaucratic sophistication in their prisons since there was no broad base of competence from which the
prison service could recruit. The aim of a prison service to reform individuals by specialised treatment was also too far in advance of public opinion in a developing country, if not elsewhere as well, for it to have had any generalised political support which would have guaranteed it an expanding budget or even to maintain its existing standards. During this period the Commissioner of Prisons was alleged to have said in a private conversation that the prison department would be one of the first services to suffer budgetary restrictions after independence and the prisoners' earning scheme would be the first thing which would have to go.

It was possible that the aims of this prison service were so far in advance of the administrative potentials of their staff that there was no serious split between the progressives and conservatives which had occurred elsewhere (7). While the senior officers should have been able to understand the implications of the prison rules requiring them to behave "with fairness but firmness, influence by example and leadership, encourage self-respect" (8) there were basic difficulties apart from any question of any individual being out of sympathy with these aims.

These aims were written in English and at least for the English senior staff they had some semantic meaning which would not necessarily have had to come from any specific prison training and experience. With the African senior staff and of course the prison warders, these were ideas expressed in an alien language which they had learned to a standard of not more than the "O" level Cambridge Overseas Examination standard. This was a standard adequate for everyday affairs but was certainly not an adequate linguistic vehicle for the communication of ideas. There was also the problem that such ideas could only be understood and acted upon at a certain level of intelligence as well as education and that this combination was unlikely to be found very frequently in the lower ranks of a service institution whether in Europe, America, or East Africa.

The Swahili lingua-franca of the country was also in much the same category as English since only a small minority of the African staff had Swahili as their first language and for the majority it could be no more a better vehicle for the conveying of ideas than the
totally alien English. The African staff were recruited from some
groups speaking Bantu languages with broadly the same grammatical
structure, but there were many others from Nilotic and Hamitic
tribes whose languages were totally different to that of Swahili and
just as complex as English.

So it could therefore be assumed that these ideas were either
not communicated or communicated and not understood, and that for this
reason the senior prison officers and warder were almost entirely free
from tensions which must have arisen had there been a conflict between
ideals and prison reality. These ideas were therefore too far in
advance of the society in which they were placed to cause anxiety and
as far as the senior staff were concerned, it was accepted as an admin-
istrative form but not as an ideological aim.

Since the major concern of the prison staff was the safe custody
of the prisoners intrusted to their care, it was difficult to assess
the prison’s efficiency except in regard to that primary aim. In
that there were few escapes it could be called efficient except that
few prisoners appeared to have wanted to escape anyway. This was
shown quite clearly in their reliance on the counting of prisoners
three times per day as a check that there had been no escapes, a method
of escape prevention which required the co-operation of the convicts.

Economically it could not have been expected to be efficient
since working the prisoners was secondary to the aim of efficient safe
custody and meant that they were not working to capacity on the tasks
allotted to them nor were the tasks allocated to them up to the full
utilisation of their aptitudes. The majority of work tasks were mono-
tonous in the extreme such as twisting coconut fibre into twine, or
did not require any serious work effort such as the cleaners.

While this was common enough in service-type institutions and
the senior prison staff was well aware of this short-fall on the poten-
tial capacities of their prisoners, there was certainly an additional
administrative factor. Outside their normal working hours and the
constant comparative idleness of convict workers, there was the problem
of unworked hours probably averaging four per day. The senior staff
certainly felt that the convicts could be worked harder and longer and
suggested that this might even be indirectly welcomed by the convicts.
prison service could recruit. The aim of a prison service to reform individuals by specialised treatment was also too far in advance of public opinion in a developing country, if not elsewhere as well, for it to have had any generalised political support which would have guaranteed it an expanding budget or even to maintain its existing standards. During this period the Commissioner of Prisons was alleged to have said in a private conversation that the prison department would be one of the first services to suffer budgetary restrictions after independence and the prisoners' earning scheme would be the first thin, which would have to go.

It was possible that the aims of this prison service were so far in advance of the administrative potentials of their staff that there was no serious split between the progressives and conservatives which had occurred elsewhere (7). While the senior officers should have been able to understand the implications of the prison rules requiring them to behave "with fairness but firmness, influence by example and leadership, encourage self-respect" (8) there were basic difficulties apart from any question of any individual being out of sympathy with these aims.

These aims were written in English and at least for the English senior staff they had some semantic meaning which would not necessarily have had to come from any specific prison training and experience. With the African senior staff and of course the prison warders, these were ideas expressed in an alien language which they had learned to a standard of not more than the "O" level Cambridge Overseas Examination standard. This was a standard adequate for everyday affairs but was certainly not an adequate linguistic vehicle for the communication of ideas. There was also the problem that such ideas could only be understood and acted upon at a certain level of intelligence as well as education and that this combination was unlikely to be found very frequently in the lower ranks of a service institution whether in Europe, America, or East Africa.

The Swahili lingua-franca of the country was also in much the same category as English since only a small minority of the African staff had Swahili as their first language and for the majority it could be no more a better vehicle for the conveying of ideas than the
totally alien English. The African staff were recruited from some
groups speaking Bantu languages with broadly the same grammatical
structure, but there were many others from Nilotic and Kho-hamitic
tribes whose languages were totally different to that of Swahili and
just as complex as English.

So it could therefore be assumed that these ideas were either
not communicated or communicated and not understood, and that for this
reason the senior prison officers and warder were almost entirely free
from tensions which must have arisen had there been a conflict between
ideals and prison reality. These ideals were therefore too far in
advance of the society in which they were placed to cause anxiety and
as far as the senior staff were concerned, it was accepted as an adminis-
trative form but not as an ideological aim.

Since the major concern of the prison staff was the safe custody
of the prisoners intrusted to their care, it was difficult to assess
the prison's efficiency except in regard to that primary aim. In
that there were few escapes it could be called efficient except that
few prisoners appeared to have wanted to escape anyway. This was
shown quite clearly in their reliance on the counting of prisoners
three times per day as a check that there had been no escapes, a method
of escape prevention which required the co-operation of the convicts.

Economically it could not have been expected to be efficient
since working the prisoners was secondary to the aim of efficient safe
custody and meant that they were not working to capacity on the tasks
allotted to them nor were the tasks allocated to them up to the full
utilisation of their aptitudes. The majority of work tasks were mono-
tonous in the extreme such as twisting coconut fibre into twine, or
did not require any serious work effort such as the cleaners.

While this was common enough in service-type institutions and
the senior prison staff was well aware of this short-fall on the poten-
tial capacities of their prisoners, there was certainly an additional
administrative factor. Outside their normal working hours and the
constant comparative idleness of convict workers, there was the problem
of unworked hours probably averaging four per day. The senior staff
certainly felt that the convicts could be worked harder and longer and
suggested that this might even be indirectly welcomed by the convicts
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groups speaking Bantu languages with broadly the same grammatical
structure, but there were many others from Nilotic and Hillo-hamitic
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from tensions which must have arisen had there been a conflict between
ideals and prison reality. These ideals were therefore too far in
advance of the society in which they were placed to cause anxiety and
as far as the senior staff were concerned, it was accepted as an admin-
istrative form but not as an ideological aim.

Since the major concern of the prison staff was the safe custody
of the prisoners intrusted to their care, it was difficult to assess
the prison's efficiency except in regard to that primary aim. In
that there were few escapes it could be called efficient except that
few prisoners appeared to have wanted to escape anyway. This was
shown quite clearly in their reliance on the counting of prisoners
three times per day as a check that there had been no escapes, a method
of escape prevention which required the co-operation of the convicts.

Economically it could not have been expected to be efficient
since working the prisoners was secondary to the aim of efficient safe
custody and meant that they were not working to capacity on the tasks
allotted to them nor were the tasks allocated to them up to the full
utilisation of their aptitudes. The majority of work tasks were mono-
tonous in the extreme such as twisting coconut fibre into twine, or
did not require any serious work effort such as the cleaners.

While this was common enough in service-type institutions and
the senior prison staff was well aware of this short-fall on the poten-
tial capacities of their prisoners, there was certainly an additional
administrative factor. Outside their normal working hours and the
constant comparative idleness of convict workers, there was the problem
of unworked hours probably averaging four per day. The senior staff
certainly felt that the convicts could be worked harder and longer and
suggested that this might even be indirectly welcomed by the convicts.
prison service could recruit. The aim of a prison service to reform individuals by specialised treatment was also too far in advance of public opinion in a developing country, if not elsewhere as well, for it to have had any generalised political support which would have guaranteed it an expanding budget or even to maintain its existing standards. During this period the Commissioner of Prisons was alleged to have said in a private conversation that the prison department would be one of the first services to suffer budgetary restrictions after independence and the prisoners' earning scheme would be the first thing, which would have to go.

It was possible that the aims of this prison service were so far in advance of the administrative potentials of their staff that there was no serious split between the progressives and conservatives which had occurred elsewhere (7). While the senior officers should have been able to understand the implications of the prison rules requiring them to behave "with fairness but firmness, influence by example and leadership, encourage self-respect" (8) there were basic difficulties apart from any question of any individual being out of sympathy with these aims.

These aims were written in English and at least for the English senior staff they had some semantic meaning which would not necessarily have had to come from any specific prison training and experience. With the African senior staff and of course the prison warders, these were ideas expressed in an alien language which they had learned to a standard of not more than the "O" level Cambridge Overseas Examination standard. This was a standard adequate for everyday affairs but was certainly not an adequate linguistic vehicle for the communication of ideas. There was also the problem that such ideas could only be understood and acted upon at a certain level of intelligence as well as education and that this combination was unlikely to be found very frequently in the lower ranks of a service institution whether in Europe, America, or East Africa.

The Swahili lingua-franca of the country was also in much the same category as English since only a small minority of the African staff had Swahili as their first language and for the majority it could be no more a better vehicle for the conveying of ideas than the
themselves as an alternative to long hours of locked-up inactivity.

The difficulty in working longer hours was that the convicts would have to be guarded and increased pressure on the warders to work longer hours would probably have had repercussions in the warders and convicts having increased informal relationships to get round such administrative requirements. Since this period included the Zanzibar Revolution, and the army mutinies in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda there was certainly an unexpressed feeling that this was not the appropriate time to increase the work required of the prison warders, least of all when the officer in charge was still British and his senior subordinates mainly newly promoted African officers.

IV. The system of record keeping

The difficulties of record keeping in a semi-literate community have already been discussed but there were additional problems caused by the fact that the system appeared to mirror the British one, and not to have been designed for the specific circumstances with which it had to deal. The comment on Pentonville (9) that "every type of record keeping was found to be unreliable, sometimes inaccurate and very frequently unsystematic" applied here.

This was occasioned not by any lack of effort on the part of the officers and warder clerks but by elements in the system itself. The majority of records were kept in longhand because there were no trained typists in the prison for almost all this period and the self-taught warder clerks did what they could in the time available. Much detail was written in large cumbersome ledgers, each prisoner's records were kept in an open file, held by twine at the corner and stacked in a cupboard, committal warrants on thin paper filed in pigeon-holes in a wooden cupboard; since these last were important legal documents justifying the officer in charge holding each convict, which may have had to last a long time and undergo hard usage, it would appear better to have had them printed on hard paper or even cardboard with even a printed number perhaps. Out of date documents, completed records and registers were kept in a store-room in a state of some dirt and confusion.

At the best this system was one which would have been suitable for records with which there was never any great urgency but certainly
unsuitable for this prison in which records were constantly being adjusted to coincide with the flow of short and long-term prisoners and the recording of their prison lives.

It was necessary to go beyond the semi-literacy of the available prison clerks to question whether the record system had been designed to suit these particular conditions. The system of controlling and recording visits and letters to and from prisoners was probably unsuitable here since they were based on the assumption that all the prisoners should have equal rights and that all would have people outside who were able to visit and write. Only the literate wrote and the nearby visited so the utility of maintaining these individual records was questionable.

There would be a case for keeping detailed records only for long-term prisoners since the requirements for short-term convicts could be met quite easily by card index. It was doubtful however if any system of records for even long-term convicts whose average sentences did not exceed one year, required a book of twentyfour pages for each man. This record (13) if it could have been completed would have given a most exhaustive background to each convict's prison lives. No such records were completed and the vast majority were perfunctorily completed with whole pages blank such as medical reports by a psychiatric social worker, psychologist and medical officer; the history sheet on which it was stated that "all incidents and observations having any bearing on the character and treatment of the inmate must be recorded", welfare details at reception board and discharge board summary. Perhaps the optimism of this type of regulation records was best shown on the identification particulars required on the first page which allowed one line each for manerisms, habits, speech, dress and limbs. Certainly a common feature of these prisoners' records was the very high proportion of uncompleted details and this vitiated the usefulness of this particular system of record keeping.

V. The contingent activities of the senior staff

The most important contingent activity of the officer in charge was to set the tone for the administration of his prison and this went far beyond the carrying out of his official duties and his administra-
tive efficiency. There were always incidents in a prison which involved the staff in their relationships with the prisoners and which may or may not have involved the senior officer in decisions as to whether he took action against his own staff or not. Pushing a prisoner along to hurry him could be called "using personal violence to a prisoner" and involve a disciplinary charge, or it could be ignored when seen.

The decision was relatively simple with warders, but became increasingly difficult as the organisational gap between the possible offender and the officer in charge narrowed. In the enclave life of this prison where the senior officers lived near to each other outside the prison and were forced by circumstances to associate to some extent both on and off duty, such decisions must have been occasions of some stress.

If he made decisions which controlled his immediate subordinates who might have tended to stray away from a narrow interpretation of prison rules as far as they concerned their own relationships with the prisoners, this standard would spread down the staff hierarchy to the prisoners themselves. This was the situation during the earlier part of the research.

If however the officer in charge was not in sympathy with this interpretation of his obligations or was too indifferent to comment on such marginal behaviour in his subordinates a different tone in the prison would become apparent. This was the situation during the second half of this research. One or two senior officers began to act marginally in this respect and their subordinates imitated them. This resulted in some of the convicts reacting in protest. Similar differences in the 'atmosphere' of penal institutions in the same area and administered by the same overall authority had been recorded elsewhere (12). However this more relaxed atmosphere need not be related in any way to rehabilitation and reform goals as it was during the first officer in charge's regime. His expressed aim in his administration was the incapacitation of the prisoners - what he called the 'chicken-run' approach of just containing them in the prison in as lightly-handed a manner as possible since he and his staff had to live with them for a long time.
While this setting of time would occur in any hierarchical institution, the effect here was probably greater not only because the prison was isolated both geographically and socially, but because of the architecture. The concentration of offices in the two storey administrative block which also acted as gate house meant that the officer in charge was very near to a high proportion of the prison's activities, this range of awareness was also wider than this because of the prison's openness with bars instead of doors; his chances of seeing and hearing and of being heard and seen were probably much higher than in western and American prisons.

The prisoners certainly conceived the prison's administrative structure to be a hierarchical one in which effective power was concentrated in the hands of the officer in charge although they would hardly have read the prison rules. With or without any consideration of these rules, there was little evidence that the prisoners sought the resolutions of their problems at levels lower than the officer in charge. Thus the numbers of applications to him were not because his subordinates disliked responsibility but because everything was seen as being in the gift of the officer in charge.

Other than the formal occasions in which the officer in charge saw prisoners on disciplinary charges he had to see (10) every day all prisoners who had requested to see him. While some of the matters under request may have been formal, the majority were certainly personal and informal but were dealt with in a formal way. The officer in charge saw each prisoner in his office in the presence of at least one subordinate and since there were usually quite a number of persons to be seen, the interview was both public and quick.

While there may have been semantic blocks preventing such officials from communicating with prisoners (11) in western prisons, the situation was obviously worse where there were racial as well as tribal linguistic blocks. The two parties had so little in common that there could have been a very limited understanding by the officer in charge of any particular convict's problems. A wide range of contingent behaviour was open to the officer in charge but in practice he could do little but pass on the problem to another agency where the interest would be even more impersonal and disinterested. In such
procedures the officer in charge did not wish to be inhuman but he had neither the personal nor administrative equipment to establish a relationship of value with prisoners in trouble.

The importance of these applications to see the officer in charge were high as they were not apparently made out of boredom or to enable prisoners to meet each other since it was relatively easy to meet elsewhere and they were not made to avoid work as the interviews occurred in the afternoon when work had been completed for the day. Certainly the prisoners saw these interviews as valuable and it was difficult to class any of them as a waste of time for those involved.

The change from the authoritarian prison regime of the past to the present more liberal regime had probably resulted in a marked reduction in the contingent activities of the prison officers. In the past the prison officers could count on the unqualified support of their superiors in their relationships with prisoners although it was probably never absolute; in such circumstances officers were able to act more freely when faced with a prisoner's problems.

The liberal regime had resulted in new rules under penal policies which required different behaviour for a wide variety of situations. These contingent activities were thus much more difficult for the general treatment of any particular prisoner as they were in themselves contingent on outside issues. The officers then tended to follow the basic rules whenever there was doubt as to which course they should follow. Prison administrative procedures made it easier to stop than to encourage convict initiative - there were always the rules to be referred to when a decision was doubtful and of course staff transfers and the problems of replacements made it difficult to maintain prison policies. In one case the welfare officer had been transferred and a warder corporal had been given the job temporarily, and a convict (12) described such a situation saying "of course you will get many more people to play one yard against the other yard at handball and so on but there is no one to organise now. Our welfare is very weak. I won't organise it myself as I would find myself in a small cell for interfering with the welfare's job. If I turn up with a cooks team and challenge any other yard he will turn it down. Even if you select a team informally in the queue he will say you have no authority to do
this. We cannot play volley ball in the yard because we don't have
a ball which we previously used to keep. He refuses even a small
thing we ask him. He is more interested in discipline than welfare."

The undesirability of putting untrained or rather unsuitable
persons into pivotal posts must be stressed. Just as the officer in
charge was important because he decided on a number of contingent
matters on which his subordinates could not decide, so similarly the
welfare office was important because he was a channel separate from
the discipline and maintenance sections of the prison and was more
permissive to prisoners' requests, and therefore important to them as
a member of staff who was less tied to discipline. He was thus a most
valuable person who could gain the confidence of prisoners and thereby
assist in the smooth and humane running of the prison in just the same
way as an industrial personnel officer was able to provide help and
understanding if he had no authoritarian functions. A convict (10)
described prison welfare officers in terms of considerable appreciation
and said "I would go to him and say that I wanted to see the officer in
charge and he used to say if it was anything about which he could help,
If you said 'no' he won't ask anything more and just write down your
name to see the officer. He was helpful because he was kind. If you
tell your family is starving he will write a letter the same day to
got particulars. If my wife had not replied to my letters, he will
even discover why she has not written."

A senior officer (1) stated that he would no longer tender advice
to prisoners on the problems which they presented to him because he
could no longer count on the support of his superiors if the prisoner
subsequently felt aggrieved, so he now only acted as a postal agency
for forwarding such problems elsewhere for consideration and action.
He quoted cases of bending the rules slightly to help particular convicts
who were under great strain in the prison and who on their re-
lease had written long letters of complaint to the Commissioner of
Prisons on which he had then been asked to comment. Thus it seemed
that the improvement in the overall administration of the prison had
reduced the ability of the officer in charge to act beneficially on
some of the contingent problems of certain convicts.

While the officer in charge may have felt that there were more
implicit as well as explicit restrictions on his contingent activities, the centre of such problems certainly as regards their quantity may have moved towards the welfare officer. While he was certainly subject to prison discipline, he had a separate office and wore civilian clothes. His formal duties of being available to the prisoners and keeping the officer in charge informed, were overshadowed by the fact that almost everything which he did was classifiable as contingency work.

Since there were outside the relative simplicity of rules and orders to be obeyed, the welfare officer's expanding contingent activities were bound to conflict with the restricting horizons of the officer in charge. In fact this was the only type of structural tension between the officers of the prison which was ever explicitly referred to by the prison officers themselves.

Another consequence of the increasing complexity of the prison administration's aims, was that the officer in charge was less likely to have heard about the prisoners' problems informally. Some convicts disliked an open approach to the officer in charge by a direct application of their personal problems, or for complaints about the prison administration itself which might have got them classified as trouble-makers.

The welfare officer thus became important as someone who by definition was inclined to listen to the prisoners' problems about the prison itself and who could be assumed to mention them to the officer in charge who might have made some changes. In fact other than by applying to see the officer in charge or mentioning the matter to the welfare officer, there were no channels for the prisoners' general complaints to reach the officer in charge except for the food committee. It was possible that the prisoners and junior prison staff may have seen the welfare officer as more powerful than he was in fact and that this may have increased but not initiated the structural tensions already referred to above. When there were complaints about the medical dresser a convict (12) suggested to another prisoner that "he should write down the complaint and go and see the welfare and he would investigate whether it was true or not about constant changes in the medical staff".
VI. Staff routine

The routine efficiency of this prison had to be assessed against certain specific local factors. In the first instance the prisoners either on committal or on remand were not demanding since they had few ideas on what their rights might have been and even if they had, they were rarely likely to complain; their level of tolerating discomfort was very high if there should have been a breakdown in administration. Secondly the prison administration was relatively simple since the variety of goods with which it had to deal was much lower than the comparable variety in a western prison. Both clothing and cell equipment as well as food scales contained fewer items.

This simplicity of equipment combined with the fact that almost all the prisoners were housed in dormitory cells, made it easier for the prison administration, not only to fulfill their administrative obligations but to cope with sudden emergencies such as a large number of remands arriving without notice. Some fifty persons arrested at a political demonstration were accepted with little difficulty by moving prisoners from one block to another.

While prisoners complained readily enough about the prison as an institution, there were few complaints about its routine administration outside the quality of the food and its cooking and the medical treatment provided. Similarly the staff did not seem to suffer from any stress which could have been attributed to any generalised or frequent administrative failures.

In other ways as well the standards required of the warder staff were sufficiently low to make sure that they could be generally reached. The problems of supervising night duty warders and keeping them awake had been solved by the institution of time clocks which had to be punched regularly by each warder rather than by raising the warders' sense of duty to the required standards. Possibly also the system of visibly counting the prisoners came into this same category since no one but the counting officer had any obligation to be efficient.

The routine searching of the prison was also an inefficient system since it rarely if ever discovered the contraband which existed and formed such an important part of the prisoners own social system. It occupied much time but did not appear to be designed to fulfil its
implicit as well as explicit restrictions on his contingent activities, the centre of such problems certainly as regards their quantity may have moved towards the welfare officer. While he was certainly subject to prison discipline, he had a separate office and wore civilian clothes. His formal duties of being available to the prisoners and keeping the officer in charge informed, were overshadowed by the fact that almost everything which he did was classifiable as contingency work.

Since these were outside the relative simplicity of rules and orders to be obeyed, the welfare officer's expanding contingent activities were bound to conflict with the restricting horizons of the officer in charge. In fact this was the only type of structural tension between the officers of the prison which was over explicitly referred to by the prison officers themselves.

Another consequence of the increasing complexity of the prison administration's aims, was that the officer in charge was less likely to have heard about the prisoners' problems informally. Some convicts disliked an open approach to the officer in charge by a direct application on their personal problems, or for complaints about the prison administration itself which might have got them classified as trouble-makers.

The welfare officer thus became important as someone who by definition was inclined to listen to the prisoners' problems about the prison itself and who could be assumed to mention them to the officer in charge who might have made some changes. In fact other than by applying to see the officer in charge or mentioning the matter to the welfare officer, there were no channels for the prisoners' general complaints to reach the officer in charge except for the food committee. It was possible that the prisoners and junior prison staff may have seen the welfare officer as more powerful than he was in fact and that this may have increased but not initiated the structural tensions already referred to above. When there were complaints about the medical dresser a convict (15) suggested to another prisoner that "he should write down the complaint and go and see the welfare and he would investigate whether it was true or not about constant changes in the medical staff".
VI. Staff routine

The routine efficiency of this prison had to be assessed against certain specific local factors. In the first instance the prisoners either on committal or on remand were not demanding since they had few ideas on what their rights might have been and even if they had, they were rarely likely to complain; their level of tolerating discomfort was very high if there should have been a breakdown in administration. Secondly the prison administration was relatively simple since the variety of goods with which it had to deal was much lower than the comparable variety in a western prison. Both clothing and cell equipment as well as food scales contained fewer items.

This simplicity of equipment combined with the fact that almost all the prisoners were housed in dormitory cells, made it easier for the prison administration, not only to fulfil their administrative obligations but to cope with sudden emergencies such as a large number of remands arriving without notice. Some fifty persons arrested at a political demonstration were accepted with little difficulty by moving prisoners from one block to another.

While prisoners complained readily enough about the prison as an institution, there were few complaints about its routine administration outside the quality of the food and its cooking and the medical treatment provided. Similarly the staff did not seem to suffer from any stress which could have been attributed to any generalized or frequent administrative failures.

In other ways as well the standards required of the warder staff were sufficiently low to make sure that they could be generally reached, the problems of supervising night duty warders and keeping them awake had been solved by the institution of time clocks which had to be punched regularly by each warder rather than by raising the warders' sense of duty to the required standards. Possibly also the system of visibly counting the prisoners came into this same category since no one but the counting officer had any obligation to be efficient.

The routine searching of the prison was also an inefficient system since it rarely if ever discovered the contraband which existed and formed such an important part of the prisoners own social system. It occupied much time but did not appear to be designed to fulfil its
primary purpose, although it was efficient in clearing the prison of rubbish, this of course could have been done by the warders in charge of each block. It could possibly have been an efficient means of re-asserting the staff's dominance over the convicts but since very few of the latter contested the staff superiority, the few suggestions of this which were made in interviews seem to have been attributable rather to the animosity of particular warders.

In such a situation in which the standards were related to the local situation, there were few demands on the warder staff which they could not fulfill without serious difficulty or strain, and few signs of any organizational malaise - an observable couldn't be bothered attitude.

The warder staff regarded the office jobs as the prizes which they aspired to obtain because clerical work inside the prison as well as outside carried increased prestige. It did not seem that these jobs were wanted because they were less troublesome, involved some privacy and some minor unofficial privileges. They were in fact more demanding since certain work had to be done and the supervision was much closer than in custodial work.

Warder duties on the other hand only involved direct supervision from time to time in each period of duty, the remainder of which was spent as the warder wanted. Certainly there was the possibility of trouble but in the absence of any marked feeling that the convicts and warders were automatically in opposition, it was not a stressful job. The close personal relationship between warders and convicts sharing a common cultural background must be stressed. As routine it may have been monotonous, but it provided endless opportunities for interesting conversation without too much work and as such as pleasant a way to spend their time as any other.

There were perhaps some structural reasons for the problems of routine efficiency in this prison and the difficulties of the staff in fulfilling the contingent obligations which were statutory on them (8). It seemed that the organizational and human aims of the prison administration were in structural conflict. On the one hand the prison department required that the prison should be run according to organizational rules and that human relations should become secondary according
to Weber's model for a complex organization (14) with the prison acting as a process (15). On the other hand the preamble to the Prison rules (6) stressed the importance of primary group relationships and organisational goals; the human relations approach with the prison acting for a purpose (16).

The first aim of the prison administration was directed towards efficiency and so it could have been if it were dealing with uniform events as if the convicts had been a series of standardised problems, and if the prison affairs had been conducted impersonally both as regards the staff and the convicts, with appointments and promotions being made on the basis of merit. The prison administration also ignored the individual element by giving each person's authority and obligations as a direct order specified in the regulations according to their work rather than as individuals.

As a process in time whether it was for penological or other purposes, the prison's rules and regulations had become more and more complex. These complexities were not added for their own sakes but to cope with unusual events and diverse social situations so that they could be placed within the scope of organisational rules. More and more rules were made to cover every diverse situation such as privately owned radios, types of toothbrushes to be issued to prisoners and the period for which they had to last, numbering of prisoners, destitute prisoners, use of weapons or force against prisoners, confidential reports on officers, the paying of compliments and guards of honour, security of prison keys - the list of matters on which the Commissioner of Prisons had in the past or might in the future issue circulars was potentially endless.

Thus it was that the senior officers were forced to adhere to certain rules which they considered to be basic to their duties and tacitly ignored large numbers of other regulations until they had their attention drawn to them by visiting inspecting officers or auditors. If this was not the actual position in this prison, their copy of the standing orders would have been kept up to date or they would have expressed anxiety that it was not so. For instance the chapters on convicts' leaders and trustee prisoners remained uncorrected although they had been totally superseded and a new system actually introduced
and working in the prison.

Although this plethora of rules and regulations was designed to cover every contingency and to support the prison staff in their work rather than to obstruct them, they could not cover every situation. The officers then had to apply their own judgement either because there was no regulation applicable or because the regulations went against what they considered to be the needs of the moment. The staff may have reacted to the bureaucratic overlay on their ability to do their work adequately, by consciously resenting the rules which restricted and prevented their freedom to act, and unconsciously by making the convicts into a stereotype of the ignorant fool who would in fact have fitted in with the requirements of the rules in not initiating or providing contingent events on which they might have had to act.

Certainly the administrative system was designed for the maximum efficiency with a hierarchy of staff and a delimitation of jobs which were to be based on merit, but not to deal with unusual events. The primacy of the injunction for instance that the 'officer in charge shall' prevented him attempting to deal with a whole series of contingent events either in the fact that they obtrude on that officer's consciousness or should have done if they were to fulfil their statutory but less exactly defined obligations to personally influence convicts towards their rehabilitation. It has been shown that the prison officers knew very few convicts personally because they did not have the time or the language necessary to know more.

It was not surprising then that the individual prison officer felt insecure when faced with unusual events in the prison. Since the rules could not provide the answer to everything, his ability to deal reasonably well depended heavily on the explicit or implicit support of his colleagues. This support was at its best when the officer staff were entirely British with security in their jobs and confidence in their own efficiency however that may have been defined or assumed at that time.

Apart from any political changes in the country the rapid changes in the officer structure meant that this was no longer possible for either the British or African officers involved, and there was no longer any implicit feeling of dependence on each other which existed before.
This was not to suggest that these officers were consciously failing in their duties, simply that they were less secure in their ability to cope with contingency problems for reasons outside their own control. As such contingency problems could have been considered the dangerous elements in their work, not so much because of the convicts but because of the possibility of their own organisation finding them to be at fault as their Commissioner of Prisons reacted in his own way to a higher level contingency consideration, it was not surprising that there were some morale problems (17).

It did not seem that the prison administration's attempt to separate human and administrative decisions as far as possible, made for inefficiency in dealing with contingency situations since there was little independence for the man on the spot. If the prison was to be made more efficient in its human rather than organisational activities, certain structural changes ought to have taken place, and that these changes seemed to presuppose smaller institutions than this one with its average convict population of about a thousand. It was only in smaller institutions that personal rather than impersonal relations could dominate and the staff able to begin to fulfil their interpersonal obligations laid down in the Prison Rules.

It would also have been necessary to reduce general rules to a minimum, many of these rules had an explicit purpose of regulating prison life to a supposedly better aim of absolute fairness to all and an implicit one that the staff would act in an undesirable way if they were not controlled by standing orders and prison rules. However much it was masked, the element of statutory mistrust of subordinates must have been another implicit background factor.

The applied limitation of duty, obligations and privileges should perhaps have been reduced to a minimum at least for senior officers so that they were able to deal with contingency problems in the light of their own judgement. Particularly that while hierarchical responsibility must remain, each officer should have been allowed to devolve any part of such responsibilities to subordinates if he wished to do so. The officer in charge was responsible for his prison and with such an overall directive, there should have been no need for specific rules that he 'shall' carry out certain duties. Also that administrative
decisions should have had no absolute priority over contingency ones, which at least implied a group approach to the more intransigent personal problems of certain convicts. Perhaps a convict (18) should give a final view on what the prison administration should have done when he said "the system should be improved by giving more qualified attention to prisoners so that they are cured. It may seem more expensive to start off with but it is cheaper in the long run when the man does not return to prison. Now once you have come to prison, you are most likely to come back again".
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The experience of imprisonment varied widely between individuals and again with each individual according to the period in his sentence which was being considered. At no time were the convicts entering the prison uniform in their personal characteristics except that they had received a legal sentence resulting in imprisonment. Similarly during this sentence the convict varied in his feelings about imprisonment and his conception of himself as an imprisoned person.

The prison received persons with numerous previous convictions and sentences of imprisonment, others who had been on probation, in approved schools or fined. Others had never been in court, much less in a prison, before this. Even those who had been imprisoned before were not necessarily better adjusted to it than on a previous occasion. After sentence the cycle of adjustment had been described as shock, resignation, adjustment, and nervousness prior to release (2). There were enormous variations in experience and adjustment varying with time and the individual.

I. Reactions to imprisonment

The convicts in general regarded prison conditions as unpleasant but not hard. Recidivists often compared it unfavourably to the old days when work was harder, and staff attitudes and conduct although harsher, were in their opinion both standard and predictable. A number commented that now each of the senior staff had their own separate rules which they tried to administer, so that convicts found it difficult to predict what attitude to adopt when making a request, when to wear tunics, and when to talk. Such minor variations seemed to take on a high importance, so much so that they considered it difficult to conform to a pattern of behaviour acceptable to authority as a whole. A prisoner (3) stated that "there is no such thing as discipline in the prison as every warder had a rule of his own. One warder will allow you to carry tobacco and the next one will put you in the small cells. The duty officer allowed me to take a packet of cigarettes and immediately outside, two warders found them and charged me". Another (4) stated that "in fact, in prison, we have no converted people."
Although some are not wholly converted, their margin between the obedient and the disobedient is very small. No matter how they try to be obedient and error proof, nature would never allow them to be so, due to the unworkable rules of the prison department. They are very coward people. Polite in manners who have suffered shocks of life. A family type, always talks about romance". The prisoners, while recognising that there were government rules, did not see them as a set of fixed entities which had to be obeyed. They saw themselves as adjusting to a set of variables which were much more numerous than previously.

No prisoner compared this prison with another, saying that one or the other was better or worse in itself, as they considered that each prison had a particular atmosphere related to the officer in charge at that time. Although the prisons were graded (5) for security and accordingly in the severity of the regime. It did not seem that prisoners asked for transfers except on grounds of climate, boredom with many years in one prison, or to be near relatives for visiting purposes. A prisoner might have said that another prison was better for some things and worse for others usually related to the personalities of particular senior officers but there did not seem to have been any overall opinions. A convict stated (6) that "during first night in the prison, I was assured by one of the old experienced prisoners that all big prisons in the state were of the same model under the same rules". It did not seem that this prison had a fixed personality of its own to which the prisoners reacted, and they assessed this prison more in relation to the two successive officers in charge than by other categories.

Every convict stated that the worst thing about prison was the plain fact of the deprivation of liberty, regardless of whether the prison was hard or comfortable. They were prevented from enjoying everything which they held to be good in life. Every convict interviewed expressed the opinion, both for himself and other convicts with whom he was associated, that no matter how poor the material conditions outside, no one would seek imprisonment for food and shelter. They stressed that the community life round their homes under any conditions provided satisfactions which prison could never replace. They did not
like prison except possibly for a small number of multiple recidivists for small offences who appeared to regard prisons as the only constant factor in their very uncertain lives. The warm climate limited the needs of vagrants who did not have to seek shelter on this account alone. A convict (?) stated that "prison life is one of the worst lives one can lead. Anybody in prison is always behind the time outside. In prison one is unable to do anything he wants because life is too routine. One is forced to sleep even if he does not want. It is not bad to keep discipline but in prison it is too exaggerated".

There were no outside conditions which made prisoners seek imprisonment as an amelioration of such conditions, nor did the conditions in the prison which might have been materially better than their outside experience, make them see the prison as easy if not enjoyable at this time. However it was widely believed by Europeans in business, law and the civil service that prison under these conditions was no deterrent. An English lawyer (38) remarked "it means nothing to them. It's an hotel. Good food, plenty of sleep and not too much hard work. No wonder crime increases".

Many convicts commented on the traumatic effect of the first experience of prison, but it was obvious that this stunning shock wore off after a very short period, possibly not lasting as long as a week. This of course was confined to the first offenders and may in fact have worn off through the experience of being on remand before and during the trial long before the man was sentenced. One convict (3) stated that "the two weeks on remand had the worst effect on me. The unknown is more terrifying than the known. By the time I was sentenced after a fortnight on remand I was used to prison". An uneducated convict (9) stated that "even now when prisons are much easier, any first offender coming into prison is shocked. To be ordered about, he does not know what is going to happen to him. What does to be imprisoned mean? What are the rules? It starts when he comes to court - no matter whether he is found guilty or not, it doesn't just come when you enter prison". Another convict (39) stated that "he is convicted, sentenced and sent to where many other unlucky people like him have landed and waived their worries and live a care-free life. They feel at home while the new admission is full of fear and worried, thinking what the
next few days will look like. On first arrival, the others tell the unhappy new admission not to worry, two years is nothing. Here we are always happy, despite the lack of some luxuries. In course of two days his worries and fear are almost wiped away”.

The prison authorities saw the prisoner in relation to his length of sentence and to the conditions in the prison which were of a high standard in comparison with the world outside. The prisoners saw the prison in relation to the outside, indeed they would be the first to admit the material advantages of prison in comparison to their outside lives. These comparisons, both by staff and prisoners were rather on the lines that a domestic animal moved from mud to concrete flooring with regular meals must have been a happier as well as a healthier creature.

This ignored the whole of the prisoner’s life experienced before he came to the prison. Life for many could not have been pleasant but the unpleasantness tended to be forgotten and the everyday affairs of life thought of as positive pleasures. Everything that he had taken for granted before, that he could have a woman if he had the need and the money, have a drink, to be able to wander about of an evening, to speak when he felt like it - in fact to have a considerable amount of personal independence, all of which immediately disappeared with imprisonment. Even an illiterate, diseased, homeless vagrant had a large measure of this individuality. Every one of the prisoners outside had an identifiable role which differentiated him from the others, gave him some satisfactions and made him reasonably pleased with his life, if only in retrospect when he lost it by conviction and imprisonment. One convict (il) stated that “when I first entered prison I felt as if I had been boiled in lead. Some even feel that they have gone mad when the prison gate closes behind them. It seemed to me that I was half in my grave - that I had half died. I saw my fellow convicts as spirits”. The new prisoner had an outside life which he had never been deprived of before and this caused serious deprivation to which all convicts reacted.

Most prisoners in conversation had a stereotype of the prison as a frightening place which upset them and this indeed was their first reaction to entering a prison and it remained with them as the normal
attitude to prison no matter how many times they were imprisoned. A convict (34) said "prison is a very frightening place. There is much to be unhappy about, you cannot get anything in from outside, you haven't any choice of food and have to eat to a time schedule and you cannot see outside the walls until the time of your release. Above all you are a person to whom troubles were given and it can only get worse and not better". Another (35) stated "you cannot get beer to drink nor wander about to talk to your friends much less see the town. You cannot use money to buy exciting clothes with which to cut a dash at a dance, and of course you cannot chat with a woman and perhaps get her to sleep with you".

These themes were constant in all talk about the prison and imprisonment in general while a few mentioned the loss of association with his own community which may have had some positive value in assisting their adjustment to the prison since he accepted that he could not get elsewhere. To western prisoners from an urban-industrial background the inability to see the horizon may not have been a severe deprivation but to most of these prisoners particularly from pastoral communities the loss of a view may have been badly felt.

To the educated prisoner the effect of imprisonment was probably much more extreme and while they did not mention so frequently the ordinary results of their loss of liberty, they frequently referred to imprisonment as torture. An educated convict (36) said "to a person like myself I consider this place to be a torture as I have been ruined, almost everything in the life which I had built, and there is no worse torture than that." While this affects prisoners at all levels, in a society which laid particular stress on education as status, the loss of status must have been particularly felt by educated or semi-educated convicts. This same prisoner (37) who had been training for a professional career before his conviction said "it is true that people are stripped of all dignity when they enter prison and as long as one is still in prison I think he will be denied his personal dignity. I don't think there is anybody who is well off as far as that line is concerned. As long as you are a prisoner you are simply regarded as something very minor. Most of us here are not the sort of people who would keep themselves neat when they are outside. So to a person who has been tidy,
somebody at least with some civilisation, although you are in difficulty, you will always endeavour to see that you are a bit tidy with the little you are given”.

The new prisoner went through a process of mortification which was standard in all total institutions and there was no procedure followed in this prison which was not duplicated in a thousand prisons all over the world. With the closing of the gate there was a complete break with the outside; no letters or visits except on application and according to entitlement.

The admission procedure made the man into a prisoner; he was processed along a line, his finger prints were taken, he was photographed if long-sentenced, his civilian clothes were removed, prison uniform issued to him, a number given, and he was interviewed. For people from the western world with a bureaucratic tradition, this may have been only an exaggeration of the procedure with which they had been faced in dealing with government for a licence, housing allocation and school places. To the majority of these African convicts, who were not clarks, ex-soldiers or policemen, the experience of this process must have been bewildering, if not frightening. The effects will have been more severe for the more educated convict as he was subjected not only to status loss, but to having it occur at the hands of prison officials whom he had previously considered his inferiors.

It could be postulated that these convicts would suffer as much as western convicts from the loss of their names and to have had themselves referred to as a number. This was certainly so in western total institutions (30) because the individuality of their lives gave them little experience of anonymity. But to the African convict the prison was seen as just one of a series of alien western institutions of which he had had varying degrees of experience. The taxation system, medical and social welfare and the whole employment pattern would have already given him some experience of this curtailment of self long before he was arrested, tried, sentenced and imprisoned, so when dealing with authority, he was used to being treated as a thing rather than as a person and expected to be listed and numbered and to be dealt with in verb forms which were predominantly from the imperative rather than subjunctive tenses.
It may also have been that Africans since they often had different names for different social purposes such as circumcision, baptism and for the propitiation of their ancestors, may have been involved less in status deprivation because of the loss of one particular name's use. No one mentioned the loss of their name as something which worried them in prison and in this respect it seemed that they expected to be treated anonymously for which this was one of the normal and acceptable penalties. In fact this prior experience of western institutions may already have acclimatised the African convict to what the prison would do to him and that this may have accounted in part for his passivity and his readiness to adapt cheerfully to a set of conditions which he saw as part of the incubus of modernity.

Then there was a will-breaking contest in which the prisoner was forced to conform. As a senior officer (12) expressed it "it is discipline from the word go. Squat down, stand up, go over there. Just as in the services, they had to jump to it". As the new prisoners came into the prison and were told to squat in pairs along the gatehouses, so they began to conform. Another (13) stated "I was received by a low crowd of warders. The reception was very warm. A warder told me to sit down, another ordered me to sit properly, the third told me that I would be the same as the others whatever position I had held outside, and the fourth informed me that all prisoners, even the Indians, had to eat the same food".

This process was drawn-out with long periods of inactivity between. A convict (6) stated that "on the morning after admission, I was sent to the office and exchanged my clothes. Afterwards I was taken to one of the big halls where I was told to enter one of the cells. For the whole of the next morning, I stayed in the office for my finger prints and body appearances to be copied". Another (14) continued "on the third day, I saw the head of the prison and he told me that I will work in the fields, no matter how many degrees you may have got."

The dispossession of outside property did not cause much concern for the simple reason that the majority had always had very little private property. The property store contained hundreds of small bags, each one contained everything which a single prisoner owned. The
Masai convicts came in wearing a single sheet and those who wore European clothes usually had no more than the clothes which they stood up in. Admittedly other property may have been taken away by relatives, but this process was not a conspicuous part of making the prisoners all the same for they did not come from social backgrounds in which there was much individualised private property.

However the passage of traditional Africans into the western industrial system was characterised by the desire to acquire property not available to them in a subsistence economy. Whether he went to work in order to earn money to buy what he wanted or sold the surplus from his work at home, he acquired property which differentiated him from his fellows. He rarely earned enough money to buy much and even those on salaries and occupying responsible positions, had very little property.

He acquired little with great effort and was proportionately proud of and careful with his possessions. Their loss meant much more to him than the loss of an equivalent article to a working class person in Britain. The ease of theft in the towns and the difficulties of the police to act against such criminals and to identify the commonplace articles which had been stolen was the occasion of thief lynchings (28).

It was not possible to postulate that African convicts because they may have come from communities which had a material culture with few artifacts, did not feel the deprivation of private property. They may well have felt it more since the few articles which they obtained were highly valued and their emotions concentrated on these rather than on a mass of more generalised property.

Certainly these convicts acquired as much private property as they could in the prison and senior officers had remarked that the real reason for the regular searches carried out in the prison was not the detection of the ways and means of escape, but to reduce the amount of property acquired by the prisoners which otherwise would have flooded the prison. The register of searches contained repeated references to 'miscellaneous rubbish' such as paper, string, wood, nails, tins and scraps of cloth. These articles individualised their anonymous worlds even when they were commonplace and easily obtained. Goffman (29)
referred to them "as symbolic devices for separating themselves from
the position they are supposed to be in".

While the vast majority of this illegally acquired property had
both a meaning and utility in material terms to their owners, some
was obtained and retained which could have no utility to their pos-
sessors except in terms of differentiating them from their fellows.
During the research period searches disclosed a telephone directory
stolen from the prison offices, whose paper was not necessary for
cigarette making as paper was plentiful in the prison and the fly-
wheel of a marine engine weighing some 20lbs.

The issue of clothing, particularly the shorts, were the subject
of much comment. The shorts were compared to those worn in school
and that they were thus made to look like children; other than a few
Koolsams, the only exception permitted to wear slacks was a convict
with a wooden leg. A convict (17) stated "that clothes bring shame.
This is experienced by everyone, not just men with ties, clerks and
teachers".

The new prisoner had to learn prison life, particularly that he
was subordinate to all the prisoners who had come in before him. A
convict (11) wrote that "I was asked what offence I had committed - they
wanted to know why I had received such a short sentence, laughing at me
so that I wanted to hang myself when they called three years a short
sentence. I am still shocked by imprisonment, being frightened of the
others, preferring to keep myself to myself". The experienced and
intelligent convict regretted that much of the disturbance in the prison
and the difficulties of the prisoners themselves came from the fact
that they had not learned the everyday rules for being a convict. A
convict (32) said "many are not accustomed to being supervised and are
used to working independently. A convict should learn from the time
he enters all that he will do in the prison, no matter how much he
knows how to do it, that he has to be guarded. Until he is told to do
it, he should not do it and that he should do all that he is told with-
out questions". The warders did not want the active co-operation of
the convicts but their compliance to their orders which whether they
were routine or not, could not be questioned for an elaboration. This
elaboration was lacking not only because the warder wanted to insure
his superiority but because he was unlikely to be able to give a more detailed explanation anyway.

Except for convicts who had manipulated themselves into specialist jobs, the convict in general had some opportunities to use his traditional skills during outside work on the farm, but elsewhere he was assumed to know nothing and to require to be ordered about to insure compliance (31).

To those who came from a traditional society, subordination was related to age, wealth and social experience, but he had had no previous experience of this overall subordination to which there were no exceptions. Even to those who had had some industrial or clerical experience, there was no parallel to this situation. A convict (13) wrote that "my first impression made me to feel that I am alone - just alone between two dogs".

Every prisoner was also subordinate to the most junior warder. This was hard to get used to by those who had held any positions or employment outside, particularly those who considered themselves educated. It was not only the deference given to senior officers which could be expected in an hierarchical institution which was resented, but its extension to the warders who were called "effendi", the title given to senior non-commissioned officers in the East African armies.

As a convict (14) expressed it "the only defensive weapon for a prisoner is to have respect and to show it to every warder, no matter how stupid the warder may be". This necessity to show respect was particularly trying for convicts new to the system as it was necessary to request permission for everything since the prisoner could not move without an escort and could obtain nothing material without first approaching a warder.

It also ran contrary to the customary deference in traditional society which was given to those of greater age and status. Joined as this was to a mild and regular amount of obscenity, common in any service institution in which they may not have been experienced before, there was bound to be a serious loss of self-esteem. This abuse in such a multi-lingual community, was usually expressed in Swahili or in English from which language a limited amount of standard British army obscenity had been borrowed.
The convict was also separated from society by being kept in prison and only allowed outside the walls for the hearing of an appeal, giving evidence, or because he was ill. He had to stay inside the prison if he was a long sentence prisoner as long as the officer in charge felt that he might escape. He was kept apart from society, not only by the fact of imprisonment, but also by the isolation of the prison as well. The limited contact which he did get with the outside world through visits, confirmed that he was unclean as he could only talk to them through a glass panel and these visitors saw him in humiliating circumstances in the uniform of a school child.

Even if the prisoners were used to slum conditions in a town or to an overcrowded hut in their home areas, there were always acts which were private and separated from the group by function and custom. Certain types and areas of nakedness, sexual, excretory and some religious functions are examples of acts which are often visible in the biological sense but invisible socially. People were conditioned by custom to practice and receive from others stylised forms of privacy peculiar to their community whether it was in a western slum or African cattle camp.

The prisoner here not only loses the privacy to which he was accustomed but was mixed with men from other communities with different ideas so that there was not only less but a mixing of expectations. In the prison the newcomer found that there were no areas in which he could assume and obtain privacy. The rules which he had had to follow all his life were not allowed. Possibly he may have felt that if these fundamental rules were broken which covered so many tabooed areas of conduct then there was no point or need for personal control any more. The "judas hole" in the door was never closed and he could be observed at any time, the lights were left on at night and the lavatories had no doors. As one convict (9) expressed it "any man feels disgrace and shame. You have to do everything in front of others - bathing, even going to the lavatory at night in a small cell where there is a tin pot and three of you sleeping in the one cell".

In a society in which heterosexuality dominated relationships and forms of sexual deviance were strongly condemned by almost all the persons and tribal groups in the prison, and there was a serious
personal shock in confinement in an all-male prison. A convict (15) of limited intelligence expressed it "no wife - nothing else worries me in prison". The average convict probably became preoccupied with his virility, perhaps even felt that he might become impotent, and since there was no outlet through eroticism, the prisoner was often driven into homosexuality for the duration of his sentence. In societies which had no social functions for homosexuality, this may have led to a deeply felt sense of degradation; that he was the lowest of the low.

Very many prisoners, while admitting their crimes did not consider themselves to be criminals. They felt they should be kept apart from prisoners who they considered to be the real criminals, essentially those who had committed different types of offences to their own. One convict (16) sentenced for defilement, expressed it that "the worst thing in prison was being among ordinary criminals, most of them discussing plans of how to snatch people's property". Another (17) said that "they were not of any value to any class of society on the globe".

The routine searches were another cause of humiliation not only because it was an invasion of their privacy, as when the same convict stated that "the worst of all is when it comes to the ways an inmate is searched - when you walk past a warden of meagre understanding - extending to an action of stripping a prisoner naken, forcing him to bend down so that his private parts can be exposed".

Most of the prisoners had never been forced to eat one sort of food before without any personal choice and this rather than its quality disturbed them. This upset the more educated prisoners more than those who had had difficult or deprived lives before conviction.

Perhaps the most serious shock was the lack of privacy over personal misfortune. The reading of their personal mail was not a direct hardship as they did not see it done, but their limited visits were public. There was nowhere to be alone, and the prisoner who had received a shattering personal blow had to parade his sorrow before his companions since he could not alone to get over it and his breakdown into tears had to be in public. Similarly they saw the sorrows of others from which equally they could not escape. In the prison they were totally involved in the lives of others; failure and
misfortune were passed on in public whereas outside they would have been confined by custom to limited groups of sympathisers. The prisoners on first entering prison were deeply shocked by the multiple processes of reducing them to uniformity by mortification even though they may have been considered to have come from a traditional life which had more public than private elements.

Familiarity with the continuance of imprisonment did not diminish the pain of losing their liberty, and this loss was there all the time. The convict adapted very quickly to doing time so that the general tenor of the prison was a passive, if not willing, acceptance of the conditions. Anxiety was identifiable with the prisoners who had received more than primary education. Unpleasant though it was in prison, it was not a situation which provoked resentment either in theory or practice. Adjustment to imprisonment was usually made within a month of entering the prison, not only with African prisoners but with the small number of European, Indian and Arab prisoners as well.

Few appeared anxious about their families as they were assumed to be looked after by their relatives and at the same time the prison welfare services did what they could to organise relief for those in serious difficulties. A parallel was drawn between a prison sentence and a period of migrant labour away from home so the prisoner did not appear to make any special arrangements or to feel that he ought to have made any. Those who did worry could not have it relieved by letters since they were predominantly illiterate and letters would not in any case be an easy medium for the relief of such tension. Their permitted visits also could not help in most cases since the prison was near to few homes, and even fewer of the families could afford the fare. Special arrangements were made for family visits to long-term prisoners, who had not been visited for long periods. No prisoner took his full entitlement of letters and visits (18).

The convicts were nevertheless emotionally involved in the outside world but not apparently in relation to a limited number of persons with definable roles, as would have been the case in a society composed of nuclear families. They longed to be free, but were not subject to the tensions related to a particular woman or child in the majority of cases which might have accounted in part for the few escapes.
II. Social and personal equilibrium

For the vast majority of the convicts, a state of personal and social equilibrium to the demands of prison life was very soon reached. It was probably true that only the convict with some education may have suffered a character deterioration. The majority found adaptation comparatively easy because of the normal subordination of personality in outside life to the group requirements of the family, lineage, clan or tribe. There was an easy familiarity in their response to the demands of routine which they interpreted as orders.

Possibly the educated convict with post-primary education was able to fend off deterioration by preserving his superiority with helping others in their writing of letters and petitions, and in keeping himself noticeably neater than the average convict. In a society in which literacy was not common and in which success and failure in personal relationship may have been due to speaking ability, the boredom assumed to exist in an African prison may have been more assumed than real. Boredom could be taken to exist because of day to day routine and the shut-in nature of the prison yard. Prisoners saw the life as restricted obviously but by no means devoid of continual interest as conversation may always have been a major pleasure in their lives and it was almost unlimited in such a prison. A convict (33) said "my fund of anecdotes will never dry up while you are ready to listen to them. There are many convicts here, new ones come and others are discharged and they are all doing different things. Everyday produces something unusual".

The prison authorities tended to have a stereotype of the convict as a stupid and bovine man, resulting possibly from a combination of racialism or tribalism and the poor view often taken in hierarchical organisations of those in the most subordinate positions. The convicts were aware of this and the intelligent, though not necessarily the educated ones, accepted the implications of this stereotype and manipulated authority from within those characteristics. This often provided these men with the mental stimulus and material rewards which enabled them to pass their sentences in comparative ease. The stereotype of dullness and passivity was more a surface judgement on the mass rather than on the individual whom the authorities, under existing bureaucratic conditions, had little opportunity of getting to know, or
of understanding. This stereotype of the convict was mutually satisfying to both staff and prisoners who each used it for their own purposes, acceptance of their passivity on the one hand and manipulation on the other.

The equilibrium was replaced by some anxiety during the period immediately before release, particularly among the educated, who appeared to get worried about their status after release connected with their anticipated difficulty in finding employment. A convict (19) wrote "everytime I think of going to the big offices looking for a job a big lump struggles in my throat, because the only greetings I will receive will be universal 'have you ever been convicted'? I will find," all my friends holding big responsible positions, hence they will take me for a spoilt man who can be good enough to dust their shoes. I chose to be a hermit for some time. Will my friends trust me any more?"

Within the prison there were few extreme personality problems; no cases were observed in which a prisoner's personality obviously deteriorated during the research period. The inadequates remained on the same level as when they were imprisoned. Their small numbers made it possible for administrative rather than medical action to mitigate situations which otherwise might have become serious. The aggressive psychopath could be given useless supervisory work to do which relieved his tensions; the homosexual aggressor could be moved from cell block to cell block so that his activities caused less disturbance and the deeply introverted convict could be left to sit in the sun where he irritated no one.

Those who did not fit into this pattern of accepting imprisonment were those who had been longest away from tribal environment and who had changed to a more individual response to authority while perhaps receiving the least satisfaction from the change. They were out of place and could not manipulate an environment approximating to the tribal one from which they had moved away. They found the triviality of most of the staff's control irritating, particularly as the majority of the warders had only received primary education. A convict (17) explained that "I could see nobody of my equal apart from the commotion of poorly dressed chaps who still are my fellow inmates. I could read even far better than the receiving warders. My situations were
aggravated by the under-rational I was met with, even from people I didn't and still don't trust that they were of any value to any class of society on the globe. The convict doesn't acquire even the least degree of rehabilitation; this is simply because the warders under whose observation he is kept are no better than an uncultured scrub completely nude of outside world evolution.

The educated or semi-educated convicts, while not fitting into the general level of the prison and its prisoners, were able to exploit this comparative superiority by using their literacy to be helpful to the warders so that they often got special jobs.

III. Adjustment to Imprisonment

There did not seem to be much reaction against the negative aspects of imprisonment there were very few cases of depression and few acts of violence. Incidents which involved a charge in front of the Superintendent for breaking prison rules averaged less than one per five hundred prisoners per day over a three year period.

The convicts constantly expressed a need to conform even though they admitted that they would get the same advantages without being quite so obedient. Convicts known to be heavily involved in illicit activity, saw no conflict between the prime requirement of conformity, which they volunteered as a fundamental necessity, and their preoccupation with and success in manipulation. There was a ready following of a loose routine. There did not seem to be any concept of learning a special convict mode of behaviour which could be learned in order that the sentence would pass easily. Newcomers were told the best way was to conform to the prison routine to which advice there was little overt resistance.

For the majority of the convicts there was no adaptation inside to new behaviour patterns unsuited to life outside which would have prevented them acting in their normal social roles when they came to be released. Autonomy, identity and responsibility were not areas in which the average convict had reached a high level of individuality outside. Only in sexuality could any damage to the personality be expected and even this may well have been muted by illiteracy.

For most convicts their social learning as represented by the
modern world, was the same as for those who had not been imprisoned - a confusing milieu of conflicting traditional and modern standards for which there were as yet no generally accepted patterns of conformity. The need to conform to whatever rules physically confronted them while they endeavoured to get as much advantage as possible round the back - conformity but not obligation. Their ability to adjust to this fast changing outside world may indeed have been damaged by the experience of prison, not because it deprived the convict of autonomy but because it paralleled much of their outside community life in its control of the individual and discouragement of individual effort. It assisted them to revert to a state of dependency in which the state, just as the tribe, clan and family outside, was a 'father and mother' and in which there was no need for individual activity. It may well have paralleled the colonial situation in which the African prisoner and prison officer were mutually protecting themselves from outside reality.

There did not seem to be any difference in this respect between convicts imprisoned for offences accepted by them as crimes, such as murder and house-breaking, and those convicted of cattle theft, driving offences, immigration, tax and licensing offences connected with trade, traffic and liquor, which were not accepted by the convict community as crimes.

It would seem therefore that the more individualistic the convict in western social and economic terms, the more prone he would be to some distortion of personality during his sentence, but in fact he found satisfaction within the prison which militated against this eventuality. By reading and writing he had a salable commodity in an illiterate society. He found it relatively easy to manipulate the custodians, some for instance were helped with their correspondence courses, and this combined with a remaining sense of tribal identity, gave him a satisfying superiority over both convicts and custodians, as well as a mental equilibrium.

It did not seem that the individual's success in easily adjusting to prison life was affected by either the length or number of sentences or indeed by the maintenance of outside relationships, which in almost all cases were virtually non-existent. Prisonization for these African
convicts appeared to mean the acceptance within the prison of attitudes and practices which were a magnification of those accepted and utilised in the prevailing African society outside and that accordingly, prison may have had little effect on them to punish or rehabilitate and that its only success may have been to confine criminals and to protect society for the period of such imprisonment.

IV. Typology of convict adaptation

a. Conformity

Some prisoners recognised the legitimate right of the government, both before and after independence, to imprison them if it so wished. In a large number of cases they did not accept that they had done wrong or that they should have been sentenced to imprisonment for a particular offence, although only a very small minority failed to admit that they had committed the offence as charged. They tended to shrug their shoulders suggesting that this was the way that government always behaved, so that they accepted the prison because it existed. Convicts (20) wrote that this type of convict was "the man who never argues. He does just as he is told, no matter whether there is a warder nearby or not. Always cheerful to his fellow prisoners. Although there are some tricky prison rules that a prisoner can likely break and get punished, this man has been without any slightest report against him for the last three years", and "Even if the time for work is over, he would do something extra for the warders without arguing. He stays quiet when others make loud comments about the warders. He has no secrets and answers any questions put to him. He is a strong-minded person and tolerates the badness around him".

They recognised that conformity to the custodial regime was the best way of passing the time while seeing the sentence as a period lost from life; they were usually cheerful, polite enough and worked just enough to get by. They never considered that there were advantages to being in prison but much of the prison regime conformed to patterns of behaviour which were already a part of their experience outside. This conformity thwarted the avowed purpose of the prison to punish and reform, and a number of staff felt embarrassed that the prisons did not have the desired effect. There was thus individual conformity by the majority to the norms of prison authority, while at
the same time no inmate solidarity.

b. Innovation

Very few convicts indeed made any specific criticisms of the prison regime and their observations were generalised. Those who were chosen by the convicts to supervise food issues and to make such improvements as they were able, were almost immediately corrupted. A convict (21) said that "they were actually elected by the other prisoners to represent them in the food committee which in fact does not exist. So as soon as they get to the kitchen they forget that they are to represent the people and become self-seekers. They are the good pretenders. They are a very proud type of people. Even outside they are the type who tries to be what they will never be. Underground type of people. Makes friends only when he have got something to gain from such friendship".

The more educated convicts stressed that there was nothing in the prison system which would assist them in their rehabilitation. Many had ideas in relation to types of crimes as to how the judicial system should work for the benefit of the country; essentially in regard to crimes other than their own, they insisted that longer sentences and harsher treatment would deter; rehabilitation appeared to occupy a very small part of their consideration.

c. Ritualism

A further group of prisoners had largely rejected the socially approved goals for the prison of accepting authority and manipulating it to their own advantage and had fallen back upon a punctilious conformity to prison rules. Within this group there were two types, firstly the ritualism of identification. Their attitudes were ambivalent; they occupied staff places as clerks, store men and other special jobs, the long-term prisoners who had earned special privileges, all of whom had earned the tolerance, if not the respect, of the staff. From these positions, they regarded the majority of their fellow prisoners as criminals with whom they unfortunately had to associate. Typically outside they were schoolmasters and clerks, and a convict (22) described this type as "in jail everyone seems equal to the other no lower or big class. This I believe is the sole cause why some prisoners forget that they are prisoners and start ordering the others."
Mainly this comes when one wants to be the ruler and cannot win a majority by telling them how big he was as everybody says he was a big shot once in his life. They become prison dictators - the authorities do not encourage nor discourage. If they were encouraged they would use fiscal force. So they were always shouting, giving orders which only fools obeyed. Masters of none and Jackals of all".

Secondly, there were the dependant ritualists who had gradually lost all initiative. In the outside world they had been unable to adjust to the demands of detribalisation and town life and had failed equally to succeed even as petty criminals. They felt secure only when they were in prison, where they regained the comforting dependence which detribalisation may have disturbed.

d. Withdrawal

It has already been stated that there did not appear to be any development of an institutional neurosis in any type of convict which could be identified as mental decay. There were, however, three types of prisonised withdrawal but which were not associated with fantasy.

Owing to the fact that the majority were illiterate stimulus to retain contact with the social world had to come from conversation which was not always available in a particular dialect or in a satisfying form. Large numbers withdrew into sleep, possibly putting in an average of more than twelve hours sleep per day and literally, outside the hours of work required by the authorities and the need to eat, slept their sentences away. Convicts (23) described this type as "if they find their fellow prisoners arguing they never take interest. None of them will dare to tell you why they were convicted. When they are not sleeping, you will always find them in a secluded corner just keeping quiet like dolls. Always they look scared and out of place. We cannot tell for sure whether it is the length of their sentences or if it is the boring prison life which makes them to be good victims of sleep or if it is their habit that they have become professional sleepers", and another "there is bitterness in his soul. He has no happiness. He gives no trouble and he receives no trouble. Just silence".

The second group was composed of social inadequates who read voraciously in books which were often beyond their comprehension,
carrying books about the prison as amulets against their troubles in the outside world.

Lastly there were those who physically withdrew from the prison situation by escape. Very few were under any psychological compulsion to escape in order to attempt the solution of an outside problem, as family troubles did not appear to have this individual burden. There was no evidence of planned escapes or planning involving ingenuity, and in fact it was not necessary as the opportunities to escape from both inside and outside were numerous. Escapes which did take place were usually a last second decision to bolt from police custody prior to imprisonment when the prison initially classified as escapees and were not in fact compulsive withdrawals from an intolerable prison situation. Escapes rather than attempts to escape which may have had other objectives such as to gain access to a homosexual in the escape block, averaged no more than one per thousand prisoners per year.

e. Rebellion

Despite the prevailing norm of conforming to an accepted authority there were a few prisoners prepared to pit themselves against authority. They were both defiant in situations which did not justify a struggle and irrational, with the result that they got increasingly heavy prison punishment which the authorities often recognised as virtually useless in deterring other subsequent and similar offences.

Since there appeared to be an identity of norms between outside and inside the prison, there was no appreciation of such a prisoner’s virtues in attacking authority and no automatic support for his activities. Although many of the staff considered that they were at the bank of most of the supposed organised troubles in the prison, these rebels were in fact unpopular. They spoilt the even continuance of irregular activity involving both the convicts themselves and their social relationships with the warder staff. A convict (24) said that such rebels were “the type of person who will not stand a duel in challenge. They are hypocrites and have a hot temper. They do not consider other opinions. They always think they are angels, that what they ever say or do is the only right way” and that “he neither gives nor receives respect. The trouble he sees around him is that which he creates himself”.

Their activities were very spasmodic and probably formed a cycle of rebellion with which to jockey into a position of authority, either accepted by their fellow convicts or in some way recognised by the staff. This developed from a stage of corruption, which gave rise to protests from which evolved the opportunity for such an individual to stage his rebellion, which to be successful was often in the form of a challenge to authority over their alleged failure to give the prisoners their rights.

f. Manipulation

This group contained the brains of the prison community who sought their own ends of power and possessions by contriving to outwit authority without coming into any conflict with it. Essentially they were men acting on their own to gain comfort rather than status by the manipulation of money and goods. Such a man was not the leader of a gang and did not use force or fear. He was not regarded as a source of trouble by his fellow convicts. He did not act in order to gain status for his return to the outside world. He was very knowledgeable about prison routine and the ways in which it could be utilised to the prisoners' advantage. More than this knowledge of routine, he had a very clear understanding of how other humans, convicts, warders and senior staff could be manipulated. Members of this group were not entirely related to recidivism, education or long sentences.

A convict (32) described them as "they are always alert, looks suspicious. Have many friends, few enemies. They are very obedient. Smiles always to hide their suspicious eyes. They never boast about their normal life. They are not accustomed to begging. Very secretive".

A further small group under this type were those who sought to ameliorate the system as far as it concerned them by catching the ear of outside authority through smuggled letters or by informing inside in an attempt to change conditions without personally antagonising authority. A convict (26) wrote of this type "they are very friendly with new admissions. You can never call this class of prisoners as informers in the normal life because an informer does his duty for money or for another benefit like promotion or employment, but this class of prisoner do theirs for nothing, because the prison authorities do not reward them under any circumstances. What I have discovered
about them is that the only gain to them is that they get a good chance to further their dirty business within the jail. In fact what they report is what they are the victim of. If you hear them reporting that there is a convict with hemp, they have already hidden theirs. The type which want a monopoly, hypocrities, the best double-crossers which want to please everybody.

Although the authorities were apprehensive about such outside allegations and laid down a formal procedure for dealing with complaints, their standing orders stated that no action would be taken on anonymous letters. Informers were used by the lower grades of staff but not by senior staff who stated that their use undermined authority.

V. The individual experience

Although prison was obviously a group exercise and fitted in with many of their outside social norms and in which authority considered that it was dealing with an undifferentiated mass of largely bovine prisoners, it was nevertheless a very individual experience.

Convicts talked at length about their prison lives, stressing their isolation, not because they were unusually selfish, but because friendship within the prison was very rare, at least in the sense of more or less disinterested sharing and pleasure in one another's company. It was never sharing but the exchange of services for mutual advantage and protection. In sickness and health he was alone and unlikely to receive or give help unless it was to someone's advantage to do so or because the authorities were potentially involved. On the one hand he may have drawn some strength from tribal identity and what he could create of clan and lineage groupings, while on the other hand being unable to develop those relationships as would have been the case outside by a full range of reciprocal goods and services.

For the convict who had not come from and did not intend to return to a tribal environment, his whole experience of prison was often mitigated by an inadequate perception of his own true position when he returned to the outside world. He may not have realised fully that he would find it very difficult to get employment and that he had been imprisoned by his own government which regarded him as a criminal.

For those men there continued the delusion of political martyrdom inherent in the colonial situation and carried through into independence.
Nor did he realise that in a situation of fast political change, his status would also have been lowered on getting outside by not being able to regain socially the momentum which he had lost while being absent in prison. For the majority of convicts their improvement in health and increased weight resulted from regular diet and freedom from parasites; a healthy condition which they might not previously have experienced, and this in itself may have given them an optimistic frame of mind.

Almost every prisoner saw prison as unpleasant because it cut him off from his own life. The physical conditions, which they accepted as reasonable, were not a part of their assessment of their prison experience, and harsh or easy conditions would not appear to vary that opinion to any marked degree.

It did seem to be true that African convicts fitted more easily into prison life than convicts in European countries with the telling parallel that there was not very much difference between this type of prison life and the life of a contract labourer on an estate or mine. Further that in a society that was mainly illiterate, imprisonment did not result in the loss of many literate activities.

African convicts often did not feel themselves in prison to be in a criminal environment. The numbers in prison in proportion to population was much higher than in Britain, while those imprisoned for 'natural' crimes formed only a small proportion of the convicts present. Those imprisoned for game, liquor, licensing, stock theft, vagrancy, keep seeking, immigration offences and tax default did not see themselves as criminals. Lastly as their loyalties were still mainly to the wider groupings of lineage, clan and tribe, they did not suffer the personality tensions from attachment to individuals and nuclear family groups.

The fact that prison and outside life had many parallels which made prison life easier to experience, did not make the convict into a stereotype of one who liked prison or was stupid or bovine. In so far as he was capable, the convict had assessed his own position very accurately; conformity brought no further trouble and shortened the sentence.
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Chapter III

The relationships between prisoners

I. Background considerations

Social groupings and patterns of prisoners relationships

While the prison population was always overwhelmingly African it did not seem that this Africanness took any particularly identifiable form. The non-African prisoners, even the Europeans and in particular an Afrikaner from the Union of South Africa, did not complain or even suggested that the other convicts were actively prejudiced against them. One group which lasted sometime consisted of a Kikuyu, a Sikh and this Afrikaner. However as the prisons used to have separate facilities for Europeans, Asians and Africans and moreover the country's politics had been dominated by issues of colour and race, it was not surprising that the prisoners expected to find and therefore did find colour prejudice in their present lives in a prison which contained a wide variety of races and tribes. Apart from East African Africans, the prison during the period of research contained English, German, South African, Indian, Pakistani, Yemeni, Goan, Ethiopian, Somali and Sudanese convicts. A convict (4) related an incident and said "you see that European sailor who is in prison here with us. Well we Africans really lack character. I was on sick parade this morning and we are examined according to our order on the sick list. Now this European who is in the small cells, was escorted in and taken to the front of the queue where the African dresser stopped examining and African convict, to look after him. He got his medicine and went away. Even the Sergeant who was in charge of the sick parade was astonished and when he had left, turned to us and said that we should not think that colonialism was ended just because the country had become independent. Amongst ourselves I said later that we are all frightened by white skin and anyway we discriminate amongst ourselves all the time."

However the British Senior Staff were acutely conscious of colour prejudice as a political issue likely at any time to create problems in the prison and even more likely to raise dangerous political issues outside which might have caused their premature retirement. The explanation of this incident was most probably that the European
convict was not allowed to associate with convicts who were not
serving in the punishment cells and that as his attendance required
a special escort he was passed through to the doctor at once so that
the escort did not have to wait around. Nevertheless it was assumed
by both the staff and convicts present to be a deliberate example of
colour prejudice.

The possibility of using this obvious issue was often in the
minds of convicts who wanted to use it for their own advantage as any
appeal to it was very likely to get a response favourable to the ini-
tiator, particularly as the policy of Africanising senior posts as
quickly as possible had left the remaining ex-patriate officers in-
creasingly isolated. A convict (5) described an argument over rations
in which he had deliberately raised an issue to which he had no right
saying, "I asked the corporal who had given this order and said it
was the order of the European. I countered this by saying that he
agrees to accept the order of the European but the order of a fellow
African he cannot agree to. I told him that he disobeyed the second
order because it was given by an African whom he was jealous of for
getting his promotion and whom he thought was stupid. I went on to
say that he thought the European’s order for food to be given to the
prison pigs was more important than an African’s order for me to be
given extra food. The corporal denied having said any such thing and
went on to explain further ". Even if this dialogue represents a
largely fictional account of this incident, it could be seen that even
the placing of such a doubt in the mind of a warder could be useful to
a prisoner no matter how far-fetched was the issue.

Often however the African convicts saw in their European companions
virtues which did not really exist as when the same convict (4) commented
that "the European convicts stick together - just that they have a white
skin is enough. We know Mr. George comes from South Africa and the
other is a German - they are not of the same tribe - they do not even
ask that before making friends with each other." A point should be
noted here that the South African convict George was referred to in this
interview as "Mr." and I had occasion to hear a number of conversations
in which Europeans who did not try and make special conditions for
themselves, were referred to as Mr. So and So by their fellow convicts.
In conversation with European convicts they pointed out and indeed had complained to the authorities that while the other convicts left them alone to serve their sentences and to make what friendships they were able, warder staff constantly marked them out for abuse just because they were Europeans using Swahili words which only had meaning in a cross-racial situation.

There did not seem to be any concept of "us Africans suffering from injustice" and opposition to authority never took on nationalist or political overtones. A convict (3) said "in detention during the emergency, they were always united. If they said that no one should do it, it would not be done. But here it is very hard to unite them as everyone wants everything his own way. If we were united, no one would go to the cell lavatory until the previous prisoner had left but they just barge in. The Kikuyu prisoner wants to live the Kikuyu way. They always want to be together. They want to organise the prison so as to have one who says this or that and no one to disagree. They want to say we are going to strike and no one will refuse to do it. They asked me yesterday and I told them here it is difficult, because you will find that the coastal peoples won't agree with you. I told them the convicts are not together; of course you can be together but to have the same mind, you cannot bring them".

Over the independence period there was a feeling in the prison that things would be better afterwards, but this seemed to be more an extension of the overall opinion of the country than something specifically related to prison conditions.

The groupings in the prison were usually on tribal lines based on linguistic necessity with the Europeans as just another tribal group with a linguistic base. A convict (44) wrote "it is a bad thing here that we cannot gossip with each other because we have no shared language. When we do talk it is in the lingua franca, the language of work and that is difficult". The educated English speaking convicts sometimes joined over tribal lines but they did not keep much together as they were reported as not trusting each other since each one tried to show that he was more educated than the others. A convict (1) said "convicts follow tribes so that they can gossip about home. We share a cell as we are children of the coast and speak Swahili. The Kikuyu
here have kept themselves more to themselves than other people as their hearts are worse than others and they will not share with others; they have kept themselves apart because many were interned during the emergency and of course they are away from home. They would do their best to get allocated a cell for themselves alone."

Another (2) said "in C Hall the majority are Kikuyus as they are long-sentence men and because of that they have got together. In D Hall they are mainly Kalenjin who have arranged for those of their tribe who were first put into E Hall to move over so that they can all be put together. The local tribes are in E Hall where all the short-term prisoners go".

It was often difficult to distinguish between tribalism as a reason for some premeditated action or as an explanation for something which may have occurred for totally different reasons. A convict (43) described an incident which he attributed to tribalism and said "sometimes there are prisoners on a charge and the Chief Warder just turns and says leave them. Mostly they are the same tribe. Why is this strange. Most people of his tribe when they go there they talk to him and he leaves them. He is favourable to most of his tribe". There were however other explanations of such incidents which could not be attributable to an unsavoury bias. In a prison containing many dialects, people speaking the same one are not only better able to understand each other but what was more important to control each other.

The Chief Warder may have been able to control his fellow tribesmen without having to resort to these formal charges.

This distribution of convicts was to a certain extent aided by the prison administrative system. A convict (9) said "in C Hall you find a majority are Kikuyus. They are mostly long sentence men who have been transferred here from other prisons; they are all in Stage IV. In E Hall the newcomers stay and there you find the local tribes. Only the Kalenjin really seem to make an effort to get together and get transferred to D Hall".

Whether there were numbers of tribes in the one prison or a majority of one tribe, it was obviously in the interests of the prison authority to keep such a majority down to a minimum. It was unlikely that the prison authorities deliberately split up tribal groups because
of the political complications which would result. The policy of filling up prison vacancies by transfers from overcrowded prisons allowed the automatic removing from prisons of long-term prisoners who belonged to the tribe dominating the geographical area of the prison.

While the prisoners divided themselves into tribal groups which the staff could do little to prevent when they were housed in large dormitory cells, it was regarded as a potential danger to stability. Just as the government was concerned about tribalism, so the prison authorities were on the watch for inter-tribal tensions. There did not appear to have been any serious tensions during this period but some convicts (1) utilised this concern for their own ends and said "if we don't get on in a cell, we report to the Chief Warder that there is danger of a quarrel on tribal lines. He then separates us". However there was always the reverse side to the influence of tribe in a prison community which contained men from so many different tribes.

As a member of one tribe the convict could belong to a particular power structure which gave many satisfactions but he was not likely to be able to dominate any particular overall situation from a position of strength. Tribes were dispersed and too much adherence to a particular tribal group was likely to increase opposition rather than facilitate success. With the creation of the new independent nation there was also at least in public a marked desaccenting of tribal factors. A convict (8) spoke on the selection of the "cell judge" who settled some disputes and said that "if he says that he is not concerned with the tribes of those who live in his cell and interferes when people of different tribes try and upset each other, then he will surely begin to be very much liked and will retain their support". There was at least the feeling that men of the same nation should no longer quarrel amongst themselves.

While a prisoner would automatically look for other convicts of the same tribe, there were alternative groupings to which he could adhere; as a convict (2) said it is really a case of people finding a place where they are most happy except that they cannot get into C Hall which contains long-term men with special privileges". Any
social group did not take up all his time and he could be a member of several according to the advantages which he could get therein. These social networks were complicated by more personal relationships than tribal affinity. Some convicts had met previously outside and have reciprocities which continued inside the prison on which both of them would draw. A convict (6) said "I got the marihuana from a youngster who looks after the prison pigs. We have known each other from our outside lives. He doesn't get any advantage from helping me in this way". It was probable that these friendships had a greater significance in the prison than outside where they may have been no more than acquaintances. The loneliness of the convict life particularly if he did not want to develop a homosexual relationship, made it likely that those who had known each other outside, would accentuate the relationship inside.

The remand who assesses that he was likely to be found guilty and sentenced to imprisonment, could pass some of his money into prison with the help of a convict whom he knew. There were also those who had had previous sentences of imprisonment or in the course of a long sentence had served in several prisons so that they had a reasonable chance of meeting other prisoners whom they had met before in the same or another prison.

The network of friendship was also related to those who had something special to offer. The special stage convicts who had been longest in the prison which included those with life sentences, had relatively free movement about the prison and might have linked up with those who were more liable to be searched. The same convict (7) said "I received a message to visit someone who knew me in another ward. He said that he was in for three years this time as he had broken his licence conditions. He had fifteen shillings with him which he asked me to keep for him as he was liable to be searched rather often as an escaper. I bought four twists of tobacco for two shillings as I had none of my own and I gave him two".

Religious groups existed and there were two prisoners leading Roman Catholic and Protestant groups of not more than twenty prisoners each but no identifiable Moslem group. The Commissioner of Prisons who was known to be interested in evangelical conversion as an important
part of criminal rehabilitation, did not seem to have induced prisoners to form such a group, possibly because the prison was not visited frequently by this officer and no specific advantages had been seen to exist.

Most convicts suggested that an important grouping came from similar criminal activities. This was certainly obvious among cattle thieves since this classification coincided with a tribal one. A convict (1) said "thieves such as pickpockets who have their own dialect keep together and housebreakers; they are always boasting trying to get the better of their rivals. Cattle thieves keep together to discuss methods. All they do really is to keep on bringing to their minds the successes of their pasts".

There were also groups based on part-time activities. A convict (3) said "the Hamisi group smokes marihuana and plays draughts. Jacob's group smokes cigarettes. The Samson group is well organised smoking marihuana and cigarettes, getting the best food and practising homosexuality. My own group of five persons smokes cigarettes and plays draughts". It seems that while such games may have had the same significance as in the outside world, smoking either tobacco or marihuana became an intensely ritualistic activity usually carried out in such groups.

More active games had not resulted in the formation of larger rival groups because the composition of the teams was fortuitous and any attempts by convicts to organise these teams was in certain circumstances resisted. A convict (2) said "the football players are self-selected, you just go and stand in the queue at football time and if there are 25 men, then we get a chance to play. We don't have games between halls we have no one to organise it as our welfare system is very weak. You would get many who would like to play such games. If a prisoner tried to do this organisation, he would find himself in the punishment cells because he had interfered with the welfare's job".

If the prison society mirrored the social structure of the communities from which the convicts came, the privileged position of the older prisoner would have been conspicuous. It did not seem that he had any benefits because of his age unless he had some additional skills. This was also because the structure of privilege in the prison
was related to the length of service completed by each individual and the long sentence prisoner was only comparatively rarely an old man.

While the tribe and to a lesser extent age remained the semi-traditional means of the convicts differentiating themselves, a more important method was the self-classification of literate which was taken to be educated in opposition to the illiterate. The literate convict (10) denigrates the others and said "some people who can't read or can't write or can't do anything" and the illiterate (11) appeared to respond to inquiries from the literate with spontaneous resentment and said "you think I have stolen your book because I am illiterate, or say you have not given him a cigarette was due to the fact that you thought yourself more civilised than him". The educated prisoners also considered that the senior staff shared this bias and one convict (12) said "the senior staff take to educated people more than they do to these uneducated chaps. Because they know that if somebody with some education, with at least some understanding, has got some knowledge of controlling himself he knows the right or bad thing although he is in prison. The fact that he is in prison doesn't mean that he is totally a bad person. He can control himself when there are rows in the prison. It is easy to tell him something and he understands". An educated convict (13) said "to be liked you have to give the uneducated prisoner some consolation. If you refuse to give cigarettes to an illiterate, he will attribute your refusal to his illiteracy, not to the number of cigarettes you have left".

It was against this background that it was difficult to find any convincing evidence of inmate solidarity except in the general sense that they were all prisoners or for very short periods in relation to specific grievances. While it was certainly true that no one trusted anyone else in the prison unless they had a specific reason for doing so, this was no more than their attitudes to social relationships outside in the urban and industrial environments away from their homes. Against a background of the practical utility of tribalism during periods of rapid social change, trust outside this framework would have had very little utility.

Similarly the strong may prey on the weak but only within this
framework and it would have been entirely wrong to parallel this prison with the jungle-like existence described in other prisons (45) except to confirm that the main influence on prisoners came from their companions rather than the staff.

If the prison and its policies had been founded entirely on British precedents and traditions, the convicts might have had to form these relationships under conditions of small cells and segregation occasioned just as much by the architecture of the prison as by their existing penal policies. In this prison whatever may have been the intentions of the Prison Department at the time, there was architectural recognition that individual relationships between convicts were not wrong in themselves - the convicts spent their non-working hours in dormitory cells which could house twenty or more persons.

While segregation was attempted for certain classes of convicts in order to provide an incentive for conformist behaviour, it was only enforced on very few for special reasons related to their individual characteristics rather than as a consequence of some overall policy of individual segregation as a good thing in itself. Thus segregation occurred here as a punishment involving confinement to the punishment cells in a separate block or even as a reward to a well-behaved long-term prisoner who wanted some privacy. It also occurred to protect an individual from possible danger; European prisoners were segregated for a time after a deranged African convict in another prison had made a homicidal attack on a European prisoner, and to protect others from a dangerous man either in the form of physical violence by a mentally upset convict or moral depravity by a persistently aggressive homosexual.

Since there was also no real enforcement of silence at work, social intercourse between the prisoners was relatively free; each prisoner had a number of persons in the same dormitory cell from whom he could select his associates and reasonable chances of being able to negotiate and participate with prisoners elsewhere if he wished to do so. With this relative freedom there was no real pattern of covert communication; on these grounds alone it was not necessary to have systems for message carrying, and of course the high percentage of illiteracy in the prison made verbal messages the only possible means
of communication through a third party as would have been the case in traditional society.

Although there was a sense of social solidarity and collective identity, the prisoner was much more interested in differentiating himself from his enforced associates than in claiming unity with them. Few saw themselves as real criminals and there were few professional criminals. In this prison those imprisoned for real and immoral as opposed to bureaucratic or newly defined offences, were at the most attached to the septic fringe of urban society as indeed would have been a high proportion of all persons in that environment. His principal motivation was often to keep away from others for fear that he might be contaminated by his enforced companionship with men whom he saw as evil. Primarily this was a need to turn his own guilt outwards onto someone else's crime which was aided by their tribal divisions and their important distinction between the educated and illiterate. He shared the European and American prisoners contempt for sexual offenders of all types but the relative freeness of their prison associations prevented this dislike from taking openly aggressive forms.

Inmate solidarity related to the type of prisoner population although all prisoners entered the prison in the same grade and since their grade rose with the length of their sentences the short-termers did not form strong associations. The serious offenders with long sentences became grouped because they were the survivors and since their number was small, they were forced into being a group by circumstances as they were housed separately.

The short-termers did not have enough time in the prison to form associations of the same potential intensity, and saw themselves still in terms of their outside lives; they still belonged to their own family and clan groups rather than to any prison group however attractive it might have appeared to be for short-term usage.

It was not only that each prisoner saw himself as isolated by both his personal problems and the criminality of his prison associates, but that relative isolation was often more useful than collectivity. The prisoner was likely to see isolation at least as one of the factors which could have resulted in his getting desirable
employment in the prison; it would not have been necessary to attempt to be seen as an isolated person by the warders because that might have been taken as a sign of extreme abnormality but to keep away from associations which might have classified him as a troublemaker; certainly those who sought or who had obtained higher status were wary of entangling alliances (49). A convict (50) said "friendship is a good thing but it can also be very bad especially in prison. In fact in prison it is not friendship at all but an exchange of services." Isolation may also have been necessary if the convict was to benefit from any special training which was given to him. A convict (48) said "as I was learning to use the machines in the workshop, some of the other men got jealous and started to give me trouble losing things and saying that I had taken them".

The small number of highly intelligent prisoners who organised their lives towards longer rather than shorter term objectives from which they could get materials of status saw real advantages in isolation. Certainly they may have made arrangements with others for some particular project but they saw few if any advantages in having a fixed group of associates. To be successful in trafficking, he had to think of not only obtaining the goods required, but of cutting down his overheads as much as possible and to this end involved as few people as possible in the necessary network of manipulation. A man with a large coterie of friends or associates, could not be successful because the small-ness of his profits prevented their use for the extension of trading and power manipulation.

Another reason for prisoners preferring to be as isolated as possible was their fear of being contaminated by other prisoners who they saw as morally bad men and real criminals. This was not to suggest that most prisoners saw themselves as innocent men because the vast majority accepted that they were correctly convicted and indeed commented on the advantages to them of the existing national judicial system (51) but that in a scale of morality, many other prisoners were worse than they were in sin. While this feeling may only have been definite towards sexual offenders, the variety of tribes which made for feelings of uncertainty combined with the fact that the
offences of most convicts were not known to their fellow prisoners, made for a pervasive feeling of uncertainty which was expressed in such moral terms.

There was a further group who were isolated either by their own wishes or those with whom they were forced to associate because of some physical or psychological abnormality. A convict (52) said "that man talks to no one and no one talks to him. He discourages others from associating with him. It is not that he is a bad man as he is quiet and inoffensive, but that his epilepsy keeps him separate".

Isolation also came with age in biological as well as social terms related to the length of the sentence already described. Although inmate advice was usually from older to younger convicts they did not appear to have had any particular social roles which could be attributed to their higher ages if only because they did not have any monopoly of prison experience or socio-political or economic power. Recidivists were also isolates more than those experiencing their first sentence but above all isolation rather than collectivity was a feature of this prison as a result of a combination of length of sentence and tribal background. Most convicts other than those with some secondary education, would not have thought of associating with those of other tribes unless there were some unusual reason to do so such as the absence from the prison of anyone of their own tribe.

Another reason for many convicts preferring isolation was that although they were legally first offenders, they had committed other offences or had been convicted in other countries, and were nervous of this knowledge coming to the knowledge of the authorities. There were several examples of one convict reporting another to the authorities when recognised as a wanted man or for previously uncharged offences. A convict (53) said "they were afraid to tell the truth about their crimes because it might be different to the grounds on which they had been convicted, particularly as regards giving information which might disclose the whereabouts of stolen property. It's not only that government imprisons someone but he is kept under observation so that even if three years of a sentence have gone by, the smallest piece of information might mean that he receives a further sentence."
As elsewhere (54) the convict tended to greater isolation at the beginning and end of his sentence and with due regard to the other factors already mentioned, more socialised in the middle. A convict (55) wrote "I put down my admission day into prison as a lowest day in my life. I laid in a cell with two other occupants; nothing to smoke and nobody to talk with, it seemed to me I was lost; all the elements and pains of this world allied themselves against me. Thinking all this I summed up all that freedom I was leaving behind, I got on my feet and borrowed tobacco from an Arab who was sleeping beside of me as he was to be released in the morning. He couldn't sleep, the last days were endless. I reflect that in prison only the first and the last days mattered. The man with a sentence of five years waits during the last days the same way as a man who is only for two months. The difference being that the man with five years behind him could never again be of any use to society. By that time the prisoner feels that days are not moving; sometimes he might say that nights are longer as he does not sleep; he has a picture of his home in his head".

While the isolation could be seen as an attempt to reduce tension, association could be said to increase it. Apart from those who had some experience of detribalised life in towns, estates and factories, the majority came from backgrounds which had a considerable social uniformity. To be moved from this to an enforced association with people from many other different backgrounds was bound to cause tension even when there were no additional strains associated with criminality and feelings of contamination.

Tension may have been reasonably controlled in the dormitory cells by the real necessity of living together and the fact that life there was not associated with additional problems over food and work. The kitchen was certainly the principal source of tension in the prison and not only because the standard of cooking and the quality of the food was a major preoccupation for almost all the convicts.

Enquiries within the prison showed much more dislike of cooks in general and in particular than any other group in the prison including the disciplinary staff. A convict (56) said "among the cooks there is one cook who makes me angry right in my soul and I
will expose this bad man to the warders". Stronger words than were used in any references to informers. This dislike was not only a concern for the corruption which they considered to exist there, but the low skill of the cooks occasioned more than anything else by the prison authorities needed to change cooking staff regularly in order to reduce rather than control the growth of trafficking in the kitchen. Since so many African men cooked for themselves while at work, hunting or cattle guarding, it did not appear that cooks were seen as doing an undesirable job because it should have been done traditionally by women; certainly no one referred to the cooking as being women's work.

Work in its relationship to tension between prisoners must be divided into the three categories of farm, fibre weaving and workshop. The farm was a tensionless area because the work was carried on outside the prison and by its very nature could not be closely supervised and allowed the appearance of some personal freedom, and of course the fact that the majority came from agricultural backgrounds and had a natural experience and facility for such work. The weaving shop in comparison to the farm, was crowded and hot, and the work of completing a daily task exceedingly dull. It was here that occasional fights broke out and there were mutual recriminations about the ways in which the daily task was completed and assessed. It was in the workshop that there was the least tension where a small group of prisoners serving long sentences were permanently associated over work which was constantly changing.

Despite this partial restriction of tension to certain areas, the convicts themselves recognised that it was always present in their prison lives and might not only have erupted at any time but was a necessary part of certain convicts' lives. A convict (57) said "some of the bad prisoners like to fight against one another and when caught they may pretend that they were playing or joking. This is owing to the oppression one may find in the small cell" and another (58) said "one can start a thing by a few words and everyone wants to see friends fighting amongst themselves".

This prison had no policy of concentrating difficult men in one cell block other than their coincidental sentences to the punishment
cells from time to time, and tended more to shift them around. Thus other convicts and the atmosphere of each cell block did more to re-
strain them than any repressive measures instituted by the authorities.

The workshop was a tensionless area which may have been because it was the only useful training provided by the prison for which the convicts could see to be of personal advantage to them on release. It allowed them to work extra hours in order to make articles wanted by the warders, and this provided them with all the benefits which could only be obtained by other prisoners through corruption. Their small numbers and the isolation of the workshop may also have contributed but it could not be said that the careful selection was a factor since it was towards the long-term convict and those who had had some semi-skilled industrial experience. They had a more limited interest in contraband articles simply because it was not now worth their while to deal in them.

While there may have been an absence of friendship between con-
vincs and excluding homosexual dyads, there were still numbers of loose dyads and triads which could not be classified as friendship and which fell within the layer groupings which have already been men-
tioned. These in other prisons had been described as "mutual home background, association in crime, expressed or unexpressed homo-
sexual attraction, mutual toleration by a forced propinquity, the wish of a submissive personality to share in the prestige of a notorious and dominant one and the man who plot and plan for future crime".

When a prisoner first entered prison especially for the first time, he was isolated and sought companionship although the established residents would tend to ignore him. Thus there was a tendency for like to pair up with like if such persons were in fact available and only the recidivist would be less inclined to hurry into such associations.

II. Patterns of cooperation between prisoners

The convicts chose their friends and associates with little con-
cern for the prison administration's existence and attitudes. They did not seem to feel that they would be at a disadvantage if they associated with other convicts whom the staff considered troublesome,
certainly no one mentioned this as something which they had to bear in mind.

While in American and British prisons it was considered useful to be in contact with someone who had connections with the prison administration such as clerks who had valuable information to retail from time to time, this did not occur in this prison. Probably because the social differences between those literates who obtained clerical jobs and the remainder of the prisoners was too wide to be bridged by outsiders who could only offer sycophancy and no material benefits in exchange for information. Nor did there seem to be any expressed need for dependable friends, particularly near to release, who would have been able to provide assistance and advice both within and without the prison.

In general the convicts found difficulty over the idea and reality of friendship in prison, a prisoner (69) wrote "when you see any prisoner wanting the friendship of another here, it is safe to assume that he is seeking something which will not be to the other's advantage. Take someone who is friendly with someone who works in the kitchen, he wants extra food and the cook wants something like tobacco which he cannot get in the kitchen; this is not friendship but a trade relationship". Another (70) wrote in the same theme "I have only one friend here who teaches me English every day and I give him each month a pound of sugar from my canteen purchases. I don't see why I shouldn't call him my friend, just because there is this exchange".

This was not to suggest that the convicts did not want friends or could not understand the concept of friendship but that prisoner society was reduced to a collection of individuals isolated from each other by their different crimes, origins, ages, the prison regulations and above all by the fact that they were known by numbers rather than names for the first time in their lives. Without reference to prisons Europeans complain of the increasing impersonalisation of western life and find the lack of any personalisation in dealings with social welfare agencies very disturbing. Here was a much more disturbing situation for these prisoners with the great traditional importance of names as establishing their owners social, religious and economic positions in their society. Without a name they were in a disturbing nihilistic
situation.

When this was combined with the damage to their self-respect from arrest, trial and imprisonment which was certainly as great with East Africans as with European and American offenders, it was not surprising that they thought of themselves in isolation rather than in relationship to the potentially available range of primary groups.

So co-operation rather than friendship between prisoners, was based on self-interest according to the particular circumstances of this prison. Their co-operative behaviour did not parallel that of other prisons because the circumstances were not the same. They remained convinced that their main interests lay in the exchange of goods and services within the convict social system as far as they were able and that the manipulation of authority was very secondary to this. This mercenary attitude to relationships in the prison was so obvious and widespread and contrasted so strongly to the concepts of inmate solidarity found in British and American prisons that it must be analysed. An old and experienced convict (71) stated categorically "prisoners are not angered about these trades". In the traditional world outside there would have been a system of balanced reciprocities for goods and services which could have been analysed in economic terms but which in fact had much wider implications. As Europeans invested in business to expand their range of success and security, the traditional African with his surplus goods and services would invest in social relationships; he was not disinterested in friendship but merely calculative. His mercenary attitude was seemingly a continuation of outside attitudes which had been hardened rather than relaxed by the circumstances of his imprisonment.

Some gambled but it was a not very widespread way of passing the time such as might have been seen in the British and American armed services. It may have been compulsive as when a convict (75) said "there was a gambling group of four who did it everyday after work and who tried to get in the same cell so that they could carry on doing it all night. It is rarely gambling by cards in which cheating can be learnt but with bones and corrie shells. Here they gamble with soap and some gain as many as 200 pieces but it is never the same person on top always, and the winner also shares out his
Another (76) said "there is no real gambling in prison as there is no money and it is just for soap; a way of passing time".

Although gambling could have wider implications as in the remarks of a convict (77) who said "this month there has been a great spate of gambling and one convict won all the soap of everyone playing. He won for a month. He will use it for cookhouse trading". The authorities were often tolerant. An officer (78) said "I wouldn't have collected that bag of pieces of soap which was brought in by my successor. They have gambled with it for years. It has never done anyone any harm. It has given them a bit of a break, lets them let off steam. It is an outlet, why interfere with it because the book says that each convict is entitled to two ounces only. I wouldn't touch it. I might say to the person - you're getting too much soap, get rid of it".

Association then was based on self-interest usually with some material advantages involved. A convict (79) said "no one moves to another ward unless he knows someone there. If he is put into a cell as a newcomer he has to be picked up by someone in order to get to know what to do. Samson introduced me to the club; he had been there for some time and he wanted me to be on his side so I was free from club troubles. More advantageous to me than to him; they may fear him as he is rather muscular and semi-educated. There is a tendency for semi-literate or illiterate persons with ambitions to make friends with a literate".

In some cases the relationship was explicitly commercial a convict (80) said "Jackson helps me as I pay him - he guards my blankets. I give him cigarettes, the extra ones which I get from the warders for writing letters for them. In fact I really employ him as a servant. He cares for my two extra ones, he hides them with the others while I am working overtime in the office. He changes the numbers before an inspection. He is the cleaner. When they have done calls one and two and are in three, he changes them from eight to one. The warders in the corridor don't interfere as we help them in writing letters".

Despite such patterns of self-interested co-operation, most convicts saw themselves as essentially isolated particularly when the circumstances of their prison lives lead to at least some degree of introspection. A convict (81) said "even well-known friends don't
look after each other. Every prisoner looks after himself because he came here by his own way. They don't look on friendship as insurance for the future. They think they will go out tomorrow and have nothing more to do with their fellow convicts. This is referring to relationships which are not homosexual. Possibly the very long-term prisoners are better paired. I was sick for four days with malaria; no one came to see me. I even had to send someone to get me water, no friends helped me. This is not just me - no one cares".

While most of these relationships were between two persons there were sometimes advantages in belonging to a small group but few if any convicts saw convict society in unitary terms, and convict solidarity as a necessary social reality. A convict (32) described such a group and said "one day I saw five or six people keep all their things in common. Their canteen goods, sugar, tea and coffee and all their other things for one month are kept together. So these people are always full of stock and never short of anything".

III. The inmate leader

A definition of leadership in a prison community has to be a wide one because of the variety of situations in which they function as the centres of informal and administratively unregulated groups, influencing and directing their members opinions and behaviour. The prison authorities tended to regard as leaders only those who lead opposition to their rule but as has been described earlier, such convicts were not only very much the product of particular short-lived situations or mentally disturbed but were themselves unpopular with their fellow prisoners. They are therefore not considered here to be leaders. Since the staff had no interest in the prisoners informal groupings other than the distribution of convicts by their dormitory cells about which their information was often incomplete and out of date as regards names rather than totals. There were no informal groups which were prison wide; religious affiliations only meant meeting on Sundays, football and handball games were too irregular and while it was possible to manipulate one's position in a particular type of work group, their composition was too often fortuitous to allow for the development of informal leaders.

Such informal leaders as existed were not necessarily those with
criminal backgrounds but had certainly been longer in the prison
than the majority who were in for sentences of less than six months.
They usually had attributes which would at least have qualified them
for leadership within their own communities, such as an equable dis­
position and great conversational ability. They certainly were not
physically distinguishable except that they were not the large bodied
whose size might have implied at least incipient aggression. While
they were inclined to give some automatic social elevation to the
literate, the outstandingly intelligent who had received a higher ed­
ucation, were avoided. One convict who had received a degree was
usually derided in both public and private. Other qualifications
which appeared to go with informal leadership were cleanliness, quick
wittedness particularly in relation to officialdom and sophistication
in prison affairs.

However informal leaders were not very obvious members of the
prison community; a few were certainly recognised from time to time
by the authorities as useful men for quietening down trouble but by
and large they did not emerge from the groupings of convict society
and their relative absence calls for explanation. British and Ameri­
can prisons with their varieties of criminality and the differences
between inmate and official values, had few universal values and this
contributed to the ephemeral nature of convict informal leadership.
This same situation existed in this prison but to a much more extreme
degree since the convict community was basically split on tribal
grounds and thus the potential number of convicts which could be
grouped and led was radically reduced.

In these circumstances discussions in the prison about leaders
brought out ideas which did not correspond to outside conceptions of
leadership, and tended to be interpreted in terms of certain convicts’
social prominence. Perhaps in a sense such ideas encouraged patterns
of behaviour in the prison to those who were attracted to them but
this did not mean that they had followers who constituted informal
groups in which such persons were accepted leaders.

Although the prison sometimes contained individuals who were
prominent outside the criminal world, in the civil service, business
or politics, this was not carried over into the prison community. It
would be wrong to suggest that the convicts forced such people to drop their outside status since it was either ignored or unknown.

Prominence within the convict community was associated with employment — the jobs which they held within the official prison hierarchy, and related to the number of convicts over whom they had either direct or indirect influence. In such a scale the cooks who were involved with every prisoner and senior prison officer and illegally with some at least of the warder, was more important than the convict store clarks, who only had to deal with a minority of the convicts who had permission to receive something special as a result of an application to the authorities.

A convict (25) said "a person who is employed in these domestic affairs is by far the most prominent. He contributes quite a lot to our well-being as inmates, and for one to get an extra ration of food he must make himself a necessary friend of a cook. Those people were regarded with some minor esteem by the prison officials for undoubtedly the life of all their fellow inmates depended on them. Not only were they prominent in the prison because they prepared meals for the rest of the prisoners but they also had to be hard workers whenever they were called for duty. A cook was the only person in prison who was employed under the system of medical fitness which prevailed in the world outside the walls. He must be deemed fit by a qualified physician before he could stay in the kitchen. Whilst the possibility of any prisoner to change his employment prevails, it was not all that much easy in the case of a cook or was it very much possible to ask the officials to deem him a cook, before the case was sanctioned by the doctor. Besides seeking the doctor, the figure to become a cook had got to see the officer in charge twice who questioned him and asked him not to abuse the work he had been chosen for. They had got to go on duty at night, and they had few warders to look after them. They must not have some temptation of escaping. Other times they were also left out until very late. Sometimes they were locked up at something like say 7.30 p.m. when other prisoners had been already locked up. As a person staying where there were some dangerous weapons, for example nails, axes, knives and so on he must not be an individual, he must be an individual of modest temper, not quarrelsome, not easily
irritated, and so on. He was recognised by all warders. In most cases and especially when the man had advanced his skill there happened to be quite a number of warders of very subordinate grade walking from one corner of the kitchen to the other looking for a cook to fix them with at least a mug of tea. In this case cooks gained more prominence and they were usually considered good chaps regardless of their crimes by these loitering warders. Whilst it took time for one to be noticed in the prison it was only a matter of two days for a cook to be known all over the prison in which he was working. Another point to be accounted for as far as cooks are concerned was that they seemed to be the happiest lot in the prison which was probably due to the fact that they fed and fitted themselves to their maximum. And also they got most of their requirements in the kitchen through the warders with whom they made friendship. As a result the kitchen cooks were by far the most healthy prisoners and most cheerful and playful.

Another convict (35) confirmed the pivotal position of the cooks in the prison's social structure and said "employment governs prominence. The cook so called are in this position. He is not only known by his fellow prisoners but by high grade officials - duty officers are always going there. This contributes to their fame. The cooks contribute to our welfare and to get anything, extra, and individual ones have to be cultivated. They have much freedom."

It has already been stated that these prisons no longer have convict leaders and the present rules allowed for Special State prisoners to have privileges but not to have control over other prisoners. A convict (18) spoke of the difference to prison life which this change had caused and said "in the former prison I used to see some of these convict leaders they were terribly awful. Specially when you are a newcomer they used to handle people very badly. They needed some sort of bribe to do anything. In this particular prison now I seem to have noticed none. I cannot think of any". Another prisoner (19) commented on the changes in the convict behaviour which had resulted from the new regulations since his previous sentence and said "before in the central prison the convicts used to rule the warders. They would force proud new admissions to carry three buckets of night-soil about,
one in each hand and one on the head and no warden will interfere with them. They will beat others, and move people from one club to another. When I came back in 1962 things had changed and no convicts have got anything to say. Even the barbers were not cruel, I found everything had changed."

The Special Stage convicts who had certain statutory privileges and who no longer had any supervisory duties although many other convicts still referred to them as 'trusts' may nevertheless have been disliked. A convict (20) said "once in a blue uniform they feel as if they own the prison. They command every convict. They can even tell me don't dare to talk to me. They harass the other convicts. They say come over here, go inside; sometimes do this and that. The authorities want this convict to have a small power but he adds another half to it. They are not supposed to order convicts about but they turn up earlier for the parade to do this and the convicts agree to them because they don't want quarrels. They are not necessarily on the side of the warders instead of the prisoner; they are on the side of themselves as a group."

The position of 'in charge' in each ward seemed to be an unofficial compromise. The position of convict leader was abolished under the new Prison Regulations which stated that no convict should be in charge of other convicts. However it was convenient for the staff to have a convict to each ward who could provide information on the prisoners there and who could be responsible for that ward's conforming to prison rules about cleanliness and daily counts. The warders also found it sensible to have a prisoner in each ward who could be assumed to be in charge of discipline even though he had no power to enforce anything other than calling for their assistance. The first question after any disturbance or query might well have been "who is in charge here" by the warders entering the ward. While it would not confer any official position, it certainly implied to those hearing that there should have been someone in charge. This may only have been a semantic point but it may well have had the effect on the convicts of creating this position which also suited their own purposes. The prisoners themselves found it convenient to have a 'ward in charge' who dealt with the authorities on their behalf and to whom they could
Some wards had a more elaborate social system with elders assisting the 'in charge' but it seemed that this could only occur in wards which had a relatively stable population of long-term prisoners. In wards which had a high turnover of prisoners, there was neither the time nor the inducement to set up a more complex structure. A convict (21) who lived in the cooks' ward said "the first person to be consulted for the settlement of any dispute is the 'in charge'." There are no elders here who help him settle a dispute. After look-up it is up to the 'in charge' to stop any disturbances. You are not told that you are in charge - it seems to be a sort of hereditary post. You go to stop a fight - you shout at them to stop - you go there to separate them".

Thus to have a convict in charge may have appeared to the prison authorities as no more than an administrative convenience but to the prisoners he would be the lowest rung in the hierarchy of prison authority and at least from that point of view, a much wanted position. A convict (37) said "the 'in charge' in the mat section has been transferred and that man is doing his best to get the job. I always see him at the morning parade telling the newcomers what to do. I do not know why he is doing this when he is to be discharged next month - a power seeker is not interested in the time. It is pleasing to be on the top if even for a day. He could not make a bid for power before as the previous man had been so long there and was firmly entrenched".

After the abolition of 'convict leaders' it was correct to say that no convicts had formal powers over their fellows, but nevertheless some long-term and literate prisoners continued to have informal powers from which they gained status rather than material benefits. Convicts called out the men every morning who were wanted for release, transfer and working parties and they did this because they knew the prisoner population better than the staff and were thus able to do it more efficiently, which in these circumstances meant less delay in getting the prison's daily organization moving.

Although this would appear to have allowed the manipulation of names for profit, this was not done and a convict (38) said "I can change the names but there is no reason to do that either for my
friends or for a bribe. The lists are not prepared by me so that I can only forget to call a name and not change it from one list to another*. Whilst he could not change the names, he was expected to support the group with which he was connected. A convict (10) said "he is unpopular as the clerk with the sick section. He does not help those who go on sick-parade by marking them as present so that they can get their daily payment. Most clerks give. If he is found out he would be removed and he is afraid of that. I give it to everyone— I am respected very much for that".

A convict (3) who had acted as an 'in-charge' described his duties and said "when the lock-up comes I tell people to sit in rows of five. After they have been counted, they will ask me to give the number. He is getting confirmation. To see that no one steals and to get a thief out of the ward. To control noise after the warder has banged the door to say that people should be asleep. To see that the ward is clean. On Sundays there is no official cleaner, so I work a rota; it has never happened that anyone refused*. Another convict (39) said "I take the new admissions to have their hair cut and to get their numbers sewn onto their shirts. When they have their work allocated to them, I see that they get to the right place. When any officer comes round I report the number in the block. When the doctor comes round I make comments on the lunatics behaviour as to whether they are better or worse*. This description of his own duties was almost certainly false but the fact that he thought he had these duties made the giving of such so-called positions an additional means of controlling convicts who might otherwise have been troublesome.

While such a convict in-charge had some official duties and at least the tacit support of the authorities, the appointment required the agreement of the convicts concerned. A convict (1) said "each cell block has a head chosen by the Chief Warder; he is not chosen by the convicts in the block. This really means that we can keep him chosen by agreeing but if we refuse to have him, the Chief Warder must choose another*. Another convict (3) said that "the in-charge convict cannot control them - he can only win them".

IV. The nature of illicit enterprise

The extent and diversity of illicit enterprise in this prison
could not be attributed to any one factor. As has been explained
earlier the majority of prisoners were materially better off in prison
than they would have been on the outside, so there was no strong ele-
ment of deprivation which they could seek to reduce. There may have
been an element of redistributing these assets according to some
system of self-evaluated need but particularly in food, there was al-
ways a substantial surplus. More than this there were the inter-re-
lated factors of opposition to established authority, the challenge
of exercising ingenuity to counter the boredom of the intelligent
and the need and competition for particular goods in short supply.
Only with marihuana was there an intensification of all the factors;
greater need, ingenuity, returns and penalties.

While it was obvious that the passage of contraband was illegal,
this should not be interpreted as indicating any great disciplinary
rigidity. Certainly the rules were there but their enforcement was a
question of priorities; and anything more than routine or emergency
activities would have required extra staff and time. Although this
had not been given as one of the reasons for the lack of consistent
and vigorous action to reduce contraband, it must certainly have been
a major contributory factor. Also there had been a continuous de-
emphasis of the primitive aspects of penal treatment in the inter-
national community of penal specialists which continued to be an im-
fluence on the penal policies of this country.

Since there was no particular attention paid to moderate smug-
gling, it followed that it was not too difficult to do and that this
in itself was one of the major factors which contributed to the ab-
sence of bitterness in all but a small number of the convicts and their
general passivity. A prison officer (87) said "it doesn't require
a great deal of subterfuge to get whatever he wants. In the evening the
prison is controlled by African warder staff who have sympathy with
their fellows. Not a problem anyway; the discovered contraband is neg-
ligible. I don't think it has serious proportions. I don't take much
notice of tobacco, it's a game. I am not breaking my back to find out
how many get a bit of tobacco in at night. A safety valve. We are
better off with this trafficking. To a certain extent it controls it-
self within reasonable limits". The convicts did not see trafficking
as an attempt to subvert the authority and administration of the prison. A convict (82) said of smuggling involving money "It's not used for anything that would endanger the prison; it goes to get more food and cigarettes to make life easier.

A convict (109) stated that money was relatively common in the prison and said "there is always quite a lot of money stored or circulating in the prison which comes to the convict from the warders. Any prisoner who has some control over food or stores can become the warders' friend. The warder wants extra food, a blanket or a pair of boots and so on. For a cost he would willingly pay 20/- or 30/-. If the prisoner is a systematic trader, he can have a monthly income probably even as much as 100/- if he is involved with meat selling".

However easy it may have been to smuggle, this facility did not exist everywhere and for every person in the prison. Office and store jobs and the kitchen were regarded as valuable areas in which to work because of the opportunities of trafficking.

While the convicts saw employment in offices and stores as opportunities for personal benefit, the warders were also aware that their own positions in charge of such offices and stores were made more difficult by convict employment there. Accordingly they assured the stability of their own jobs by frequently removing their convict assistants because of suspicion or as a result of deliberate testing of their honesty. A convict (99) described such a situation and said "I have been honest from the first time he tried me. You know by leaving some things unlocked. I am not a fool and if he leaves a shilling on the table, it is no use pretending that he had forgotten it. The storesman warder also tests me by having me searched by other warders as I return to my ward".

Illicit enterprise was divided between illegalities which involved the passage into and out of the prison and that which was carried out entirely within the walls. The outside trafficking required the greater skill since it involved not only the negotiation of a deal between people who had no official and legal reason to speak to each other and which was usually carried out through a third party as well as the passage in and out of the prison of the wanted goods through the only gate. While money may have been used for such
trading, the majority of these trade-goods came from the dry stores which entered, and were then used in the prison. The main difference between outside and inside trafficking was that the former may have been a relationship between two people which would probably only exist for the duration of this transaction and that the time span of the transaction would be much shorter than for inside trafficking.

A prison officer (87) said "something inside is used; a prisoner will lift it and out it goes; we know this happens from store shortages; things disappear which prisoners couldn't possibly use or want inside." While convict descriptions of their smuggling successes may appear to have been exaggerated since there could be no objective proof of a smuggling operation unless one was a convict participant or the operation had been detected, it should be realised that such events occurred over a long period of time and involved only a few convicts out of thousands who remembered them without the time spacing which would have occurred if a daily record could have been kept; the events were bunched in the informants' memories.

Outside trafficking was in theory the most attractive type of smuggling because there were no limits to what the prisoner could get provided he had the right goods for exchange. It was of course restricted to those who were allowed to work outside, firstly a small number who had specialised jobs who worked in relative isolation as laundrymen and those who looked after pigs and sheep in specialist jobs to which they were permanently allocated. Secondly workers such as those in the fields and latrine cleaners in the warders lines who worked in gangs which had no permanent composition and who may not have been able to insure that they were at particular places on particular dates. There was also the further restriction that the prison authorities did not put on these gangs prisoners about whom they had doubts over discipline or escaping.

A convict (83) said "anyone on the outside jobs such as the laundryman or those who looked after the pigs and sheep can get what they want. Marihuana, beer to drink, tobacco and probably women as well. It is just a matter of agreement; they are both humans and the convict uniform doesn't matter and the local tribesmen are hard-up - it is not too difficult. The trouble starts going back through the
prison gate. This was qualified by another (89) who said "making good from being on an outside gang depends entirely on whether he has any local contacts - friends or relatives. A stranger cannot gain much there. A civilian in the farm area where there is no cover would be noticed by many. The lavatory gang are the main carriers in and out of the prison; it stays in the lines from early morning until after mid-day. When they are in the lines; they disperse and no one looks after them; they can buy anything".

There may have been seasonal changes in the amount of personal contact between traders. In the wet season with longer grass, it was much easier to slip away from work and back again without being noticed either by the warder in charge or the gang or in the case of the farm from the warders on the watch towers on the prison wall. While in the dry season it would have been more likely for goods to be left and picked up at a later time, and this was an easy process as there were no walls or fences to prevent goods being left at night on the farm or in the warders' lines. Some outside workers were not supervised at all such as the laundromen and animal feeders and fishermen because there was insufficient staff for such work and such convicts were thought to be trustworthy and to have too much to lose from engaging in trafficking.

Passing smuggled goods into and out of the prison was not difficult provided that the convict concerned passed through at the beginning or the end of the working day when the warder corporal on duty could only search a small number because the working system of the prison could not be disrupted. He probably concentrated on those who had been to town rather than those who had worked locally. In any case the convicts had to depend more on their own ingenuity than on any element of luck if they were to be consistently successful. Blankets have gone out of the prison in the bottom of a bucket filled with milky disinfectant. A convict (73) said "when I came in I put 40/- on my leg under plaster and then wrapped a bandage round it; they only took off the bandage. Between the layers on the bottom of sandals and in the slits through which the waist tapes for our shorts are passed. Laundry coming in and out was used, as was rubbish going out to feed the animals or to be burnt as well as produce
The experienced smuggler varied his methods as often as he could and never left his smuggled goods in any one place in the prison for very long. There was also a real restriction on the quantity which could be smuggled even if greater quantities were available. The convict (91) in such a situation made a virtue of necessity and said "I could have stolen much more but after I had taken a reasonable number of cigarettes for myself, I left the rest. It would have been depriving my fellow convicts of their fair share rather than depriving the prison department."

Within the prison illicit enterprise was centred on the stores, workshops and kitchen, and its extent was not so much related to the amount and efficiency of the prison staff's supervision but to the amount and variety of goods which had a trafficking value. A convict (101) said "the amount of trading that can go on depends upon the extent of the workshops; if only there was a tailoring shop, we would be able to get much more ". Probably there were both exchanges of goods and services which took place in a very short space of time as in a shop and those which resembled hire-purchase in which one party made a down payment in order to reserve another's services or goods. In the stores it was the latter which probably dominated as the quantity of goods available and access to them was restricted. A convict store clerk's list (Table 32) of the exchanges which occurred during a four month period and the length of time which it took for each transaction to be completed showed this very clearly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individueals</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Gave</th>
<th>Time Span</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pair of sandals</td>
<td>Shirt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Set of draughts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 cigarettes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Somali evening meal</td>
<td>Tooth brush</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hens' and milk</td>
<td>Exchange of boots</td>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Warder one shilling</td>
<td>Warder 55 cents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Warder 55 cents</td>
<td>Typed letter</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indian evening meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arab evening meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td>Wrote petition</td>
<td>2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Two shillings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>One shilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Warder three shillings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Two shillings and fifty cents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Packet of cigarettes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tin of baked beans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 days Somali food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Indian mid-day meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4 cigarettes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Drink and packet of cigarettes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Arab evening food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>50 cents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Bottle of distilled spirit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Two books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pair of boots</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Shoe laces</td>
<td>At once</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Drafted appeal</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pair trousers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 pairs boots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This list of transactions showed the position of the store clerk as a functionary who was thought to be of pivotal importance, not only as a highly literate man who could write petitions and appeals for others which he could not have done so well in the cells, but as a dispenser of scarce goods not only to prisoners but to the warders as well. At the end of the period well over half the transactions had not been completed although the stores clerk had received advance payments. This convict (31) in explanation said "I gave a shirt to No.2 in the list as he is a powerful man, he has got confidences with every warder and convict. If I had not given it to him, he would have a bad opinion of me. I got no better relations with him, nothing has changed but I have prevented it getting worse. I have been given more than I have given out. A long time ago I got meat and 4 pints of milk from No.6; just now he has asked me to change the boots with which he was issued as they were too large. It was a big help; they were only giving out boots which were of no use to anyone - size 12, and I changed them the next day for size 7. When ordered to wear shoes, you are given shoes but the sizes don't matter. To give out a pair of the right size is a privilege which you get from me. This repayment has to be earned; he invented. No.3 gave me draughts; it is the best gift he could give me; he made them in the workshop but he hasn't asked for a return. I drafted the appeal for No.22 and I was given the drink and cigarettes later. I give them when they ask; if you don't give there must be a reason. What I give out to my friends does not come from the main store for which there is a stock check and audit. Once they have been issued to the daily issue store, they are not subject to the same checks and they are not signed for there. Yesterday for instance the inventory clerk came with dozens of pairs
of used boots taken from prisoners on their release. We only
accepted into the store six pairs for exchange as they were worn out,
the remainder stayed in the other store and I can do what I like with
them. There is no restriction on what I do there, just the restric-
tion of choosing those whom I want to help".

Thus it could be seen that this store clerk had a permanent
floating surplus of goods which he was able to manipulate to his own
advantage. This advantage was a personal one and there was no evi-
dence that he had a network through which he was accumulating profits
which was probably because the amount of goods was limited and irregu-
larly available, and in any case as a store clerk he had a privileged
position providing both privacy and power which he did not want to
lose. The authorities who assumed that smuggling and trafficking al-
ways went on, did not want to move him away from the stores as not
only was he polite and unassuming but he was skilled in repairing
typewriters.

In theory it should have been possible for long-term convicts
with successful trading connections to build up a circle of personal
influence from which his prison life would have been made easier.
This convict (90) replied to the suggestion that because of his store
connections, he appeared to be a wealthy man by prison standards "the
others say so because I smoke over the whole months. I wash my own
clothes and blankets. I would like to give them to somebody to wash
for a cigarette, but it gives a very bad impression to the other con-
viets. They all watch that. The man who washes another's clothes; they
think of him as a homosexual. So I don't want my name spoiled in the
eyes of other prisoners".

There were several other factors which prevented the system of
particular individuals being able to run successful trading networks.
Tobacco was their principal need but it was available from canteen
stores every month and there was no real difficulty in smuggling it in
since raw tobacco was both extremely plentiful and cheap on the out-
side. A further restriction on the build up of a group of traders was
the bareness of the prison. The convicts' dress was simple, the cell
fittings were simple and in comparison to an American or European
prison with its multiplicity of fittings and clothing, there were
obvious restrictions on the quantity of illegal goods which could be hidden in any one place. Therefore the build-up of a stock of contraband would have required a more numerous network of agents than in a western prison and proportionately greater problems of control. In commercial terms then tobacco was not really a reasonably commercial proposition because stock would have had to be distributed so widely in such small quantities.

While there were ways of smuggling profits out of the prison immediately prior to release through the help of warders, prisoners being discharged and remand prisoners attending court, it seemed unlikely that the operator would have been able to enforce debt collection if the rate of profit was unusually high either inside the prison or outside after release or through relatives and friends. There were the additional factors that any such network could not have operated with the assistance of anyone outside such as the families and friends of the convicts still inside. A British 'tobacco baron' operated within a relatively stable and uniform social system outside the prison; convicts had addresses, they spoke the same language and had personalised relationships with certain individuals outside. In addition this convict community functioned without violence except for homosexual rivalry, and there was a social climate which would not tolerate such bullying for commercial ends. No one referred to the existence of strong-arm men who dominated their cell groups for economic or social advantages. In this prison trading would have had to be completed totally within the prison and debts could not be collected later owing to distances between the homes of the participants and tribal differences which in the outside world would have effectively prevented a visitor from another tribe being able to collect such a debt on a short visit. Trading was certainly carried on for repayment at the end of the month but not so much that it became a source of obvious complaint by the convicts and anxiety to the prison administration.

More important than these were the attitudes of the prisoners themselves towards trading that it created a bad impression on others. The professional trader, outside the marihuana specialist, was not a popular man because there was at least the implication that he was de-
priving others of scarce prison goods and there were openly ex-
pressed hostile views about the extent of corruption in the prison
(97). There seems to have been a distinction in the minds of con-
victs between trading which involved the accumulation of goods
whether it included corruption of the staff or not, resulting in
such convicts getting clear advantages over their fellows, and the
manipulation of goods which made convict life more pleasant and which
didn't make the convicts concerned too conspicuous and this was not
the subject of adverse comment.

The long-term convict built up a network of relationships rather
than friendships which became active when there were advantages to
both sides. Almost all illegal activity could not be carried out
alone and the successful manipulator would have to be able to bring
these relationships into action at short notice when it was advan-
tageous. A convict (95) described this and said "the convict who
writes up our numbers sells marihuana. One of the escapes had two
pounds of sugar which he wanted to exchange for marihuana so that he
handed it over to him. A warder on duty saw the sugar and asked what
he was doing with sugar at work. He replied that he had exchanged it
for tobacco that morning as the other man and he could only meet then.
The warder let him take it to his cell which was in the next yard to
the kitchen.

Rashidi another convict was white-washing that block and on
entering the cell saw the sugar. Now it so happened that Rashidi was
my friend and when he asked me I said I could hide the sugar if he
stole it. After a while he came back and told me that he would pass
it into the block through the lavatory window. I was in the rope
making workshop and wrapping the sugar in an old piece of towel and
hid it in a pile of rope fibre.

Before work stopped the convict clerk found his sugar gone and
when the painter denied having taken it, I knew we were going to be
searched so I asked a cook to hide it and he took it away in the
pocket of his duty apron."

The convict Rashidi when he saw the sugar at once realised that
it was illegal or it would have been locked away in a canteen box
and since it was illegal had greater possibilities for him than legal
goods as the owner could not complain too loudly over the loss without its origin being investigated. So he opened up a relationship which had lain dormant by getting the other man to hide it for which he would later have been able to claim a share. When the convict in the workshop saw that he would be searched when he left the yard, he was able to find a cook who would help him at short notice. This would have been more costly as the cook himself had access to much potential contraband by ration stealing and in this instance would have probably taken half of the sugar for his share.

The experienced convict would seek in any break from routine in which he was alone rather than one of a group, an opportunity which he could develop to his own advantage. A convict (96) described a sudden opening into which he was able to move and said "on Thursday there was a ration of meat but I was late getting back to the yard only to find that the remaining two men's bowls of porridge were without meat. The warder sent me across to the kitchen to tell the corporal in charge that these rations were short and I was sent in to get the meat from the cooks. As I passed through the kitchen I picked up an extra bowl and put it under the other two. While the warder was away for a moment I passed the extra ration under the iron bar gate to a friend. When the warder returned I gave him the two rations which I had been sent to fetch only to find that my own ration had been stolen. The warder told me to go back and fetch another ration, but I argued that no one would believe me if I went back there again and that he had better fetch it himself. I expostulated with him until he got quite upset asking why I was making such a nuisance of myself when he had helped me personally a day or two previously. In the end he agreed to get me food as soon as the count was completed. This satisfied me for the moment so I went round the back and ate the extra ration which I had stolen. Later that evening the warder appeared at the gate with a cook carrying a really full ration of porridge, meat and beans so that I was in great difficulties to get it all down".

In this affair the convict was able to steal an extra ration and then to manipulate the warder into getting him a further ration by insinuating that his original ration had been lost due to the warder's
own negligence in failing to control the issues.

In western and American prisons it has been suggested that convicts engaged in illegal activities paid particular attention to the regularities of prison life which they needed for their planning. This never came up in discussions in this prison for several reasons. This was an African prison in which not only the convicts but the majority of warders did not in the prison or in their lives outside centre themselves on clock time. Admittedly the prison had a system of administrative time which was enforced as far as possible but the convicts did not pay particular attention to this for use in illegal activities involving people and situational opportunities. If prisoners were not culturally educated to think in terms of formal time, it would have been difficult for them to see its planning advantage, apart from the difficulties of getting others to accept it usefully.

Trafficking within the prison required not only the opportunity to steal something but also to move it to another part of the prison. This ability to move about the prison was an important and valued asset. While most convicts could engineer particular movements about the prison, it was the special stage long-term convicts who had the greatest freedom of movement and opportunities for trafficking. A convict (71) said "the special stage are really the traders - they have everything because they have freedom of movement and are locked up at 9 p.m. in the evening. At the end of the month when canteen issues are made, you will see these men with lots of property, sugar and cigarettes as they collect their debts. They cannot be interfered with, only informed against through spite".

Although the experienced convict who had been in this prison for sometime found no difficulty in communicating with yards other than his own and receiving and passing goods, the average convict found this difficult and welcomed any opportunity which allowed him to talk and trade with convicts in other yards. The best opportunity to do this was usually the Sunday services for Christians in which prisoners of each denomination were collected from their different yards to attend the service of their choice. This mingling had previously been tolerated as giving the convict something to look forward to which did not have any serious disciplinary problems for
those attending. A convict (100) described this situation and their feelings about changing the rule and said "a new rule came concerning Sunday services. If we wanted to go to a service, we had to go with an escort. I don't know why they should suddenly order this as I did not think they had a surplus of warders without any other work to do. It was necessary for you to actually attend the service and pray. If you didn't enter the church room, possibly to have a chat outside or to buy or exchange tobacco, the warder returned you to your yard. It was bad luck that I should have been one of the first to be caught outside and sent back - we were smoking outside".

V. Trafficking in mariguana and tobacco

While the discussion of drugs at any time was heavily loaded with the cultural considerations of the persons concerned, it was certain that these African convicts in discussions on their use of mariguana, did not recognise it as specifically addicting and referred to it as "strong tobacco" and the most extreme physiological results no more than drunkeness or generalised feelings of pleasure.

Except for some of the passive partners in homosexual relationships, those who smoke mariguana inside were those who had already done it on the outside and there was no extension of such habituation to another criminal group inside the prison. Some informants stated that as many as four-fifths of the convicts smoked mariguana as and when the opportunity arose which may have been no more than the comparable numbers in the non-criminal population (24). References to tobacco certainly suggested habituation if not addiction but these were references to cigarettes rather than to tobacco in general, so that there may have been social factors in which the relative rarity and cost of cigarettes gave heightened pleasure to their smokers. This was shown in comments that cigarettes would be smoked by a group of convicts together which would be a more appropriate reference to mariguana smoking.

Just as soap and food were universal currencies within the prison, cigarettes were similarly useable but at a higher value rating. A convict (102) said "on our monthly pay day we get our stock of cigarettes. You can see crowds of people walking about making their
exchange plans for cigarettes into meat or cooked food", and another (103) simply commented "cigarettes are a very valuable currency".

They commanded high prices in exchange for food. A packet of King Stork, a medium quality cigarette, would be exchanged for three months meat ration on the days when meat was given. In contrast to this the cash price of such cigarettes in the prison would approximate to the outside commercial price outside, not because money was easier to obtain but because its scarcity gave it the equivalent value to three months meat ration (42) according to inside prison prices.

It seemed that the ready availability of non-cigarette tobacco allowed no more than the simplest form of trading in tobacco with a quantity being borrowed in the middle of the month and repaid double from canteen issues at the end of that same month.

There did not appear to exist in the prison any system of tobacco trading which allowed social and economic power to be concentrated in the hands of a few enterprising and forceful convicts. There were no specific tobacco 'barons' in this prison because of several inter-related factors; firstly this was a tobacco producing country in which every peasant could cultivate tobacco if he wanted and have tufts of crudely cured tobacco in his home which meant that it did not have to pass through established and licensed retail channels. Secondly the quality of the home-grown tobacco was poor and the price very low and since it was marketed in small weights it was easily obtainable and could be used as dust for snuff, or for use as cigarettes in newspaper. Thirdly this poor quality tobacco could be obtained legally in the prison through the convicts monthly canteen purchases and since it was cheap allowed much large quantities to come in than would have been the case if only cigarettes were purchasable. The fact that cigarettes were now legally available in the prison had appeared to have deflated the value of the home-grown tobacco and reduced the possibility of any group of people trying to corner the market by battening on a high proportion of the prison population being addicted to tobacco. A convict (14) said "no one is able to sell his home-grown tobacco to another because everyone
has some and there is plenty about. When it gets into short supply at the end of the month, some buy tobacco with their meat ration. The rate would be two cigarettes for a meat ration. No one runs a special trade in tobacco.

Perhaps the only direct trading in the prison involving profit concerned marihuana which was not in sufficient supply for the needs of the prison and the transactions involved an element of danger as a convict (71) said "marihuana in the prison is like diamonds; everyone wants it". The possession of illegally obtained tobacco and meat could often be ingeniously explained away but unless the Chief Warder suspected a plant, the finding of marihuana led to a charge and loss of remission at the very least.

It was difficult to describe the function of marihuana in this prison community because it was heavily coloured with the stereotype of the marihuana smoker being a dangerous or certainly potentially dangerous person. This stereotype was held by the prison authorities and by the courts which usually imprisoned persons found in possession of this narcotic. The staff were extremely concerned over the presence of marihuana in the prison and stated that if they found anyone in possession of it, he would be charged in the courts rather than have it dealt with as a prison offence. This again could be qualified by the details of prison offences listed to the extent that a large amount found would be made into a court case but a single packet or cigarette might not.

A decision not to prosecute in the courts would be in the interests of the staff as a court case from the prison would have involved much extra work and dislocation by having to arrange transport and provide witnesses. But more than this the detection of marihuana smoking was difficult unless a smoker was detected by its distinctive smell while being smoked or when the dried plant was found unmixed with tobacco. A convict (32) who had been found with a marihuana and tobacco cigarette during working hours, said "the warder who caught me did not know that there was marihuana in the cigarette and in fact he gave it to me back as I said that I was carrying it for a lunch-time smoke". Although the details of sentences given for possessing marihuana (Table 37) showed that it was usually loss of
remission, the convicts thought that the penalties were higher. A convict (23) said "marihuana trafficking was very dangerous indeed as if you are caught you may be sent to court and have your sentence increased".

A convict (104) described another penalty given by the authorities and said "during an evening search some marihuana was found in the clothes of two laundrymen and they were taken to the small cells for the night. Next morning in front of the prison officer, they said that it had been planted on them. This officer believed them so that they did not get any loss of remission but all the men in that dormitory cell were kept locked up during recreation time for a whole week; they were lucky".

It was not possible to estimate the number of marihuana smokers in the prison. A convict (71) said "about twenty have marihuana in this prison at any one time. There are four who get together to smoke, and I know that this is the escapee block and that two of them live in other blocks. Whichever gets none, will not use it until the others have got together. It is easy enough to get in with excuses about cleaning or collecting something and they stay together until they are found and told to get out".

It has been suggested that marihuana may not in fact be as habit forming as alcohol and that this plant species may have wide variations in its drug content according to the ecological conditions under which it was grown (24). Discussions with prisoners smoking marihuana and a detailed analysis of incidents of violence did not seem to show any direct connection with smoking. The smoking in the prison seemed to be a solitary pursuit of the long-term prisoner and usually to have none of the group aspects noticed amongst smokers outside particularly among school boys.

Marihuana was difficult to obtain but not so difficult as to raise its price beyond the reach of those who wanted it, so that a few convicts with the necessary contacts, would profit unusually and create the system of "barons" which was a constant problem in British prisons (24). A convict (33) talked about his own trading and said "for a whole week now I have not had any marihuana. I haven't any money to buy marhuana. The convict who has a stock now does not
smoke so he won't take my cigarettes in exchange. It must be a
month now without a smoke. Of course he is not the only one in the
prison who smokes marihuana but like me they have ordered some and
not yet got it. The marihuana traders give a warder who brings in
marihuana about fifteen packets of cigarettes for between 2/- and
½/² worth".

Marihuana prices as with other commodities wanted by the pri-
soners and the warders as well, fluctuated in relation to the monthly
pay days for the warders and the giving out of canteen supplies to
the convicts. High prices always appeared immediately prior to these
days after which they dropped drastically. Although some prisoners
were able to get supplies through their friends leaving packets of
marihuana outside which were picked up while they were on outside
work-parties, the traffic principally took place through warders who
were themselves under financial pressure towards the end of the month.

It was difficult to discover the exact roles of the marihuana
smoker and retailer because it only involved a small number of people
in the prison while occupying an inversely large proportion of con-
versation. Marihuana was certainly regarded as dangerous by the
prison authorities and some incidents were found in which marihuana
smoking had precipitated violence by accident rather than through the
need to smoke or the withdrawal of the drug. A convict (25) de-
scribed such an incident and said "at night he went to the bed of the
convict in charge of the ward to steal tobacco. However it wasn't
tobacco but marihuana and he smoked it deeply, because he was not
accustomed he was affected by the smoke. He started to upset the
whole ward, knocking over the cups and throwing water about. The
others knocked on the door and called the warder who got the man put
in the punishment cells".

However with a limited and possibly addicted clientele, there
was a permanent market for marihuana and traders who specialised in
this need. A convict (27) said "the man who trades in marihuana does
make some profits. They bring it in from the outside through the
outside work gangs or through the warders and sell it". This would
seem to have been the ideal situation and to become the centre of a
trade and extortion group, necessary to the convicts but nevertheless
hated. There did not seem to have been this trading organisation which socially dominated its users and convicts denied that the trader in marijuana had any particular power or that he accumulated profits or was able to enforce his debt collection. Another convict (30) said "it was more of a trade than an exchange and they do it for people to whom they are acquainted. They can never dare to do it for somebody whom they don't know. A person with whom they have been for a long time. They must have a fair knowledge of them. The newcomer who is a marijuana smoker can get it by means of those people who have known him outside. Anybody that comes here must have somebody who knows him. A friend of his will direct him to the person who owns some marijuana in his dormitory".

Convicts tended to say that it was not the trader in marijuana or cigarettes who accumulated profits and therefore power but the gambler. Potentially this was a dangerous situation if the gambler was successful and retained power for its own sake, but it did seem that the compulsive gambler was more or less honest and that he did not combine his gambling with cheating. A convict (29) talked about a successful gambler and said "for the whole month he has had success so that he has got all the tobacco of the group who play. He won't use this tobacco for smuggling in from outside. He will go to the kitchen and for a shilling's worth of tobacco he will get a week's extra ration of meat. Other tobacco he will exchange for marijuana, or sell some for money which he will hide away". In this dialogue there did not seem to have been any ill-will towards this man who had obtained tobacco stocks for the whole month. This lack of animosity may have been due in part to the honesty of the gambling in that they knew that his wins would not continue for long and as they continued to play in the same card school, it was very likely that he would soon start losing and another would win. Secondly because he did not use his gains to trade further with his convict associates and to further impoverish them. The successful gambler in this discussion had used his gains to benefit himself alone and not to tie others to him in ways other than that of their gambling school. Certainly no complaints or rumours were ever heard of cheating at cards although there were several schools of compulsive gamblers during most of the
The trade described seemed to be carried out on a direct person to person basis for cash and the only help received from outsiders who may have suggested that he should approach another who might have a supply. Marihuana was never given on credit as were the exchanges of meat and tobacco. Any money which accumulated in the prison was thought to be usually the result of trading in marihuana. A convict (105) described such trading and said "those who trade in marihuana really cheat other convicts. They arrange the exchange of a pound of sugar for 50 cents worth of marihuana and other exchanges for cigarettes and money. Marihuana always brings big profits since the profit on an expenditure of one shilling will be seven shillings".

The availability of marihuana was not high in terms of the number of convicts who would like to smoke it but there were probably a core of prisoners who were always trading in it and a much larger number who would take up an occasional opportunity to obtain it if it presented itself. A convict (71) said "I don't smoke marihuana either outside or here, but I trade in it to get extra things from the cooks".

One source of supply were those on outside work-parties who had opportunities to talk to passers by and those who lived on the land surrounding the prison. Marihuana was grown locally as easily as tobacco and while it was prohibited by law, it was so prevalent that the police would have been very unlikely to take generalised action against its growth and would only prosecute when they came across it in the course of other investigations.

Marihuana also came in through a few warders who may have been friends of those convicts concerned, but they were unlikely to bring it in without payment. A convict (25) said "cigarettes or uncut tobacco will be brought in by a warder anytime but he will not bring in marihuana without money. You give him five shillings and tell him that you want two shillings worth in return, but it has to be towards the end of the month when most warders have no money left. You have to choose the warder to approach with some care as some who are not peaceful souls, will prosecute you at once. By and large its a tricky transaction".

Although some may have accumulated some money by trading in
marihuana, it was much more likely that it would be spent on getting extra food from the cooks. The difficulty of hiding money and the fact that he had a working relationship with a warden who would want to keep the relationship going since it broke the monotony of his work with little possibility of being found out combined with a high return of someone else's investment, made it unlikely that the convict would save his profits.

The hiding of contraband was an important factor in the organisation of illicit enterprise in that it had to be guarded both against authority and other convicts—a double degree of ingenuity. A convict (72) said "Marihuana is done up in packets valued at a shilling each and is usually hidden in the coconut fibre mattresses of convicts who have reached a privileged stage. If you go to the marihuana trader about a sale, he will take your money which he probably hides in the same place. How can you search a mattress and it may be that one or two of these men have as much as 200/- hidden somewhere about and may be it is hidden elsewhere in the water-pipes, you don't know. He asks you to leave the cell, after a while brings you what you want. Of course the workshops would be the best place of all to hide contraband since there are so many things stacked about, but there is not much point in having a stock if you cannot get at it to trade. Probably he keeps his current trading balance in the cell and his deposit banked in the workshop. The same applies to money; the main stock which is always in notes is kept in the workshops and coin for actual use stays in the cell".

From material found in searches it seemed that either very little was found successfully in searches in which the convict community was organised against the search party or this talk of contraband was a fiction of a number of convicts' imaginations. However contraband was at the centre of so much reported convict activity that it would be unreasonable to suggest that there had been so much collusion between informants to misinform the researcher to an agreed policy. It was also discovered by accident as in the case described by a convict (73) who said "this man stole what he thought was tobacco from someone in his cell. He smoked it when everyone was asleep but he then made such an uproar that the officer was called
and he was put in the punishment cells". The manipulation of contraband seemed to have been the preoccupation of a limited number of convicts with superior intelligence rather than education, and that the contraband itself was widely distributed and not kept for long in any one hiding place.

Other than money from such trading, small quantities of money were available from other sources. A convict (26) said "when my friend was transferred to another prison, he left me two shillings. I hid one shilling and used the other for marijuana. That man who was transferred used to work as an office cleaner and he got odd coins from men coming in at the start of their sentences and those going to court, who were nervous of being searched".

In the smuggling of marijuana, operators used considerable ingenuity in their methods and various types of convicts were assessable in their ability to be of use. Conspicuous convicts such as Europeans, the rebellious and highly educated were of little use but someone who excited sympathy or who was able to convey the impression of low intelligence were ideal. A dumb convict (26) was the link man between warders and convicts in one instance because not only was there a general tendency to assume that he was stupid as he was dumb but because if he was approached by the authorities he would not disclose anything, if indeed they would ever have considered him as an important operator.

VI. Food Trading

The quality and quantity of the food was a major preoccupation of the convicts and the main cause of complaint. The senior staff were alert to this major potential cause of trouble and took whatever action they could either as a result of their own observations or the complaints of the prisoners' elected kitchen committees, to maintain the quality of the food and a reasonable standard of cooking. These laudable motives were often frustrated by the fact that the cooks had usually had not previous experience of cooking since in order to keep kitchen corruption at a minimum they had to be changed from time to time, even if they were not discharged from the prison or removed for a prison offence. Much of the complaining was occasioned by the monotony of the
diet and the difficulty under any circumstances of making institutionally cooked food generally attractive to eat, which of course was not mentioned by the prisoners as a sufficient excuse.

Since the prison kitchen was the main centre of illicit activity any disturbance of the routine there was bound to have serious consequences to those who had carefully organised themselves. It was probable that any group of warders and convicts who had been long associated in the kitchen had become involved in some form of illicit activity. This may have been virtually impossible to detect without disturbing warder morale as much as the convicts and that the only way to stop such illegalities was to regularly move people in and out of the kitchen in order to stop the building up of illegal enterprises.

A convict (34) said that "the kitchen corporal resigned because he found that the new officer had appointed new people onto the food committee. He did not like it because he thought that these people were put their to check on him. They have got the same rank and they will know every trick he does. When he went the cook who had been there for three or four years resigned as well from the kitchen because he knew that this business of selling meat was finished."

Although the kitchen was the main centre for illegal activities or at least a concentration of possibilities, cooks work was not wanted. The same convict said "few want to be cooks. It is a good position to have but there is hard work in doing it. At night you have to wake up to get the first meal ready, and the whole day you are working. Wanting to be a cook or not has nothing to do with the food being adequate or not, the only thing they think about is hard work. Also there is no need to become a cook to get extra food as every afternoon volunteers wash the kitchen utensils and are given an extra ration in the evening in payment. The hard working helpers get the jobs as cooks". The tension over food was also increased as the cooks were unpopular. A convict (106) said "when all the cooks had been removed in one sweep, there was no reaction from the other prisoners as they have no sympathy with the cooks. They think they deserve to be changed. Very few want to be cooks anyway; there are advantages but it is hard work and you have to wake up early. All day you work. Yet they don't like the persons who go to be cooks."
...However if there were 60 instead of 25 cooks in the kitchen many
would like to go there".

Some (92) noted the amount of food which was wasted and said
"the mid-day meal is quite popular but the evening food is not half
so good, so that some people don't even turn up to eat it. Some of
this food is thrown away and a lot goes every morning to feed the
prison pigs. Also some of the waste goes into the warders's lines to
feed their chickens and dogs if any warder tells the cook that he
wants such waste." This was felt to be a reasonable use for the
waste.

A much more important complaint concerned warders eating such
rations in the prison or prisoners making special trading arrange-
ments concerning the most wanted food. A convict (93) said "many
warders eat what they can get inside the prison, particularly on the
days of the meat ration. It is not so much that this food is free
but it is ready cooked and warders who have no wives don't want to
take the trouble to cook for themselves when they go off duty. So
the bachelor warder has a chat with the cook and makes him a visit
after he has been given his pay. Perhaps last month there might have
been five warders eating there, this month possibly ten and next
month there might be two. I don't think that this had any effect on
the quantity of food issued but might possibly cause some shortage of
cooking oil. With meat and flour it makes no difference". Although
no convict mentioned this official corruption as justification for
their own activities it set the tone for them and made it much easier
for them to trade.

Most food trading was related to the meat ration. Many Africans
possibly because of a shortage of protein had a need, almost a passion
for meat, which could not be satisfied by the amount available on the
ration. Africans of many tribes over a number of years have been seen
to eat abnormally large quantities of meat by western standards at a
single sitting. While there may also have been social, economic and
religious factors involved in this love of meat, it was important to
recognise that greed was not a normal factor. It was certainly felt
that meat was more important than tobacco and many would sell their
tobacco canteen allowance in advance for an additional and regular
supply of meat on a month to month basis. While some prisoners may have given up their normal meat ration to obtain tobacco, this trade was mainly connected with those who received special diets and those who worked in the kitchen. A convict (107) said "some convicts particularly Indians never buy tobacco and put all their earnings on deposit for use on their release. Those, particularly those on special Indian or Arab diets exchange half their meat ration for tobacco and receive a full allowance of tobacco after two months."

Participants in such arrangements did not consider that the relationship involved any element of trust, regarding it as a straightforward commercial transaction. Each assessed the trustworthiness of the other before the matter was initiated and the supplier of food if he was a cook, was regarded as more trustworthy than most as he stood to lose his job if the arrangement got discovered. A convict (108) said "you will see that every cook in the kitchen has two or three persons to whom he takes each evening beans cooked in oil for which he receives payment in cigarettes, marihuana etc. Many things go on in the kitchen and it will never stop. If you have 50 cents to pay to a cook you can get half a pound of cooking oil and for a shilling much more and it is from the prisoners' rations."

VII. Stability and conflict in the convict social system

Each cell appeared to have an informal structure in which power was conceded to certain individuals to operate over the cell group. It seemed that each dormitory cell had a judge appointed who made penal decisions and a chairman who modified these decisions on appeal. A convict (14) described this difference and said "If the judge wants a case to be decided in a particular way, the chairman can say that this is not the proper way of settling it and refuse to allow the decision. The judge will put the case aside for two days and then discuss the matter again by the authority of the chairman who is then really making the decisions. It will then go on until the chairman sees on which side there is right. The judge has no power by himself". It was significant that the words used for settling a case in this interview was 'Kusumguna' meaning to talk informally and not verbs relating to judicial procedure from the courts outside.
The selection of the judge appeared to be based on certain characteristics; a convict (16) said "the judge should not be rather larger than average in body but he should be an older man with brains. Someone who has been in that cell for a long time. It is also essential that he should know Swahili because he is able to use that language on behalf of the cell group in conversations with the officers and warders. It is not necessary to give him any authority as such because he has been chosen just because he gets on well with everyone. Men are twisted by his words alone".

Convicts alleged that it would not have been possible for the judge to be discarded by a coup d'etat in the cell group because he was not physically strong enough to enforce his own rule. A convict (16) said that "if a large convict gets rid of the judge by force, over whom would he then rule. Everyone else in the cell would give him trouble and refuse to obey".

Thus authority rested on consensus not only in the appointment of someone to adjudicate but in the enforcement as well. A convict (1) said "each yard and cell has its own elders who settle cases which we do not want to go forward such as the thefts of illegally held property by one convict from another. A man who stole a packet of cigarettes, would be made to pay back ½ packets at the end of the month or even two packets when he got his canteen articles. If he refuses, the elders would seize the fine when that person came to put his property back in the cell box in the evening".

The prisoners in any particular yard or communal cell exercised a strong control over their fellows whom they felt had acted against the common good. Since so much of the prisoners' time was spent away from the supervision of the disciplinary staff, a penalised prisoner could not appeal to them for help and must obey or arrange to move his cell, which might not result in any improvement in his social situation. A convict (17) described these offences and penalties and said "you might be told to walk round the cell twenty times on your knees or perhaps with your hands above you head in addition. You might be forbidden to use the lavatory at night for a month, even to be given remission like the prison rules for good behaviour after sentence. These punishments are given if a prisoner dirties the
communal lavatory, spitting on the ground where people sleep, using your own drinking cup to take water from the cell bucket instead of using the special cup provided, not doing his share of cell duties, pulling the plug of the lavatory at night when people are asleep and urinating in the washroom. There are also penalties for giving trouble to the staff which might penalise the cell or yard or occupants like feeding with a particular warder and not folding your kit correctly".

A convict (14) described a case and said "a convict spat on the floor of the cell and the judge gave his punishment as cleaning the cell lavatory for two weeks as well as the wash-away drain of the main lavatory, as well as having to walk on his knees for two days whenever he wanted to be in the sleeping cell. I said that this was too harsh and that one punishment was enough and the case went on appeal and the penalty was reduced". It seemed that by this system of appeal, the judge was able to demonstrate how far it was possible to go in punishing any wrong-doer and that together with the chairman they gained together increased popularity by allowing the sentence to be both more powerful and more popular.

Another case was described by the same convict who said "a convict was found to have stolen another man's tobacco during the night which we found the next morning by searching the cell. We then said that the case would be done in the evening and not taken to the prison authorities. When we discussed it later some were all for taking the matter to the prison authorities, but I said this would not be useful. So he was put on probation in the cell for two weeks by bringing water for the cell whenever it was needed and that if he did it again he would be sent in front of the officer in charge". This seemed to show that a dormitory cell which had succeeded in organising itself because its members had been together for some time preferred to keep its power intact by not using the superstructure of formal authority to keep their own internal discipline.

Thus prisoners settled much of their own quarrels themselves without having felt the need to bring authority into these affairs. Possibly they had in mind that it was better to deal with such matters domestically and that to bring the warders in was to complicate
issues which in the long run were both trivial and inevitable. A convict (22) noted a disturbance and commented that "it is only possible to keep discipline internalised if the matter does not involve the authorities either directly or indirectly". A convict (15) describing an incident said "a convict stole a pound of sugar from his fellow convict in the Stage IV compound and took it to a friend in the Stage II compound for him to trade with to their mutual benefit. He was followed by the warder to the Stage II block and challenged when the second man denied receiving the stolen sugar. When the warder on duty at the gate was appealed to he said that the thief had not gone through the gate". The man who had lost the sugar saw that he could not do anything about the case as the warder would not support it and he could not control what happened in another block, so he was left without being able to do anything more than threaten.

The utility of this informal organisation was shown in another case (83) when "a convict was always making noise when the rest of the cell wanted to listen to the radio. We decided that a light sentence would not stop this interference with us all. He was told that he could not drink water inside the cell night or day for a week and that he must not urinate in the cell at night and also for the same period he must sleep on the stone floor without a sleeping mat". In a case which involved a number of cell members directly the sentence was considerably harsher than the case of spitting on the floor which did not directly inconvenience all cell members.

While there may have been some political reasoning to discourage fighting in the prison, it seemed that it had always been discouraged particularly now that there had been a relaxation of prison discipline. Apart from fights based on homosexual tensions, there were those which occurred because a prisoner's property was misappropriated but every effort was made to separate them. A convict (1) said "people do not fight often or for long in prison. Someone always tries to separate fights; you can never know in advance who is going to be injured or how seriously and there would be serious repercussions. People don't like this sort of disturbance; only the stupid fight". Another (84) said "if you don't stop it, it might extend and involve everyone in the cell". It seemed that quarrels in the prison
were almost always confined to two or three prisoners at a time and at group conflict was rare. A long-term convict (56) said "I can only remember one such disturbance when food committee members were to be chosen to represent prisoners in the kitchen. A group wanted a certain Kikuyu to be taken out of the kitchen and another group wanted him to remain. It went on like that until these two convicts started fighting. Egged on by the others they just would not stop fighting until they actually arrived at the punishment cells. One argument, it was a big one".

Even when the authorities were forced to intervene in a fight between two convicts, the convicts had no sympathy for the man who started the fight even though he was the aggrieved party. A convict (95) said "two young men started to fight because one had taken the evening food of the other. He went full tilt at the other feet and fists, even an eye was injured. They were separated by a warden and the man whose food had been stolen was put in the punishment cells; quite right too as he was in the wrong for starting the fight rather than telling the warden who was nearby that his food had been stolen!"

While some convicts (1) denied that anyone would plan revenge, and said "no one makes trouble for someone consistently. No one would try and use witchcraft against another. Everyone is in a shared hardship and after work who would want to work up this amount of venom". Others thought otherwise. A convict who felt that he was being antagonised by another convict may have planned his revenge with considerable skill to get his own back for his own satisfaction rather than to penalise his opponent beyond the bounds of reasonable retaliation. A convict (75) explained such a case and said "I work at rope making and usually manage to weave 450 feet in a day which when I have completed I take to the Corporal in charge for checking and marking me up for my daily payment. However since the sugar incident this convict clerk has refused to put the completed mark against my name without the whole length of rope being measured. Fair enough on the first day, it was measured and found correct even though the Corporal told him he was wasting his time as I had worked there for over ten months completing my task correctly every day. Nevertheless he did the same measuring yesterday and the day before. So today I knew I was going to
be called to this office so I got ready 300 feet only and took it to the Corporal when my name was shouted, who took it without asking me its length and threw it onto the pile of completed rope. The convict clerk wanted to measure my rope but I was safe as it had been mixed up with everyone else's completed tasks, so I got angry and seized his shirt since he wanted to make an issue of the confiscated sugar. I did not want to go further than this just to give him a fright particularly as all the time I had been in the yard I had never got into a fight before".

"I shouted that he was just provoking me to hit him so that I would get 7 days punishment calls in return for being caught with his sugar. If that is not true why don't you write down my work when the Corporal has passed it - don't you want to obey his orders. So I pushed him over as the Corporal came to see what was going on. When I explained to the Corporal he told the convict clerk not to get ideas above his station and to write down the numbers of any convict whose task had been passed by him". In this case the aggrieved convict carefully planned the whole incident so that authority would support him while at the same time only make his enemy publicly lose face.

In the analysis of stability and conflict in the prisoners' social system there was a clear difference between issues concerning the individual and those concerning the group. The individual quite correctly saw himself as isolated, and he could only gain advantages through an exchange of goods and services. He neither expected nor found altruism in the prison anymore than he would on the outside, although he recognised it as a desirable expectation.

But although the individual saw himself in a society in which everyone was out for himself, the convicts in the groupings which they arranged for themselves or had forced on them by the prison authorities, acted both implicitly and explicitly together, when they felt that their joint interests were concerned.

This was not to say that theft from convicts by convicts would have always been penalised, although they would have said that this was a bad act. The process of reaction involved two stages of corporate decision before the process of justice was completed. In the first place the aggrieved man would have had to canvas support for his case and to get this he would have had to be someone generally
agreeable to the group concerned as a whole, or to canvass the
dominant sub-group in the dormitory cell and get their support.

There was no doubt that this was a fundamental change from the
recent past before the prison administration abolished convict
leaders, introduced pay for work and relaxed disciplinary rules. A
convict (1) said "In the prison now there are no prisoners who en-
force their rule on others by force. In the old days this was common
when work in prison was much harder, tobacco was totally forbidden
and warders encouraged prisoners to dominate others and save them
work".

While there may have been no crude physical dominance at the
centre of such groups, however they were formed or acted in particu-
lar circumstances, there must have been a dominant personality. This
was clearly recognised, not only by the convicts but by the authori-
ties. A prison officer (78) said "there is always someone in every
cell who has the stronger personality and he is nearly always a long-
term convict. The short-term men avoids commitments. It is an older
type, not the hot-headed young man; the larger type who can physically
enforce".

So the initiation of communal action would be the canvassing of
support, the collection of disapproval and the assumption of guilt.
In this respect it would have been easier for the group to support
action about some acts which involved them all, than for an individual
grievance; the clear distinction between public and private delicts.
This may not have been so much because it was one individual making
the complaint however wrong it may have been in terms of general
morality - that it's for instance wrong to steal from one's fellows
with which they would all have agreed without hesitation, but because
it involved two persons. Two persons in a dormitory cell were ten
per cent more or less of the average population there; a sizeable
proportion to be aggrieved with each other and with the internal ad-
ministration of their communal cell life. Thus it was that few such
cases were accepted for adjudication since the results would have been
more disruptive than the acts complained about. They were better left
to the convicts themselves to protect their own interest by mercenary
alliances.
VIII. Convicts self-reaction

Inmates' perception of their own interest seemed to split between abstract conceptions of what it was in their best interest to do and restrictions on the attainment of those objectives by the lack of any incentive or opportunity which they could recognise as valid. The prisoners wanted to learn while they were in prison and in this they did no more than reflect the national ideology of education as the basis for all personal and national progress.

The desire for literacy was widespread and the prison authorities did what they could to encourage this by providing slates for classes and allowing certain prisoners who had some educational qualifications to take literacy classes and receive the skilled rate of daily pay for having done so. However the teaching of literacy to adults required at least some specialist training so the classes were often daily presented. This combined with the fact that classes took place in the afternoon after the day's work had been completed rather than later in the day when it would have been cooler, which was not possible because of the evening meal and lock-up, discouraged all but the most persistent from becoming literate. However this desire for literacy was often very shallow. A convict (60) said "their greatest need was to learn to read and write. Here they are taught free and they don't want to learn unless they are paid for coming to classes. Only a few persist in learning and they are old people who see that their way of life is changing".

This desire for education was perhaps strongest in those who were already partially educated and who tentatively explored any possibilities for improving themselves. My employment by Makerere University College, meant that I received many appeals for educational help (51) in letters such as, "I need to learn at your College as I know myself if I get out from prison I will have nothing to do" and "please, sir, I wish only to be one of your college for I have nothing to do in future time".

Most convicts considered that the prison should have provided a wide variety of training beyond mere literacy though such comments were never related to their cost. A convict (52) said "there should be all types of trades and occupations from field boy to a clerical,
printing, mechanical, electrical jobs, and in fact all sorts of
works should be taught to prisoners according to their aptitudes
in addition to the present opportunities of tailoring, carpenters,
masons etc".

While there was considerable interest in the possibility of
materially improving their lives through prison training, little was
said to imply that the convicts were able to improve themselves
psychologically at least to the extent of understanding themselves.
The major part of their public lives was spent in protesting if not
cultivating the illusion that their presence in prison was accidental.
While few kept up this pretence in private, they were unprepared to
relax this attitude in front of their fellow prisoners especially
stressing the difference between themselves as people and government
as an institution which tended to oppress them, if not so much delib-
erately, then by accident. Their lives in prison allowed them
to maintain this dichotomy and it seemed a fundamental block to their
rehabilitation. A convict could recognise his own guilt in private
but the whole convict social system prevented him from giving this
change of attitude any public expression; he received no implied
support and would thus have been forced to act as a deviant with his
peers.

Admittedly some were quite cheerfully open about their criminal
activities but usually in the context of a past from which they had
either grown away or outlived; they were no longer in the physical
environment which made it possible for them to return to such activi-
ties and as such they could afford to reminisce. Others accepted
their own guilt in all its implications and some that their sentences
were punishment for a far wider range of crime than the particular
crime for which they had been sentenced.

In an attempt to break this dichotomy of differentiating the
actions of the government from the lives of their peers, an experi-
ment in group therapy was attempted with twentyfive volunteers. The
members had to discuss their sentences in front of the group either
admitting the correctness of their convictions or to defend them-
selves in cross-examination from their companions. The majority
admitted their guilt in front of their peers and the minority who
chose to defend their innocence were obviously disconcerted that their fellow convicts were able to attack their stories with considerable skill. These convicts would never agree for instance that a speaker was telling the truth about his illegal conviction on the basis that the police were biased and had to convict someone.

While it was apparent that the convicts attempted to conform to both prisoner deviant norms and the norms expected by the prison staff, no one seemed to see this was a difficult task, and there were no signs in interviews that this was an area of convict tension. This absence of tension was further evidence that African convicts whether or not they had had previous experience of the urban-industrial environment and western-type governmental techniques, were able to adjust without difficulty to situations of complete social and economic subordination. This ease of adjustment was probably enabled by an innate ability to adjust and manipulate socio-political situations.

Whether this was proved or not, their reactions to the fact of imprisonment both for first offenders and recidivists, would be to an overall social exposure. They had to participate and this gave an appearance of standardized behaviour, which appeared to be more complete than that observable in British and American prisons.

While the standards of the prison conformed to accepted international standards for prisons, in comparison to western prisons they were empty places. It was not only that they had less equipment than a contemporary western prison and in this would have compared to a British army barrack-room at the start of World War Two, but the prisoners themselves were relatively propertyless. This was not only because the rules forbade the possession of non-regulation goods, but they did not see property in the obvious western form of pictures as necessary for their peace of mind. Since only a small minority of the convicts were sufficiently literate to get emotional satisfaction from reading and writing, this channel was also blocked to them.

Thus inmate interests were almost entirely expressed in and through conversation when this was seen as a proportion of the total interactions between convicts. The convicts who could not read or write were thus restricted in the ways by which they might have made their prison lives more tolerable. A convict (74) said "there is
nothing they can do part from sitting about; two or three of them in a group, talking of how they used to enjoy their outside life and probably what they will do when they leave the prison. Some of them talk of how they might go and raid people. Some of them of how they will revenge on the people who made them come to prison. Some of them probably will waste their time playing drafts - relaxing games".

It was a conversational prison and in this no more than a continuation of their traditional ways of interacting outside. Conversation was not only a pleasure in itself but a method of obtaining status. While it could be postulated that the majority of conversations in western society are between two people, the impression was gained in this prison that conversation was usually a group activity for more than two persons.

While this may have been enabled by the existence of dormitory cells, conversational privacy did not seem to be something which the convicts either expected or aimed at. Conversations started by two persons would be joined by others without comment or resentment from its initiators. Conversational topics were potentially common property just as they would have been in traditional outside life. Thus conversation was the principal medium through which the convicts gained stability and sought happiness in the prison environment.

In this respect it was more than using conversation to pass the time although of course it was used for this as well. They appreciated good talk in a way that must have had parallels to the 19th century salons of Europe and the coffee houses of 18th century Britain. As a development of this, they were keenly interested in the oratory of their politicians which no longer has any high priority in the necessary attainments of western politicians. A convict (63) said "you will see here some men whose main preoccupation was to argue over political issues and to try and tear about the speeches of politicians; others argue over prison affairs and religion, argument is their way of life".

Apart from this specialisation conversation was likely to be as general and as specific as that in western prisons. A convict (64) said "prisoners can talk of many things when they are together and they do talk in turns when they are together, and changing subjects
from one subject to another they talk of how one would make a lot of money by trading and of how one would buy a field and become a farmer. They can also change their subject to and talk of women, beautiful women one has ever met". Another (65) said "their conversations are on food, women and stealing, these are the only things they can talk about".

While it could be said that much conversation was concerned with crime, it was difficult to parallel this exactly with the conversations on crime in western prisons where there are many more convicts involved in criminal activities hostile to the societies in which they lived. This was not so in this prison; certainly thieves talked about stealing but the preoccupation of cattle thieves with cattle theft was not quite in the same class since it was an approved pattern of behaviour within their own society.

It was not suggested that criminals did not discuss their criminal activities in detail but the professional was reticent except with his very few inmates. Thus the petty criminal bragged about his achievements and his listeners thought that they were learning to be better criminals but such conversation may have had less significance than it would in western prisons where the criminal population was both larger in numbers and more professionally experienced even in the range of petty criminality. Some convicts did indeed refer to the prison as a school for learning to be a criminal but there were also the same restrictions on the passage of this information as on the general interactions of the prisoners because of tribe and language.

Probably more conversation took place over the legal aspects of their cases particularly since this was an area in which the convict was centrally placed and could talk about it without the possibility of his talk being leaked to the authorities to his subsequent disadvantage. A convict (66) said "particularly on Sundays as today, convicts love to exchange experiences about their cases". In this there was a surprising lack of complaints about either the police and judiciary (51) even when this topic was lead into the interviews. While the western observer could comment that both the substantive court laws and its procedure was alien to the traditional judicial practices of these people, they themselves recognised very clearly
the benefits of clearly stated charges and an impartial if not indifferent judiciary. Their talk about the police often seemed to suggest that they and the criminal, particularly the recidivists, had shared interests in crime and some even considered their future on release would be as policemen with nothing in the conversation to suggest that they were joking.

While their conversations may not have shown much anxiety or concern about their present position or future prospects, essays written by convicts about their thoughts showed a much clearer picture of their worries. A convict (67) wrote "while I am at work I have worries about many matters - who got the job I was doing before I was arrested. I don't worry so much at night or when resting but at work that's when the prison really causes me to worry. At work the prisoner is alone without anyone to talk to as a friend". Another (68) wrote "at night I really worry thinking about my home and prison then becomes very hard. If government understood this it would be fair if a sentence was counted for nights as well as days separately".
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- Chapter IX -
The exercise of authority

I. Convicts' attitude to authority

The convict's attitude to imprisonment was the result of his social conditioning to the idea and exercise of authority. The African child is brought up to consider obedience as the sign of a good child and disobedience as the characteristic of a bad child. Research into attitudes to authority among school children in the Mombasa area of Kenya (Table 33) showed that this simple concept dominated their ideas of what is expected of them. As could be seen, few indeed went beyond this requirement in characterising the behaviour of a child and in fact it could be said that it excluded any other conceptions. This concept of obedience was not confined to this area alone as it was found in Tanzania (Table 34) and was similarly so prevalent in Uganda as to have excluded any other characteristic of a good child (1). An analysis of the opinions of juvenile delinquents who were on probation (Table 35) in Mombasa showed the same dominance of the necessity to be obedient.

TABLE 33. Mombasa Primary School 1963 (52)

A. Characteristic of a good child
1. Obedient 17
2. Serves others 1
3. Cooks 1
4. Pleases parents 4
5. Gives honour to mother 1
6. Helps parents 1
7. Respects parents 1
8. Unspecified 12
(a good child is a good child)

B. Characteristics of a bad child
1. Disobedient 19
2. Does not take warnings 1
3. Selfish 1
4. Steals 1
5. Does not honour mother 2
6. Does not respect parents 1
7. Does not help others 1
8. Does not work 1
9. Unspecified 12
(a bad child does bad things)

TABLE 34. Puncani Rural Middle School 1958 (52)

A. Characteristics of a good child
1. Respect for parents and elders 26
2. Obedience 54
3. Works at school 4
4. Gives happiness to elders 3
5. Helps parents 4
6. Does not quarrel 3
7. Does not steal 6
8. Does not swear 2
9. Keeps quiet 1
10. Truthful 1
11. Works hard 2
12. Unspecified (a good child does good things) 11

B. Characteristics of a bad child
1. Disrespectful 24
2. Disobedient 46
3. Does not like school 1
4. Annoys elders 4
5. Quarrelsome 7
6. Steals 9
7. Swears 13
8. Not religious 1
9. Smokes 1
10. Drinks 1
11. Unspecified (a bad child does bad things) 12

TABLE 35. Juvenile delinquents - Mombasa 1961 (52)

A. Characteristics of a good child
1. Obedience 14
2. To be able to read 10
3. To work 11
4. To be trustworthy 5
5. Not to wander about town 8
6. Respect for elders 8

B. Characteristics of a bad child
1. Stealing 24
2. Drinking 9
3. Fighting 14
4. Swearing 4
5. Having bad companions 2
6. Disrespectful 2
7. Disobedience 8
8. Absconding from school 2

In adulthood, the convict was well aware of this requirement and stated "in life, it was necessary to obey father and mother as it was they that taught the child to obey orders of government and of others who are in authority over me" (2). He admits that "it was necessary to obey my father and mother because everyone in the world does this" (3) and that no doubt gave the moral flavour to their obedience as a general rationalisation.

This obedience required of a son can make heavy demands on him which he was apparently ready to accept as ideally correct. A convict writes (4) that "my father can send me on any errand and give me work to do. He can beat me if I have done wrong to him; he can even complain to government about me so that they could imprison me as out of control. He has power to tell me that he must be given help
and I must obey without question. He could tell me to maintain my younger brothers, paying their school fees; he doesn't have to ask anyone else.

At the back of their obedience, and this again was recognised at a very early age, was the economic and social advantages of doing so in communities which had close-knit families and little individualism. The same convict wrote that "I obey my father so that he should be pleased and put me in school. Those who did not obey have trouble finding their tax money at short notice or to get enough bride-wealth to marry". Another (5) expressed it more forcefully, writing that "If I did not obey my father, his fatherhood had no more point for me. He has an obligation to get me married and to give me land to work. If I did not obey my father, the neighbours would think me a fool. He looks after me when I am sick and bought me my first clothes. To disobey him is a very serious matter". Disobedience is seen as bringing disadvantages very quickly.

This obligation to obey was not confined to parents only and another convict (6) wrote that "the head of my clan has authority over me and in return for accepting this, he was willing to help me with the school fees of my brothers and to act for me when I wanted other help and could not come home from work in the town to put it right". Another expressed (7) the same theme when he wrote that "I was always taught by my elders to obey them and all the other elders and that when I was young that I should obey everyone older than me. Thus it was that if a man did not obey his elders, he could not expect those younger than himself to obey him". These results were confirmed by a small sample of convict opinion (Table 36). Obedience therefore was a predominant social ideal and requirement.

**TABLE 36. Prison - convicts - 1963**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Characteristics of a good child</th>
<th>B. Characteristics of a bad child</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Obedient</td>
<td>1. Does not respect parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Respects parents</td>
<td>2. Disobedient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Loved by parents</td>
<td>3. Gets sent to prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Plays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Works at school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Helps parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This obedience to the family and village elders had in some cases extended naturally into the field of government as when a convict (8) writes that "my father was like a chief and my mother a headman and in fact that was how they expressed it to me when I was young". Another wrote (9) that "it was necessary to obey all the leaders of whom the highest was Government - also to obey my parents, particularly my father who started the household and who was in control of all property. Government sees that I obey all rules and helps me when I am in trouble. We were all inside Government".

From this childhood background the adult convict considers that government should be obeyed, seeing no ambivalence between their views and their convictions for criminal offences. A convict wrote (10) that "there were many people who should be obeyed; the major ones were the family and the government. We find that the government was obeyed by everybody no matter to what dignity, degree or age he may have possessed - in case one fails to obey the government he was severely dealt with". Another wrote (11) that "the government protected me and my property from the force of others. It will arbitrate so that there will be no quarreling. There was also profit in government for us as it builds hospitals. Government was like a second God so that if I do not obey government, it can do what it wills with me because of its strength. If I am disobedient to government, I can be imprisoned and waste my whole life".

From this it can be seen that in their acceptance of obedience to government there was the same pragmatic understanding that it was useful on the one hand to obey and often unpleasant to disobey. The government and the parent had to be obeyed because they existed and had power, and it was very noticeable that there was no religious justification of obedience or reference to divine law. It seems therefore that the convict came to prison predisposed to obey the government in the form of the prison and its officials; he was not against the government as such and was remarkably free from complaints about the
courts, the police and even the prison in which he was serving his sentence. There was no deep-rooted resentment against government, a rebellious 'bloody-mindedness' towards authority in any form.

II. Prison discipline

The formal social controls under law were available for the prison staff to use when they felt it necessary. Much of the day to day prison activity was routine in which no commands were issued and the convicts carried on with a system of work to which they had become habituated. In this the warders were often not in evidence and the convict population did what was required of them, often with the assistance and co-operation of prisoners who had become assistants to the prison staff and had some authority over other prisoners in default of the warders themselves doing the work.

Offences charged against a prisoner were heard by the officer in charge of the prison (12) or in cases of special severity of which none occurred during the research, transferred to be dealt with by the Commissioner of Prisons (13). No prisoner could be punished until he had had an opportunity of hearing the charge against him and making his defence (14). This could only be done "after due enquiry" (15) which would take the form of "military orderly room proceedings" (16), which ensured (17) that the accused was present throughout. The charge had to be read out, the accused's plea recorded, witnesses heard and examined separately with opportunity to cross-examine. Then the accused had to have had an opportunity to make a statement or to call witnesses, and if he was found guilty he should be allowed to make a statement in mitigation.

There was no reference to any additional body such as a board of Visiting Justices, but in the case of a serious assault, indecency or a narcotic offence, the matter was sent to the police who investigated and prosecuted as a crime reported to them for action. During the research, one prisoner received a 9 months sentence for buggery and another a year for a violent assault which injured a warden. This second case could have been dealt with as an aggravated prison offence and given a sentence of corporal punishment, but such a sentence would have involved so much clerical work in getting the necessary approval...
from the Commissioner (18) that it was sent to the police instead (19).

In a previous case the officer in charge had had to type the whole case out himself in the absence of a competent warder clerk and had vowed never to give such a sentence again. It was stated by the officer in charge that all cases involving marihuana were referred to the police but it was noticeable that although marihuana was found during searches, no charge had been taken to the police. Marihuana when it was found was classified as possession of a prohibited article. It would seem from an examination of these seventeen sentences under the Prison Rules (Table 37) over seventeen months that the possession of marihuana was being taken progressively as a less serious offence. All the sentences had been given by the same senior officer.

**TABLE 37. Charges for possessing Marihuana - March 1961 to August 1962**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>14 days loss of remission</th>
<th>28 days loss of remission</th>
<th>16 days Penal Dist and small cells</th>
<th>7 days loss of remission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No earnings 3 mths.</td>
<td>No earnings 3 mths.</td>
<td>No earnings 3 mths.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Penal Dist and small cells</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 days loss of remissions</td>
<td>14 days loss of remissions</td>
<td>16 days Penal Dist and small cells</td>
<td>7 days loss of remission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No earnings 3 mths.</td>
<td>No earnings 3 mths.</td>
<td>No earnings 3 mths.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discipline of prisoners (20) was based on British precedents (21) even to the same wording in some sub-sections. This section was very all embracing with such wordings as (n) "in any way offends against good order and discipline" a favourite type of charge in military and para-military organisations (22). Such wording would allow almost endless charges to be brought if the rules were to be enforced to the letter and the time of the officer in charge would have been almost totally involved in hearing charges, but prisoners were allowed considerable latitude in committing offences and as well large numbers...
of offenders were never discovered.

The officer in charge of this prison for minor prison offences (23) might have given seven days in the punishment cells on penal diet (24), forfeiture of remission not exceeding fourteen days reduction in stage, or postponement and forfeiture of earnings (not exceeding one half), and removal from the earnings scheme until such time as the prisoner was considered fit for restoration to his original grade by virtue of his good conduct and skill at his trade.

For a major prison offence, he might have given (25) to an adult male prisoner not over 45 years, or under death sentence or a civil vagrant, 12 strokes corporal punishment, seven days in the punishment cells on penal diet, forfeiture of remission not exceeding thirty days, reduction of stage or postponement of promotion in stage or forfeiture of privileges and lastly forfeiture of earnings not exceeding three-quarters, removal from the earnings scheme for a period not exceeding six months and reduction in earnings grade until he was considered fit for restoration.

III. Disciplinary actions and consequences

Any prison officer might make a charge against a prisoner or use the threat of a charge to attempt to succeed in controlling a prisoner. The warder making the charge took the offending prisoner to the officer on duty at the gate-house or to the Chief Warder on duty who vetted that the charge was reasonable. In cases which he considered merited special consideration, he told the warder that the charge was not advisable at all or that the prisoner could be adequately dealt with by an admonition there and then.

If the charge was accepted, a charge sheet was made out and the prisoner returned to his yard if the offence was of a minor nature, or transferred to the punishment cells (26) to await hearing on that afternoon if there was time or on the following day.

The rules for the exercise of prison discipline were very exact and were followed correctly in the prison. They were designed to insure fairness assuming that the prison officers concerned would be just in their use of their powers, but the system was in effect one of arbitrary power in which the controls were exterior to those instituted
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 1961</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 1962</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct.</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.</td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Jan.</td>
<td>1137</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb.</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1336
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by the law and their method of administration. In the 1336 persons recorded (Table 38) as having been punished between February 1961 and September 1963 all except two received punishment which represented 0.15% being found not guilty. The figure for all the country's prisons for 1962 was 59 or 0.11% out of 5227 offences (27). The prisoner offences register for a consecutive series of 427 offences recorded no cases in which the charge had been dismissed (121).

The offences with which prisoners were charged (Table 39) under the prison rules, showed 24.1% to involve a prison officer directly in matters involving disobedience and disrespect and it was significant that the latter was the second highest type of offence, while offences involving other prison staff were only 10.6%.

TABLE 39. Offences by prisoners August 1962 to May 1963

| 1. Disobedience to an order | 122 |
| 2. Treats an officer with disrespect | 152 |
| 3. Negligent at work | 16 |
| 4. Possession of prohibited article | 168 |
| 5. Making a false accusation | 6 |
| 6. Removing/stealing food | 54 |
| 7. Refusing work | 73 |
| 8. Leaving appointed place | 74 |
| 9. Quarrelling with another prisoner | 46 |
| 10. Altering date of release on shirt | 18 |
| 11. Throwing away his food | 12 |
| 12. Not wearing prisoner number on shirt | 57 |
| 13. Stealing prison property | 22 |
| 14. Creating a disturbance | 37 |
| 15. Destroying prison property | 76 |
| 16. Refusing to shave | 17 |
| 17. Drunk | 8 |
| 18. Not wearing escape clothing | 56 |
| 19. Smoking at lock-up | 23 |
| 20. Doing unauthorised work | 19 |
| 21. Violent to a prison officer | 16 |
| 22. Fighting with another prisoner | 46 |
| 23. Using indecent language | 35 |
| 24. Altering sick card | 7 |
| 25. Refusing to allow search | 19 |
| 26. Using indecent | 4 |
| 27. Communicating with civilians | 12 |
| 28. Malingerage | 12 |
| 29. Refusing to come out at unlock | 25 |
| 30. Conduct to the prejudice of good order and prison discipline | 95 |

Total 1327

Offences involving the prisoner alone in asserting his individuality such as possession of a prohibited article, not wearing the correct costumes or refusing to come out of his cell, or for gain such as stealing food, doing unauthorised work or altering the date of release on his uniform came to 58.10%. Prohibited articles also
included extra items of prison clothing so that they could have a
spare set or to use the shorts as underpants.

Some offences had special significance such as not wearing the
prison number and date of release on the shirt (51) which informants
stated was due to some convicts feeling that their date of release
was private to them alone rather than an attempt to deceive the auth-
orities into an earlier discharge. Not wearing escapee clothing
(45) was not due to any desire to escape again but because men who
had escaped once were held in special security and were not therefore
going any benefit under the Stage System from their long sentences.

Doing unauthorised work referred to the manufacture of combs,
tin cups, boxes and tinder lighting sets in the workshop, which were
constantly made and as constantly found in searches. Using indecent
language was due to the provocative nature of Swahili abuse which was
usually sexual and personal. Refusing to shave might have had some
political significance in offenders prior to independence and one can
only feel admiration for the splendid 8 who managed to get suffi-
ciently drunk as to come to the notice of authority.

It seemed from the list of offences that warders charged more
for offences which might in other prisons have been ignored or circum-
vented by tactful staff. The analysis of these prison offences showed
that there was little violence and insubordination and the bulk of
them were minor offences which were not deliberate challenges to
authority but the consequences of deprivations in their imprisonment.

Although the case was judged by the officer in charge, in the
eyes of his staff, the prisoner was already guilty. His staff con-
sidered that if there had been any doubt as to the correctness of the
charge, they would not have brought it in the first place and secondly
if there had been any doubt the charge would not have been formalised
on paper. The prison staff expected a conviction and punishment and
the officer in charge knew (28) that he must convict, and what was
more, convict without appearing to doubt the warder's evidence too
much. The convicts themselves were aware that the officer in charge
had very little latitude (29) saying that "when I came up in front
of the officer, he knew that I had been falsely charged but he could
not take my side against his own staff, so I got seven days in the
punishment cells; after all, the man who charged me was a corporal.

The most that the officer in charge could do was to give a warning and he was very sparing in its use for fear of losing the support of his own warder staff.

In such cases the prison represented both judge and jury and the prisoner could not expect to get an unbiased hearing. Even if the alleged offence occurred in the presence of other prisoners, they were unlikely to want to give evidence against the staff and if they were summoned, would undoubtedly pervert. The prisoner could not appeal against sentence but he could petition the President (30) a long laborious and almost inevitably useless process which he was not likely to undertake for a short punishment.

Alternatively when a Visiting Justice visited the prison to hear complaints, he could petition formally to be seen (31) or he could approach a Visiting Justice on his tour round the prison in which the latter was accompanied by a prison officer other than the two most senior officers in the prison.

Both methods involved considerable prominence for the complainant and he assumed that he would be prejudiced in his future prison life although the officers were remarkably disinterested in the nature of complaints which were made. The only restriction known on these complaints was a request by the officer in charge to myself as a Visiting Justice not to make my entries in the Minute Book (32) longer than necessary as they all had to be typed out and answered in detail and he had no secretary (33).

The only reasonably successful way of appealing was by application to the officer in charge for the restoration of privileges which had been lost (34) and 110 out of 870 applications between January and September 1962 (Table 40) were for the restoration of remission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 40. Prisoners applications January to September 1962</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter to District Commissioners of home area ... ... ... ... 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of lost remission... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to family to sell property ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of employment in prison ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter to police about property ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To see Discharged Prisoners Association Representative... ... ... 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of money on deposit in prison... ... ... ... ... ... 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About petition ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for transfer to another prison ... ... ... ... ... ... 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About appealing on case... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To see medical officer... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About employment on release ... 10
About obtaining special diet in prison ... 12
To be allowed to play football ... 12
About confiscated money ... 13
To be removed from small cells ... 13
Letter to Commissioners of Prisons ... 14
About property left with friends ... 49
About relief for wife and family ... 23
To obtain rise in Prison Grade ... 13
To be allowed to buy books ... 8
To be allowed to receive newspapers ... 12
Miscellaneous ... 20

Total 866

Perhaps the officer in charge also recognised that the only way in which he could administer justice and retain the authority necessary over his warder staff was to give sentences of loss of remission which made up 630 of 47.3% of the sentences given. In effect, these were suspended sentences which were not felt until the end of the sentence and the lost remission could be regained by good conduct and on application to the officer in charge for its restoration could be made any time before release.

Good conduct in this respect was keeping out of the way of authority, as the large number of convicts and their turnover would have made it very unlikely that the senior prison officers would know more than a few convicts sufficiently well to assess their good conduct on a personal basis. While the officer in charge heard prison charges and gave punishment to the best of his judgement, the convicts spent some time in evaluating the punishments and assessing their consistency. A convict said "sometimes punishments were severe and sometimes not so severe. We grouped them by the punishments; sometimes someone with a cigarette got seven days and some with a full bundle of tobacco got the same. Recently a man was caught bringing a packet of cigarettes into the prison and the other was just smoking in a prohibited place during working hours; the former had done a great mistake of bringing it from outside of the prison but they got the same sentence". (105)

Guilt or innocence of the charge did not appear to be as important as the sentence, which was noticed because of its rarity.

There was also the additional factor that the warder charging in the case was not likely to remember or see the prisoner making this application for restoration of lost remission which usually took place more than three months after the offence had been adjudged.
A number of cases were not made into charges by the actions of the Chief Warders who exercise considerable discretion in whom they charged or forgot about. The Chief Warders were responsible for much of the even running of the prison and certainly at the start of this research when the senior officers were all British, they alone among the senior staff were able to understand the prison gossip in the vernacular, and to assess the social and political temper of the prison and at least some of its complex inter-relationships. To be done well this involved no formal activities but a nice sense of intuition which prevented much injustice balancing information, jealousy and rivalry against the need of the prison for internal peace rather than an imposed stability. In general they were interested in maintaining a quiet prison and would not charge unless their authority was challenged, or when they had a reason for charging which they could not avoid.

This filtering of charges was recognised by the convicts, one of whom stated (35) in an interview which was interrupted by the sudden search of that cell block "the Chief Warder was making a search for clothes over and above each convict's entitlement, he found a lot here this afternoon and missed a lot as well. He is a reasonable man and he wouldn't charge anyone for having extra clothing. He just wanted the clothes back". The Chief Warder in this case seems to have acted in order to control the amount of convict manipulation rather than to attempt the impossible of preventing it with its corollary of disturbing the convict-warder status quo.

The very selective nature of the charging of prisoners for prison offences was illustrated by the following description of convicts caught smuggling. "Hamisi a long-term prisoner who had the privileged position of block cleaner saw the smuggling of the sugar through the yard gate and reported it to the Corporal on duty who stopped the cook as he went back into the kitchen and found the sugar. I was sent off as the cook said the sugar was mine which I admitted at once. I said that I wouldn't say from where I had got the sugar until the cook was let off. I then told the Corporal that he knew that I had been brought the sugar at work and that to say from where I got it would only mean that two would be charged instead of one so I have to tell you that I
stole it myself entirely alone.

The Corporal sent me away to think about it saying that I would be charged if I did not tell him but when I was called back later I had of course found out that Hamisi had informed on me. So I told him that Hamisi had given me the sugar and that he had rushed to the Corporal when he saw that the sugar would be found.

The Corporal checked and found this story reasonable, remarking that the world was indeed a bad place if a partner could so quickly dump his friend when it was to his advantage to do so. I expressed surprise to the Corporal that he did not know that Hamisi was a really nasty character. The Corporal then said that he ought to charge me but the case would have involved so many people but it was more than enough punishment that two pounds of sugar should be lost. So that was the end of that disturbance.

In this case the corporal warder had a case in which the cook could have been charged with smuggling goods through a yard gate which at that time ought to have been locked in the canteen box of the owner's cell. Hamisi as the informer acted quickly to build up his own position since it was outside his own yard, and not as was sometimes the case with informers, to prevent too much illegal activity in their yards which might upset their regular lives which included their own well established illegal practices. No staff member liked informers and although they were prepared to make use of such information, preferred that its source should not be disclosed, much less that a convict would benefit from the relationship, and he was thus very ready to agree that Hamisi was a very bad man whom they could all find thoroughly unpleasant. So the Corporal here from the start, was disinclined to prosecute and became more so when the complexity of the case became apparent since no one was going to tell the truth and sorting out the evidence and hearing the case would have taken up too much time. At the same time he must have realised that two pounds of sugar in transit was not a legal transaction since the quantity was unusually large and there would have been no cause to use so much in exchange for chewing tobacco which could just as easily have been traded within a single yard. In these circumstances further enquiries would have got nowhere except in wasting his own
time and patience so he did not prosecute realising that the loss
of the sugar was probably a greater penalty to all concerned than
formal penalties of loss of remission or warning which would have
been given for such a minor offence.

In another instance a convict (36) stated that "recently mari-
huana was found in the mattress of a Special Stage (37) prisoner
as the result of an informer. The Chief Warder knew it was jealousy
and that it might not even have been that man's marihuana, so he took
the marihuana, burnt it and made no charge. But the other Chief
Warder, who had no brains, would have charged the user of the mattress
and just made himself unpopular to no purpose at all". The same in-
formant stated that "the Chief Warders used informers although the
senior officers did not, and that one of the ways in which they were
rewarded was the shelving of any charges which might be brought
against them.

Although informers were not liked by either staff or convicts,
junior staff might only have been able to neglect any information
laid before them when there were other factors allowing this as in the
incident to be quoted. Most senior officers were aware of the power
balances within the convict community and realised that they could not
control all breaks in discipline, preferring to ally themselves with
a general overall pattern of fairness acceptable to both staff and
prisoners.

The following incident involving an informer was described by a
convict who said, "one convict who was in Stage IV used a bed to which
he was entitled, but was transferred to another prison. Another con-
"velt started to use this bed which had not been returned to the store
although he was not entitled to do so by the Prison Rules. No one
noticed this or complained until this convict had a petty quarrel
about food with another who had found out that Ali was getting in ex-
tra rations and distributing them to certain special friends. Ali
was the cleaner in this yard and at that time was their leader. We
thought we had settled the quarrel but Athumani was not satisfied and
on Friday reported sick to get out of the work details, went to the
store and told them about the bed. The storeman thanked him but of
course there were convicts about who had heard Athumani giving this
information and immediately told Ali. Ali being an experienced convict checked with a tailor friend working near the store before challenging Athumani when he came back to the yard. When Athumani said that he just wanted the satisfaction of seeing Ali sleeping back on the floor again, the former knocked him down and stamped on his face with his boots Athumani screamed for help and the Chief Warder who happened to be passing came to the yard and asked what was going on. Now this Chief Warder was a fair and just man who knew both the rules and the realities of prison life. He soon saw that Athumani was an informer and on asking Ali what had happened, was told that he had fallen down in a fit and hurt himself. The Chief Warder asked Athumani if he had any witnesses that he had been assaulted but all the other convicts present, said that they had seen no assault because he had just fallen down. The Chief Warder refused to take any action although Athumani explained exactly why he had been hit, saying it was entirely your own fault". (98)

In this incident the Chief Warder had seen that the injured man was unpopular with the convicts of his yard and appreciated that the informer had only acted out of spite rather than in the public interest, so he ignored the case, having estimated at the same time that the other convicts would not do the informer very serious damage and there would be no complaints to a senior officer. By this act he had gained the appreciation of a group of convicts who would not take advantage of his action outside this incident and whom he could not control effectively by other means in all probability.

The prison discipline system was arbitrary in its application since it was direct towards the furtherance of control by the warders over the convicts and as such there could be no functional equality between the parties involved in the hearing of the charge against a prisoner.

Difficulty of keeping discipline in the prison was that the officer in charge had limited powers which were far more restricted than the most junior and inexperienced magistrate in the courts outside. Although most of the prison disciplinary charges that came up before him were minor infractions of the rules, he had the problem of not giving too much too soon from his limited powers. If he was
only able to give seven days punishment cells and penal diet, he could not afford to give this for first offences because he could not give anything heavier for subsequent charges. The experienced convict was well aware of this limitation in the powers of the prison authorities to control him. A convict says "once you were caught once or twice, punishment made no difference to you. You became a usual man with them. But a man who had never been in a small cell he was always careful never to go there, but a man who had been there twice it didn't matter if he would be there ten times" (95).

The officer in charge then in dealing with a persistent offender against prison rules had to husband his powers in order not to exhaust them too early in a battle of strength of character. He was perhaps inclined to take the persistent offender too seriously as he was very infrequently a leader of those in opposition to authority and saw him in too personal terms. The persistent offender probably expected and wanted the authorities to react to his offences and if the officer in charge did so he would end up getting standard maximum sentences in which he experienced little discomfort if not satisfaction from the change and excitement involved. In the end if a particular officer in charge could not control the troublesome convict, he was transferred to another prison which was often a mutually satisfactory end to a series of conflicts.

However there were cases in which the legal punishments were not as great as the administrative consequences. Technical training in the prison could only provide for a very limited number of convicts at any one time divided between those under training and those who could carry out the prison's work contracts and these places were much in demand. A convict described an incident in which the penalty may have gone beyond the needs of disciplinary control saying "I was caught smoking during working hours and I was put in the small cells. As everyone smoked when they could at work this should have been enough, but I was taken out of the workshop and put in the rope section" (96).

Another major method of disciplinary control were searches (106) which were obligatory for the staff to carry out on every prisoner at least once a fortnight as well as when entering prison on admission
and when going to attend court. The rules also laid down that buildings will be searched at the same time as the prisoners or while they are at work. It also ordered that searching should occur in a particular manner (107) in the presence of not less than two prison officers. It appeared that searching was not effective as a means of controlling the presence of prohibited articles within the prison.

The officer staff with warders searched every part of the prison at short notice and at irregular intervals. In the first place the prisoners expected to be searched at any time and the experienced prisoner was prepared at all times for such an eventuality and secondly the administration block at the entrance where the orders for searches were initiated and the orders given, always contained convicts on duty as office cleaners and orderlies, as well as prisoners waiting for interviews on release and admission who soon passed the word back into the prison proper when they heard a suggestion that a search would be carried out in a particular part. A convict said "last night we heard there was going to be a search in the evening and we had it. They opened up all the beds, I didn't know what they were looking for" (108).

Some officers considered that they would never find any significant items of contraband by searches and that this was not their main purpose which was to reduce the level of smuggling by this form of offensive patrolling. Further they stated that searches were the only way of keeping the prison relatively tidy. A search always disclosed large quantities of illegally held articles which the prisoners had accumulated and retained in excess of their permitted property. Most searches brought in a sack full of what the search register described as miscellaneous rubbish such as newspapers, old tins, rags, twine and rubber. A series of consecutive entries in the search register (Table 41) showed the triviality of what was found in terms of outside values. However a more detailed examination of the actual materials found (Table 42) showed that the general term 'rubbish' covered a wide variety of useful and interesting articles.
### TABLE 41. Search Register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place searched</th>
<th>Material found</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30/8</td>
<td>Special Stage &quot;E&quot; Hall</td>
<td>Marijuana, soap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9</td>
<td>Cooks Seg. blocks</td>
<td>Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/9</td>
<td>Small cells &quot;A&quot; block</td>
<td>Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/9</td>
<td>&quot;E&quot; New Adm. Ham'</td>
<td>1/50, Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; &quot;B&quot; Halls</td>
<td>Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>New Adm.</td>
<td>2/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/9</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Hall</td>
<td>Coconut fibre, rubber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/9</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Hall 1,2,3.</td>
<td>Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Hall 4,5,6.</td>
<td>Coconut fibre, rubber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/9</td>
<td>Kitchen Adm. small</td>
<td>Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/9</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Hall 4,5,8.</td>
<td>Coconut string, rubber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/9</td>
<td>Remand</td>
<td>1/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/9</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; &quot;B&quot; Halls</td>
<td>String, razor blades, P.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/9</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Hall 1,2,3.</td>
<td>Directory, cigarette lighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/9</td>
<td>&quot;B&quot; Hall</td>
<td>Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/9</td>
<td>Remand</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/9</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Hall</td>
<td>Coconut fibre, rubber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/9</td>
<td>Remand</td>
<td>Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/9</td>
<td>Main gate</td>
<td>1/98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/9</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; &quot;B&quot; &quot;C&quot; Small</td>
<td>Scrubbing brush, mats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>Remands</td>
<td>1/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>&quot;C&quot; Hall</td>
<td>3/55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/10</td>
<td>Whole prison</td>
<td>Soap, string, tins, combs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>spoons, uniforms, book, sheets,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sandals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>S, Cells, cooks</td>
<td>4 mats, blanket, pillow, comb,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>broken glass, 3 spoons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>S, Cells</td>
<td>Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/10</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; Hall</td>
<td>2 blankets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; &quot;B&quot; Cooks</td>
<td>Vest, roll of rope, cigarette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lighter, comb, spoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; &quot;B&quot; Small Cells</td>
<td>4/50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10</td>
<td>&quot;D&quot; Hall</td>
<td>Blanket, 3 mats, shirt, 3 shorts,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>places clothing, soap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/10</td>
<td>Remand</td>
<td>1/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/10</td>
<td>Remand</td>
<td>1/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/10</td>
<td>&quot;E&quot; &quot;F&quot; Halls</td>
<td>String, paper, pieces of stick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/10</td>
<td>Remand</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 42. Material found in search with their prison prices and uses

   Used to put over gruel so that it can be drunk later.
2. 7 wooden combs. Made in workshops.
   Price (1/50) or one twist of coarse tobacco.
3. 2 old tins with tops for keeping private stores. No price
4. Cowrie shells set of 4 used in gambling.
   Brought in by field gang.
5. Strip of tyre rubber for use in sandals
   Enough for strings on one pair sandals. Price 1/50.
6. Two stones used for washing legs, not pumice,
   Probably from Masai, Sandi.
7. Two home-made tweezers, for pulling beard hairs
   Mainly used by old convicts.
8. One miniature empty Angostura Bitters bottle with snuff.
9. Two metal spoons brought in by lavatory gang.
   One wooden spoon, one metal spoon; both made in prison.
10. Fibre rope 15 pieces. For hanging clothes after washing.
    This was done to prevent them being stolen while drying.
11. Two tinder lighting sets. Price 1/-
    Stone for striking the light - Sold for two days meat ration
    One safety razor except for blade.
12. Terra prison clothing
    21 small pieces for washing
    2 long pieces for sleeping
    1 long strip purpose unknown.
13. 1 handkerchief
15. Pulled out cotton fibre for use in fire making for smoking.
16. Wooden ashtray
17. One small towel (from Prison Stores)
18. Two small bottles.

A convict describing a search said "at lock up time in the
evening the officer in charge started a sudden search. We had to line
up outside the cells and we were each searched cell by cell. They
took away our wooden combs, pictures, and lots of other things which
were not wanted in the prison or which upset th officer but no one was
prosecuted. The warder who was watching me said he was very tired as
he had been on duty a long time without eating when he came on duty
in the morning. It could be seen that prisoners were not allowed
private things like pictures of their wives it was a part of their
punishment. They got a lot of stuff but plenty remained because they
searched too much at a time and the warders got tired. It was bad
luck if you got caught. They were not worrying about tobacco but
only about dangerous things like weapons, iron bars and razor blades"
(110).

In the usual prison inspections such articles were carefully
hidden to comply with cell rules and the search remained a reasonable
method of seizing this excess without the difficulties consequent on
taking things from convicts one by one. A senior officer (114) said
that "searches were an excellent way of cleaning the prison of a lot
of old rubbish. I have seen the duty office knee-deep in rubbish.
It was a treasure hunt - sort of prospecting and it kept the staff
on their toes." Very few charges were brought as a result of such
searches and the authorities considered that the articles were just
attempts to organise some personalised property and not in order to
organise escapes as might have been thought from the quantities of
coconut fibre which was found and which was used for clothes lines.

Prison officers stated that the major finds of contraband occurred when there was a break in the links of a convict trading system as when a bag full of soap was thrown over the wall at the wrong time or when a warder looked in a new place at an unexpected time thus finding a cache of meat in an unlighted boiler or when a particular warder worked on intuition in deciding which convict was carrying illegal goods. The warder on the gate was widely reported to have second-sight in his detection of contraband in the opinion of officers, but the more experienced convicts suggested that he was no match for professional smugglers who expected him to search them when they passed the gate.

Searches were also regarded by the staff as a means of reducing prison clothing which was held in excess of the authorised scale. Every convict wishes for an extra blanket and for an extra shirt or shorts to wear as underclothes and quite a number of these extra articles were present in every yard. Searches found some of them and they were returned to the stores without charges being made against their owners. Some of the extra kit could be retained by artifice as when there was an allowance of two blankets which made a third very conspicuous but two extra looked like another convict's kit and may well be missed in a normal quick search. Convicts were allowed two tunics on each of which should have been stitched a square of cloth giving number, date of admittance and expected date of release. A convict described his evasions and said "I put the number on my two legal shirts. The other extra shirts have no number on them but I keep a spare number cloth which I pinned onto the spare shirts which I wore" (109). Searches also found quite large quantities of soap which had been hoarded by convicts and this was regarded by some senior staff as a useful economy measure (114). In some yards which had a relatively stable convict population allowing a higher degree of organisation, contraband was left in the charge of the ward cleaner to take care of when there was a search and he would get a share in its use should he have been able to evade the search party.

Although the convicts expected searches to happen regularly throughout the prison, they were successful only in reducing the amount
of illegally held goods. Their success in discovering property which went beyond quantities of trivia was not very great.

This lack of success probably resulted from the fact that only an area of the prison was searched at any one time usually without the convicts being present. The convicts' ability to evade the searches resulted from their system of keeping important illegal goods moving while the prison authorities seemed to assume that they were kept regularly in particular places.

A convict (111) said "in searches lots of stuff was found out but lots of stuff was not found. It was just a matter of bad luck if I was searched or those three convicts over there. Convicts walk about with their most precious property on them such as money or marijuana, and most of the searches took place when we were out of the cells at work. When they searched they took away tinder sets and cigarette boxes which we made ourselves, excess newspapers and soap and shoes which should have been on the feet of their owners if they were entitled to them. They were never likely to find marijuana except by extreme bad luck. Perhaps there may have been as much as three thousand shillings in the possession of convicts here in the prison. These things were hidden in the soles of our sandals and in the tops of our shorts where the ropes passed along".

Another convict (89) described the background to the convict's reactions to searching and said "searches go on all the time but they only find rubbish. Friendly warders, Special Stage prisoners, clerks and prisoners at work in the administrative block gave tip-offs, and then everyone got ready. The convict in charge might have transferred the articles to another cell for which he got his share. There was much passing from hand to hand and acting up to assist this movement. Much was buried in the flower beds and the cracks in the walls and floor were used as well as the water-closet flushing system".

The searching at the gates had to be sporadic and limited or the time-table of the prison would have been held up with undesirable consequence in making the convicts resentful and the warder staff resentful of the extra work involved. A convict (113) said "only a few persons could be searched at the gate at any one time because there were so many passing through and the work could not be held up. It
was a chance that's all - the odds were not short".

Searches were made because it was necessary to make a show of searching in order to restrain smuggling or because a warder and a convict were in conflict, or because information had been given by an informer and a trap laid. The remands were likely to be searched more frequently than any other because their court appearance every fortnight were predictable and arrangements could be made to pick up smuggled goods at the courts. Those convicts who had attempted to escape in the past or who were considered to be potential escapists were also searched more often than the others.

The sheer mechanics of an effective search would necessitate the immobilisation of the whole prison for a whole day at least and involved a multiplicity of counter-checks to prevent complicity between convicts and with their warder friends, the passage of illegal goods between cells as well as skillful diversionary techniques.

Since the main method of controlling the movement of contraband were searches of cells and at gates, special methods had to be devised for getting such things at least into the cells in the first instance. One method was described by a convict employed in the stores (112) who said "I would never be found with anything on me during a search and I didn't take a thing out hiding it. I just carried it out".

The position of such convicts was also aided by the fact that they were known to the senior officers, often by name since only a few had such specialised jobs in places which they frequently visited. The same convict said "even if the warder on the gate was jealous of me and wanted the ball point pen which I was carrying, he would not do so because the other day the officer in charge said good morning to me by name. So the warder is afraid if I am known to the officer in charge. They marked that. If good morning was said to me by the officer in charge that was a certificate to me. There was no warder who will stop me anywhere".

Sometimes in order to get past the gate search a warder would help to get the contraband past by carrying it in themselves. Although this might have been a pure issue of corruption, some warders certainly viewed it as a means of controlling convicts who were potentially troublesome, since the event was often expressed as a personal favour
and coupled with a reminder that the convict concerned had to get on with serving his sentence without causing any trouble.

A convict (89) described this and said "if the warder had been in charge of a block for a week, he would give notice of a search or help to hide contraband. I repaired a primus stove for a warder corporal and he gave me two packets of cigarettes; we were to be searched in front of the officer in charge and when I got to the door, he searched me himself. On transfers to another prison if the warder in charge of the party was known to you, he would carry your special secret stores - money and marijuana. He would look after your things, he wouldn't steal or destroy them because if he did, you might try and escape and then he would be fined. There was no trouble in this as warders on escort were very nervous and therefore more inclined to honour prisoners."

The role of the informer in prison life was difficult to assess as most convicts assumed that they were constantly at work keeping the prison administration informed of people and events on which they could then act. A senior officer (86) said "I have never used one. The only one known in my service was a criminal lunatic who used to want to talk to the officer in charge, just sitting outside the window of his office, I didn't want one and I had never looked for one. It was a dangerous relationship as the informer would become powerful in the prison and be troublesome to other prisoners". It was accepted by the convicts that this particular officer did not use informers and that the senior staff did not want to hear or see informers so that when the Chief Warder reported to the officer in charge he would say that he got his information from warders rather than convicts.

Thus it was unlikely that the prison administration wanted or used regular informers since it put those senior officers using them in an invidious position. Prison warders also were not fond of informers because they were in a position to be informed against just as much as the convicts themselves and it was probable that only the middle staff grades had a professional interest in what they heard. However the Chief Warder who had a more delicate responsibility for keeping internal peace had to take account of all the information he
could get in order to hand off trouble by transferring trouble-makers from one yard to another and making spot searches for dangerous articles.

Possibly the word informer conjures up the idea of a semi-professional role in the same way that the police had to use a network of informers as a constant part of their activities. Some convicts (86) said that "informing was a personal relationship. It was not that someone always informed. New officers came and the old network disappeared when convicts were released and both orders had to create new relationships as they were strangers.

They also considered the informer to be an established part of the authority structure and that the officers were dependent on them for information before they took any action. It may have been part of the convicts' stereotype of the officers that they did not think them capable of being independently successful in their battle of wits with the convicts. A convict said "no one knew how this Corporal found the new hiding places, and I don't know who told him. Among the new cooks whom he had appointed he must have an informer. Somebody who informed him secretly" (92). This assumption that there was a network of informers organised by the prison authorities gained weight whenever there was an occurrence to suggest that some convict was making contact with the authorities. A convict said "there was one whom the corporal may have planted as a spy because he never used to be a helper in the kitchen. I remember the morning he was put there as a cook. I was told to call this man to the office in the morning but I never knew why he was wanted in the office. In the afternoon I found him in the cook block. I asked him if he was going to be a cook as I thought he was to be released. He said he was just called and told he was to be a cook. I think he might have been a cook but he was the same tribe as the Corporal, you know they talked their own language which no one else understood" (93).

It was possible that those who used informers saw them as members of the convict community who adhered to the same administrative ideals as they did rather than as men who looked for their own advancement and who broke the convict code of behaviour in so doing. This did occur in some cases and a convict (87) said "I worked on the outside gang
and if I saw someone who thought of escaping, I would report to the warders. I am trying to protect that prisoner as he was making his life worse for himself. He was also bringing trouble to us in the gang. In any case the warder in charge might have been a good warder and if the escape happens, he might have been transferred to our disadvantage. If I felt that a dangerous person had a knife I would report it. Once I went to an outside house with a trustee for marijuana and we were nearly seen by an officer. I was so upset by this narrow escape that I told the warder so that he should warn the whole gang."

There were also informers who saw another convict getting privileges to which they felt he was not entitled as a convict (89) said "when I was arrested, the prison authorities did not know that I was an escapee from another prison but an informer told the officer in charge and I was put on special watch and lost my privileges. It is the jealous man who becomes the informer". It was not possible to find out whether this allegation was true or not, but this experienced convict did not consider that this information could have come from his finger-print records catching up with him.

Most convicts considered that the informer was more likely to be motivated by jealousy than by attempts to gain personal power and influence with the assistants. A convict (94) said "informing was some sort of jealousy. Someone finds you with something which he wanted which you refused politely enough. Only a little while later he finds that you could have spared him some after all. He would then try to tell the whole thing to the warders." Another convict (126) wrote "if I was working in the fibre section without giving any trouble and completing my task on time another convict who was lazy and could not do the work, might have told the warder that I was able to finish the task on time because I had stolen fibre from other convicts there".

In general convicts considered that informers were those who wanted to get a position of privilege in the first place and who subsequently had to continue to inform to maintain that position. One convict (90) said "prisoners didn't really think that anyone was an informer except those who held good positions" and another (86) said "remember that when anyone got a position of trust like being in
charge of a cell, he had to maintain his position and he would do this partly by passing on useful information to the corporal warder so that he could be on his guard. He was much better off after this as he was in a better position”. Another convict (89) was more contemptuous of these advantages and said that “the informer was stupid enough to think that he would benefit by getting extra food, promotion in stage and become a ward leader but it was not true”.

The role of informer was probably the most sensitive one in the prison to adverse criticism and it was more difficult to get direct information about "stool-pigeons" than it was about homosexuality. Their types seemed to conform to those discovered in a United States prison (2) and those whom it was suspected had acted as informers were either first offenders who had previously held good positions on the outside or those who did not regard themselves as criminals and were very hostile to their enforced association with "real criminals". The remainder were petty and persistent criminals of weak character who had wanted to get advantages for themselves by informing, and it was possible that "the very young man who was not conditioned to criminality but who found himself in prison, and was pretty overwhelmed by the whole thing" would seek the protection of an older and experienced convict in what may have been initially a quasi-homosexual relationship rather than attempted to act as an informer.

Whatever the prison officers felt about informers and their morality it was almost impossible for them to ignore information which came into their hands from informers. If it related to possible serious events they could not refuse to take action as in the event of it being true, they would have made themselves liable to disciplinary action afterwards for dereliction of duty. A convict (88) said "the authorities weren’t fools and they didn’t believe what you said just there and then, but they were on the watch nevertheless and could soon see whether that person had told the truth or not”.

It was probable that the role of informer was less important than it was before the introduction of the earnings scheme and lawful canteen purchases since contraband was now more difficult to identify and explanations less easy to disprove. At least convicts considered it to be less common and there was very little animosity shown in the
interviews to the hypothetical informer. They referred to the beating up of informers in the past when the prison discipline was much harsher but now they considered that this would have resulted in their losing remission. A convict (89) described their present reactions to informers and said "we knew the three informers in the prison at the moment and keep out of their way. If we hit them, we would only lose remission so it was best just to keep it in mind and hope to meet him outside. We ourselves bribed them with kindness so that they suspected nothing - if we had boycotted them, they would immediately suspect something and a searched followed. In June however they appointed a ward leader who used to be an informer and the convicts rejected him by refusing to eat or to enter the ward again so he was soon taken away. It was easy enough to get rid of such an informer. We just wrote a letter to the Commission complaining about the officer in charge and sign his name and number".

The convicts realized that the informer was just as unpopular with the staff as with themselves and that if they did not go too far they could make the informer's life as unpleasant as they liked. A convict described an incident involving an informer saying "we didn't want to hit the informer, just to give him a good fright to stop him doing it again. He dashed off to the gate and told the warden he was being hit. We followed and told the warden that if he thought he had been hit by us he should be allowed to go to the office and make a charge; we gave him full permission in front of the warden. I felt that this was too good an opportunity to miss so that when the Sergeant came round after the mid-day court I stood up and said to the informer that he was accusing me of hitting him. The informer had to stand up and he repeated his accusations; of course the Sergeant asked him why he had been hit and he had to say out loud in front of everyone that it had happened as he had informed. The Sergeant then said that they were in charge of the prison and not convicts such as him who had only been there a few months, and that people who caused trouble such as this deserved a beating and that as far as he was concerned, the informer ought to have had a more thorough thumping than he had had so far" (116).

It could be seen that the authorities not only disliked informers
but saw in an incident like this an excellent opportunity to gain popularity as individuals and to divert some of the dislike of authority away from themselves onto this small group who could do little to protect themselves since they were known to be informers. In this incident the informer had not only been privately threatened and punished by the persons against whom he had spoken but had been publicly humiliated by being provoked into complaining against them in public.

The role of the informer was not entirely negative as once he was known, he stopped illegal activity which was going on in his immediate area even if he had no intention of reporting it. A convict (117) said "I wandered round the rations when the warden's back was turned but I couldn't take anything as there was an informer standing there". In conversations with the staff there was no recognition that informers whether they continued to inform or not, automatically exercised a moderating influence on the amount of illegal activity in their areas.

IV. Response to discipline

The stereotype of obedience in child and criminal has already been described as it affected their life outside. Inside prison, the convict saw no obligation to oppose authority unless he was forced into a corner and felt obliged to retaliate. A convict described such a situation (33) and said "a warden decided to search me during work and found a spoon in my pocket which I should not have had in the work area. I asked to be excused saying that I should have been searched on entering. The warden replied that I was a troublemaker and that he would see to it that I lost some of my remission. This made me angry so we started swearing at each other and ended up fighting. Later in the small cells I was given my mid-day meal at 3 p.m. when it was cold; the Corporal in charge would not listen to my complaint and said that I wouldn't be in the cells if I was not mad, so I threw the food into the urinal". This resulted in two charges for assaulting a prison officer and refusing to eat which could have been dealt with by a warning for the first and some sympathy for the second event.

In general they regarded it as luck whether they were charged with offences in circumstances when they were not provoked, and that
obedience or at least the external signs of this, was the best policy. One convict wrote (39) that "the prisoners obeyed the rules not merely on wishing, but on weighing the circumstances surrounding the order enforcing the rules".

Others gave their views more explicitly (40) and wrote that "if you didn't obey, you got unnecessarily messed about and put into the small cells away from everyone else on dry porridge without vegetables. If you got this done to you, it just reduced the length of your life. You ended up with a longer sentence and came out of prison an old man. No one wanted to delay his own return to his home". Another (41) concurred and wrote "I obeyed prison rules so that my time wouldn't be increased. Also, if a man did not follow the rules, he would be chivied about by the warders all the time. If I didn't obey, I would find my sentence very lengthy and letters from home made me think about this". Another, underlined these views (42) with "there was no point in challenging authority. Indeed, we were men, but government was a stronger man than all of us put together".

Prisoners on the whole did not see any virtue in opposing authority for its own sake since they recognised the legality of government even if they did not accept the application of the law to their own particular cases. A convict quarrelled with a warder and an observer said that "another convict came up to him and said that it was bad to quarrel with a warder. The warder had done no wrong and he was certainly not responsible for your imprisonment so leave him alone. Remember when you quarrel with a warder, you were not hitting him but all of us because we would feel the harsher discipline just as much as you. If he was a harsh warder we could not do much to restrain him but with a reasonable one we could at least see that he was able to remain that way by giving him the respect which was his due" (100).

This was very much the general view of the convict community who looked with disfavour at the hot-headed ones who behaved aggressively to authority for their own personal reasons without any backing from their fellows. These convicts were certainly not regarded as leaders but the authorities probably saw in them a direct challenge which had to be met and assumed quite incorrectly that they were the
leaders and represented a potential if not an actual challenge to their control.

A convict described these antagonistic prisoners and said that "they were the ones who had had numerous gaol sentences and no matter how carefully it was explained to them, could not understand the reason behind an order. He would only obey if it was in his interests to do so and if you tried to use force on him, he reacted immediately with force. If you told him to behave or he would go to the punishment cells, he laughed in your face as he had been there so often" (101).

Another convict develops this theme of the interdependence of disciplinary staff and convicts said "of course some warders broke the rules by letting off prisoners whom they found breaking prison regulations. They did this because the prison was a community and if such a warder upset prisoners in this way he would become unpopular and no one would greet him or talk to him when he was on duty in the yards. Similarly we recognised that these officers were our friends who wanted peace and quiet just as much as we did and we tended to do what they wanted particularly if they asked us. If a prisoner and a warder got into a feud which seemed likely to affect the general peace of a particular yard, the prisoner would be penalised by his fellow prisoners - they certainly wouldn't join with him in his private feud against a warder. If a prisoner did this people of his own tribe would tell him to stop or they would punish him" (102).

Very few prisoners thought that a particular warder had a grudge against them and charge records of 548 prisoners showed that only six prisoners had been charged by the same prison officer more than once. Two of these charges were on the same day, one pair two days apart and the remainder three weeks, one month and three months apart. Convicts (43) gave accounts of what they considered to be unjust victimisation, and stated that "he had told a warder that if he were Minister for Home Affairs, he would cut the salaries of the warder staff because they did not do enough work. The warder was very annoyed and charged me, and on another occasion, a warder asked a cook for a cup of milk which he refused to give so that next day he was charged for using abusive language". There was a certain naivety in the account in
these men not expecting to be charged in the circumstances. There was very little evidence of victimisation of convicts by warder staff.

It would be reasonable to suppose that an offender would get prominence and tended to be charged again and again because he was known, but there were very few multiple offenders and 299 or 55.5% of these 540 prisoners had only one offence recorded against them and no evidence of escalating charges against particular prisoners.

The convicts divided the warder staff into those who were friendly and those who were not, and accounted for charging on this basis as something which was natural to expect rather than to depreciate. They did not put forward the idea that the warders involved in trafficking put men on charges to cover up their activities (47).

The details of those who did charge (Table 43) showed that there were wide variations in the numbers of charges made by officers. Allowances had to be made for the transfers of warders and prisoners so that their period together in any prison may not have coincided and that a few of which only two showed in the records, were charges made out on the direction of the officer in charge who would then have heard the case himself.

TABLE 43. Charges against prisoners—details from 540 prisoner records
Covering sentences in other prisons
Excluding charges where name and number not recorded.

(A) Made by senior officers and chief warders
One officer made 7, 6 5 and 3 charges each.
Three officers made 4 charges each.
Four officers made 2 charges each.
Thirteen officers made 1 charge each.

(B) Made by sergeants and below.
87 warder staff made one charge only.
20 warders made 2 charges each.
6 corporal warders made 2 charges each.
7 warders made 3 charges each.
1 warder corporal made 3 charges.
3 warders made 4 charges each.
2 L/Cpl. warders made 4 charges each.
2 warder corporals made 4 charges each.
3 warders made 5 charges each.
1 L/Cpl. warder made 5 charges.
1 corporal warder made 5 charges.
1 warder made 6 charges.
1 L/Cpl. warder made 6 charges.
1 corporal warder made 6 charges.
1 warder made 7 charges.
1 corporal warder made 7 charges.
1 warder made 8 charges.
1 L/Cpl. warder made 9 charges.
1 corporal warder made 9 charges.
1 warder made 10 charges.
1 L/Cpl. warder made 10 charges.
3 warders made 12 charges each.
1 warder made 17 charges.
1 corporal warder made 30 charges.

The corporal who made thirty charges was probably on gate duty checking convict gangs in and out and thus in a position of having had to charge many prisoners carrying contraband however few were searched. It was estimated that about one half of the warder staff during the period of the research had made no charges at all. Charging was at all times a question of the circumstances, particularly of the personalities involved.

Other prisoners sought to get on charges. Examples reported in interviews, were initiated by the desire to break the monotony of a long sentence, to enjoy the privacy of a single cell for a time and to join a homosexual partner who was already serving a period in the punishment cells.

The warders themselves recognised that there were limitations on the number of charges which they could bring. In practice and in the eyes of the senior staff (45) the "average warder was the man who was basically responsible for running the prison; it was only to those in authority that the convict was a number while the majority of warders referred to prisoners by their names". They were in close personal touch with the prisoners all day and every day; whatever the role structure, which gave them different functions in the running of the prison, the warders and prisoners were socially drawn to each other by race, tribe and propinquity. Certainly at the beginning of the study when British Officers predominated, the warders and convicts were basically sympathetic to each other as fellow Africans provided that the former were not required to turn this sympathy into active disloyalty. Also as members of the same tribe certain warders and convicts came from the same areas and were able to converse in their own dialects.

Whether or not to lay a charge against a prisoner may have depended upon whether the matter would become known to others whatever the actual offence. When two men were fighting to solve a private quarrel about which a warder had found out by accident, a convict on-looeker said "they should be charged as they were homosexuals but the others said that they should be let off as they would now at least
respect each other. The warder said that he could not let them off as one was dripping blood and both their shirts were torn and bloody. But the convicts said that the injured man could tend his own cut and the shirts could be cleaned and repaired by morning. So the warder who was a real friend of the people let the matter go" (103). In another case "a warder came across two men who were fighting but they realised that if the matter went forward they would be punished so they said they were just having a friendly tussle, so the warder saw that he had no cause to make a charge since the convicts themselves would not give true evidence" (104).

From this it could be deduced that warders were not going to make themselves more unpopular than they had to be. If they became unpopular, life could be made unpleasant by abuse and generally framing the warder so that in the eyes of authority, he was inefficient and did not have proper control over his prisoners. A carefully conducted campaign of non-co-operation with a particular warder could soon teach him the undesirability of being too efficient. For example it was easy for convicts to make the daily counts of the prisoners and their tools a farce if they wished, since they were not going anywhere anyway and the warders thereby would be prevented from going off duty.

Another problem of discipline was not so much keeping the warder and convicts socially apart as their roles would require but the difficulty of a warder who had made a successful or unsuccessful attempt to prosecute a prisoner. In either case he had to come back to duty in close proximity of this man and his companions. It often seemed to be the case that warders who did not want to charge a convict for prison offences felt compelled to come and discuss the matter with the convict afterwards. This was not necessarily because the warder was afraid to make charges but because he was possibly nervous of unpopularity with the convicts than he was prepared to admit. Similarly the convict, particularly the experienced long-term prisoner, wanted to assert his independence of whatever the warder threatened to do but not to the extent of provoking him again into further and more definite enmity. A convict describing a conversation with a warder said "he told me that I had caused him much more trouble than other convicts and what was more had done it in front of the other convicts. Supposing
I prosecuted you, he said what would have happened then. I replied that he could not prosecute me, that would only happen in court and all that he could do was to report my conduct. He then said if that was my attitude, he would charge me nevertheless. I replied that to a long-term prisoner there was nothing in that threat. I told him my name and my number and invited him to go and do it. I wasn't afraid nor was I afraid to ask him for a cigarette" (119). The convict had thus very adroitly shown his independence while at the same time restoring the status-quo by a very out-of-place request which relieved the tension.

A warder may also regret making himself unpopular with the convicts by being too much of a disciplinarian and seek an opportunity later to reinstate his good-will status. A convict described such an attempt and said "I wasn't satisfied with my food so I went to the warder on duty with whom I had recently quarrelled and asked for more. To my surprise he got me an extra ration. He then said why do you cause trouble to the warders when you know that they can charge you and you will lose remission. You think I am a bad man but I am not. Don't make a habit of swearing at warders. There was no need to swear just ask politely. You asked me for more food just now and I got it for you. I thanked him profusely and told him that he was a true son of this independent country" (120).

A convict described what happened after an unsuccessful charge and said "the warder and I stayed together until the evening count - I never said a word. After lock-up he opened my cell door and started to explain what had happened that afternoon and said he had indeed wanted to charge me but I had got away with it because of my clever tongue and anyway he wasn't really meaning to go ahead with the charge and only wanted to give me a good fright and before he went off duty gave me a small present of tobacco" (99). The warder was under strong pressure to try and reach a neutral relationship with the prisoner concerned as he did not like the idea of having this feeling of animosity coming at him when he was on duty, since he wanted to be liked while he was at work just as much as anyone else. However this did not give the convict a superior position as he also did not want the resentment of the warder to be an unpleasant factor in his future
social life in that yard. The prisoner in the above incident reacted to these overtures and said "I then started to soft-soap him telling him that he was indeed a warder on the outside with the people. He could do what he liked when he liked outside but we were shut inside the prison, so could he get me a shilling's worth of cigarettes? I would be very grateful as my home was a long way off and no relatives who could come and visit me with presents. He replied that if I was lucky I could get what I wanted". So before the evening was over, the quarrel had been completely resolved to the advantage of both the parties concerned and the warder was not going to be subject to convict pressure and the convict had worked his way well towards getting the warder to traffic on his behalf.

This social relationship went further with some warders who had more personal reasons to identify themselves with the life inside than outside and a need to be liked. A convict (45) stated that "many warders were highly thought of by prisoners who even shared their food with them, especially those who had no wives in the lines. Others kept a watch out for senior staff. Others helped the prisoners by doing them any small services by getting things in from outside without making any profit. It was impossible to be liked by the prisoners and not break the rules because the rules said that the warder must never be familiar with a prisoner and under such a rule, they just could not speak to each other, not chatting and never getting used to each other".

Another reason for the restriction on charging was that the warder could directly profit from a close relationship with the prisoners. This was explained by a senior officer (28) who stated that "the warder was underpaid on an average wage of 200/- per month despite a free house and uniform. If he got an opportunity to better his food supply through trading, he would do so. I assumed that a very large number did it. A packet of cigarettes would buy almost anything". In the simplest terms he could benefit himself materially much more by being able to traffic than by maintaining discipline in the hope of eventual promotion.

A further reason (46) was that the warders saw that the office staff could only cope with a certain number of charges every day
without getting into clerical difficulties. The senior staff was overworked already and they did not welcome a rush of charges which involved them personally in extra work. Also there were only a limited number of punishment cells available less those occupied by persons under mental observation, so that they could not have more than twelve prisoners under punishment at any one time without getting into administrative difficulties and the consequences of not being able to carry out the punishment. It was more sensible to keep a few punishment cells empty all the time than to fill them with prisoners. The prisoners recognised the selective nature of charging for prison offences and realised that the staff did not want to charge for reasons of time involved, disturbance caused later and their own need for a reasonable balance between staff and convicts. A convict said that "the charges which went forward were those concerning convicts who caused malicious premeditated trouble with the warders. If any convict was up to such tricks even a minor fault would result in a charge. It was stupid to provoke such a situation as any warden or senior officer if he wanted could find twenty things to charge a prisoner for at any time" (101).

As had already been stated the warders were expected to control the prisoners under their supervision and a spate of charges, while being accepted as a sign of the concerned prisoners' offences, was also taken as a sign that the warden was not doing his work properly by stopping the offences before they occurred. A senior officer (118) remarked "if a warden brought fifteen charges against prisoners in one week, I would have regarded him with very very great suspicion. What was he trying to sell with the prisoners couldn't afford to buy". The warders were acutely aware that too much contraband found during a search was bad for their chances of promotion.

It was noticed when examining charges by warders (Table 43) which covered a period of three years that two warders who made three and four charges respectively were promoted to lance-corporal while none of the heavy chargers gained promotion in the same period. It could be accepted that the average warden was under both social and administrative pressure to charge prisoners as infrequently as possible.
The distribution of charges by months (Table 38) showed that there were no trends which could be attributed to climate. December–January were the hottest months and June–July the coolest. January 1962 had the highest rate recorded but January 1963 was one of the lowest and June and July went up and down quite irregularly. It was not possible to correlate offences with rainy days as meteorological data was not available but there were very few days in which rain would have prevented the prisoners from working, and this would not have involved them in being confined to their cells with the consequent build-up of tension. Comparable data from the United States (124) suggested that prison offences were related to the greater heat in summer when the temperature was over 75 degrees and good behaviour to the early summer, but this could not be a true comparison since the average heat here was always above this throughout the year. It was also not possible to check offences against the temperature normally felt in the prisoners' home areas although one third would have come from the temperate upland zone.

The division of offences by days of the week (Table 44) showed a steady rise in the number of offences to Thursday and then a decline, and considering that Saturday only involved work until mid-day and that on Sunday they were locked up all day except for meals, there were relatively more incidents on Saturday and an insignificant number on Sunday. A comparison with Pentonville, London (44) showed a higher lower rate for Sunday and a peak of offences on Tuesday. In this prison it was not possible to explain the reason for this peak on Thursday, even if there were a majority of Moslem convicts in the prison, who would rest on Fridays outside, their day of rest would still be Sunday as that was the official government's day of rest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Incidents of offences by days of the week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

516 offences

Except for special work parties, games teams going outside to
play football, cook details and special handicraft men working for their own benefit, the majority of prisoners were confined in their wards from 1 p.m. onwards and an analysis of the times of offences showed a concentration in the morning and at meal times when they were associating with the warders rather than in the afternoons when the convicts' own internal disciplinary system would be used rather than to call in warders from outside the cell block.

The distribution of offences geographically within the prison (Table 45) showed that 60% occurred in the prison yard and a further 16.8% during work other than in the workshop. The offences at the gate related to the attempted smuggling in of prohibited articles, and at the kitchen offences related to stealing food could have been expected but not in these rather low numbers. The very small number of offences in cells and wards in which the prisoners spent the majority of their time was very significant, and it confirmed that there was a strong element of self-government in the cells in which left to themselves, they did not provoke trouble involving the authorities. The periods out-of-doors in which they were alone with a warder away from the supervision of senior officers involved little strain and some accommodation with the warder.

TABLE 45. Location of prison offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prison yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Library - recreation room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Main office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cells and wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>At outside work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pre-work assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Punishment cells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sick parade in prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Recumbent ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Laundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

500 offences

The concentration of offences in the yard when there were large numbers of prisoners present suggested that the staff may have felt the need in public to assert themselves more than they would have felt the need to do in less public places. The prisoners may also
have felt the need in public to respond to challenges of authority, not only because it was authority showing itself there but also because the events took place in front of so many of the other convicts. Such offences were refusal to line-up when ordered, using threatening language to a warder and smoking on parade.

It was also the place in which prisoners were searched when returning from work and where they were called out into work parties, so there were large numbers of charges for possession of prohibited articles, refusing to work, and finding their clothes incorrect according to the regulations (48).

In general the yard was the assembly area of the prison which every prisoner passed through several times a day, and in which much larger numbers of prisoners congregated at any one time than would be possible in a prison of star-shaped design. At one time prisoners ate in the yard rather than in their wards until this was recognised as a security risk and food was then distributed to wards at meal-times. Enemies came across each other in the yard and there were occasional fights. A warder could wait for a particular convict until he came out of his ward, or was returning to it. The concentration of offences in the yard was a result of the architectural design of the prison.

An analysis of offenders against prison rules by their ages (Table 46) showed that 56.7% of the offences were committed by those under 25 years while the proportion of the prison population was 44.9% only. The younger prisoners tended to be the main offenders against prison discipline with the under 20's proportionately much more likely to be charged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% prison age distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 20</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 25</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Short-term offenders who were in the prison for a maximum of 4 months committed 43.5% or 166 offences in a consecutive sample of 382 prison offences with the long-term prisoners carrying out the remainder. The long-term offenders by length of sentence and opportunity committed a very small proportion of the offences.

If the occurrence of the offence was related to the period of the sentence in which it occurred (Table 47) it could be seen that up to half-time accounts for 72.0% of all offences and that there was a sharp drop to 8.8% occurring in the period immediately before release. They were thus very conscious of loss of remission and its relationship to prison offences.

| TABLE 47. Time of prison offence related to passage of sentence including remission allowed |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------------|
| First fifth of sentence | 71 | 22.4 percentage |
| Second fifth of sentence | 82 | 25.9             |
| Middle fifth of sentence  | 75 | 23.7             |
| Fourth fifth of sentence  | 61 | 19.2             |
| Last fifth of sentence    | 28 | 8.8              |
| Total                     | 317 | 100.0%           |

The daily offence rate varied from 0.3% per day in May 1961 with a prison population of 604 (Table 38) to 2.5% per day in November 1962 with 1092 prisoners. The average for the whole period February 1961 to September 1963 was 1.3% which was below English rates for five prisons (49) but the offences per head of daily average of population were substantially lower. This prison's lowest rate was .001% in May 1961 and the highest .006% in January 1962. So in comparison to a variety of English prisons, there was an extremely low offence rate, and a comparatively law abiding prison.

A comparison with Pentonville (50) showed some significant differences: one-third of the violence, no escapes and breakers of parole, 13% less insubordination and then a host of other offences which might not have come under comparable classes and which made up 44% of the Mombasa offences; these including refusal to work, leaving place of work, quarrelling with another prisoner, not wearing uniform as ordered and the general group of offences classed as contrary to good order.
V. Outside disciplinary controls

Each prison had one or more Visiting Justices appointed by the Prison Department and published in the Government Gazette, who were expected to visit the prison at regular intervals. The duties and obligations of the Visiting Justices were laid down in a small handbook (53) issued on appointment. It stated therein that these appointments served two purposes - "fostering public interest in the manner in which prisons are conducted, thus providing public confidence in the Prison Administration and it also gives the prisoners a channel of appeal outside the administration of the prison". While required to investigate any complaint or request, they were asked to bear in mind the necessity of upholding discipline in prison institutions.

A third reason which the senior officers (45) admitted was that it protected them from false accusations of brutality and maladministration made by the prisoners during their sentence or after their release. The Visiting Justice recorded all the complaints which were made to him in a register and if these rounds were made regularly and a prisoner did not make a complaint, then he could not very successfully make a subsequent complaint.

He was indeed accompanied by a prison officer on his rounds more for his protection than to reduce or in any way hinder the making of complaints. Probably a greater restriction on this was the fact that at the beginning of the research the majority of Visiting Justices were non-Africans and they had a very limited knowledge of Swahili.

He was allowed to visit any part of the prison and to inspect food, workshops and punishment cells. His arrival in a cell block was usually loudly announced and he was surrounded by a small group of convicts which grew according to the amount of Swahili talked. The majority of the complaints were minor ones in which it was felt that a complaint to the Visiting Justice could accelerate or change an application to the officer in charge and get a favourable result. It did not seem to be taken as an opportunity for serious complaints because it involved a face to face confrontation, which possibly all prisoners except those who identified themselves with a political reason for their offence, tended to avoid.
On occasions the senior staff drew the attention of the Visiting Justice to matters which they felt ought to be changed and which their department was likely to refuse, hoping that their observations would be read there and cause a change to be considered, such as the difficulties of housing and observing lunatics. Sometimes there had been prisoners on remand for unusually long periods, and the Visiting Justice's recording of these delays might have caused the police to complete the case or discharge the accused.

The Visiting Justice was legally empowered to hear any complaints, to enquire especially into the condition of prisoners under punishment, to call the attention of the officer in charge to any irregularity in the administration of the prison or fault in the conduct of any prison officer and to record any suggestions or remarks which he may have had to make.

These comments were forwarded to the Commissioner of Prisons for his attention, to which were attached the comments of the officer in charge. If the Visiting Justice wished to pursue a complaint, he could do so by persistently recording a particular irregularity. His ability to do so effectively was limited by the fact that he was appointed by the Prison Department at whom this criticism was directed and his appointment could be withdrawn.

The intention to allow a channel for complaints was there but the circumstances were against the systematic hearing of problems; the prison was several miles from town and Visiting Justices were prepared to fulfill a social obligation at some inconvenience but not to deal punctiliously with an extended progression of complaints which could take a day to go through and record. Thus matters were heard superficially and recorded in one line with the name and number of the applicant. Once the matter was recorded, it almost inevitably got the same answer as it got when the matter was originally dealt with by the officer concerned. The system of Visiting Justices while designed to protect the prison and prisoners from abuse, was of very limited use in this respect and acted more to protect the prison officers from unwarranted complaints.

VI. Custodial problems

The custody of the prisoners was the main concern of the prison
staff and the administration was organised to ensure this. The duties of the officer in charge as to custody were explicit (130), and were time-consuming both in movement and in maintaining the requisite registers. This was accepted by the senior officers (45) who stated that "whatever else you may have done about the prisoners' welfare, spiritual, practical or what have you, it was always drummed into you that your first concern was security. Your primary job was to see that he remained inside until he was released according to the law". Precautions were constantly taken on security grounds, such as the hitting of cell bars with a long steel pole, and worn-out tools being thrown into the sea rather than buried. Hacksaw blades were put into special custody each evening and drawn out again in the morning for workshop use. Everyone was looked at as a potential escapee.

This preoccupation with custody was shown in the officer in charge's order book (Table 48) in which he recorded his special instructions for the prison which were initialled by all senior officers under his command.

**TABLE 48. Superintendent's order book.**

| 1. | Female warders on duty. |
| 2. | Riot and Alarm orders. |
| 3. | N.C.O. or warden in charge Kitchen. |
| 4. | Sentry on duty by day. |
| 5. | Sentry on duty by night. |
| 6. | Daily duty senior N.C.O. |
| 7. | Chief warden. |
| 8. | Fire orders. |
| 9. | Prison hospital guards |
| 12. | Guards at C.P. General Hospital |
| 13. | For guard in case of attack from outside prison. |
| 14. | For receipt and issue of rations. |
| 15. | Office in charge documentation. |
| 16. | Escorting remands and accused prisoners to court. |
| 17. | Daily production of registers to officer in charge. |
| 18. | Searches. |
| 19. | Correspondence to be signed by Sup. in charge. |
| 20. | Sleeping in officers. |
| 22. | Officers away at weekend. |
| 23. | Checking and signing of work tickets. |
| 25. | Unauthorised use of prison transport. |
| 26. | Contact with Supt. of hours. |
| 27. | Washing prisoners clothing. |
| 28. | Internal cleanliness and sanitation. |
| 29. | Emergency sick to hospital security of. |
| 30. | Introduction of bogus tell-tale clock. |
| 33. | Night patrol check every 10 minutes. |
| 34. | Escorts for outside gangs. |
35. Escorts for prisoners going to outside hospitals.
36. Adjustments to prisoners' earnings while in hospital.
37. Shift duties over weekends.
38. Serving of production orders and notices.
39. Reception procedure.
40. Laundering prisoners' uniforms.
41. Mail from Post Office to go direct to Supt.
42. Duty truck leaving times.
43. Warning to drivers about privately arranged overloading.
44. Warder living at farm.

All escapes were treated as serious affairs and a special
enquiry form (54) had to be completed which made specific statements
as to why the escape was allowed to occur and whether any warder in
charge of that prisoner should be charged with a prison offence. It
did not appear that these charges were taken any more seriously by
the prison authorities than other offences since it was difficult
for them to enforce serious disciplinary measures when the only wit-
ness who could be called would usually be the warder himself or
another warder of equivalent rank. There was no evidence in any of
the cases studied of collusion between the warders and the escapes.

The first question to ask must have been whether in this medium
security prison, escaping would be possible or impossible. In this
connection it was not necessary to consider the rare individual who
planned to escape by use of determination and courage. No system
would hold them if they were present. This prison only contained one
such person who had escaped repeatedly in the past but he was now
middle-aged and concerned with completing his sentence.

Large numbers of prisoners worked outside the prison and it
would not have been difficult to run off while the attention of the
warder was elsewhere; in fact it would not have been necessary to run
as there was ample cover in the prison grounds to allow for secret
movement. Inside the prison, the roofs of the cell blocks were
attached to the outside wall covered with barbed wire; the prisoners
slept on coconut fibre mats which could have been used to get over the
barbed wire. Possibly rope would have been necessary, but that was not
difficult to get and ever, prison sealer produced newly made lengths
of fibre rope and string made to use as clothes lines in the cells.
An escape-conscious officer could take this as being evidence of pre-
paration for escape but it was so common and impossible to stop as
many convicts were involved every working day on rope-making and nat
wearing. There were ample ways of escaping that were not too difficult.

Since these opportunities existed the absence of escapes was very noticeable. The record of the prison showed one escape, soon recaptured, in a period of over two years. So few escapes had occurred prior to that occasion that it was not possible to analyse them. There were none from inside the prison and the remainder were either from outside work or during visits to the hospital as an out or in-patient. This was well below the average for any prison as in 1962 there were 229 escapes from 33,843 prisoners admitted (55) which was in any case a very low rate and may have involved almost immediate recapture. The public were not interested in escapes unless there was a known violent man at large. Escapes did not get publicity because the newspapers did not have to look for news to fill their small editions outside politics, international relations and crime. It was doubtful whether escapes were reported in the press at all unless the escape drew attention to himself through violent crime. Neither the government nor the general public appeared to take the prison service to task for escapes.

The senior officer (45) said that "escaping was never a problem and that the amount of time spent in preventing escapes depended on the Commissioner - the current one was very escape conscious while his predecessor never bothered if we lost a few. Escapes were inevitable - they got away from Colditz, let alone these chicken runs where they are guarded by warders who, to say the least, are on the indolent side".

The second question was whether they wanted to escape. The same senior officer said that "the vast majority didn't want to escape. No intricate arrangements were made for escape" and he qualified this hastily by "hoping that fifteen wouldn't go that night from a tunnel under the workshop. It was opportunity every time. If it didn't work the simple way, nobody bothered - it had to be a simple answer. No fear now of being shot while on the run, as there was in the Emergency, to restrain them. The vast majority knew where they were well off - they were no fools and pretty well off inside. They accepted the loss of their freedom. It was quite strange, their acceptance of their situation. A settled and equable atmosphere".
Discussion about escape was not a common subject in prisoners' interviews but in their statements there was considerable support for the prison officer's view. An old recidivist (56) said that "in the old days, when the prison was hard, all of us thought about escaping, not those days, when prison life was easy — no harder than a boarding school". Another (57) stated that "when a prisoner came to prison, he was upset and worried and because of this, he thought about running away, especially those with long sentences, but when he had finished half of his sentence, he gave up thinking about running away". It was perhaps significant that there was no verb-form for 'to escape' and the verb 'to run away' was used. Perhaps the clearest statement came from a long-term educated prisoner (58) who stated that "nowadays prisoners hardly ever escaped from prison, but still we find warders pretending to prevent them from doing so".

A prisoner going through the motions of attempting to escape without ever intending to do so could cause considerable disorganisation at one of the three daily counts by hiding. At the morning count, he could delay work parties going out. This may have been unwise as it meant everyone sitting in the sun and his fellow-convicts would resent it. A missing prisoner at the count before look-up (59) kept the whole staff shift on duty until he was found — in this case, about four hours extra work without inconveniencing his fellow-convicts at all.

In discussing escaping and prison conditions it did not seem that the prisoners were under any individualised tension which made them want to escape. There were no 'gorillas' and 'tobacco barons' inside who could have bullied or terrorised the weaker convict. Very few convicts seemed to be deeply attached to individual members of their families outside and such individuals were looked after by other members of the family so that they were apparently not in the sort of difficulties which the individual prisoner felt that only he could solve and might have had to escape to do it; the institution of a prison welfare service further reduced this type of potential tension. Escapes did not occur because of the prison security arrangements, but because the prisoners did not want to escape under existing conditions.
VII. Staff attitudes

It had already been established that there were no problems over discipline in this prison and that the rates for offences were very low. The attitude of the British senior staff at the start of this research was very ambivalent, even within the compass of one interview. The senior officer (45) said that "in dealings with the prisoners, there didn't seem to be any resentment, if I wondered about and talked to a prisoner, there was usually a cheerful answer. No turning away or sullen expression because I was a prison officer. I had never been threatened in the whole of my service. No one had ever tried to bewitch me (60). Happy in their work I could only presume".

This officer, sincere, humane and experienced in the terms of what he had been required to do, conceded that discipline was no trouble and that most of those who were charged in the prison "were petty offenders; general sort of party game between the convicts and the staff. I had never regarded tobacco as a serious offence but it had to be dealt with - I would have sold my own soul for tobacco if I were inside. Politics had had no effect one way or the other on prison discipline. A man got pushed a little too far by a warder who did not like him, there was a clash as they didn't like each other and the prisoner might even thump the warder. I've got to take a serious view by law, but the overall picture was no discipline problem". In this last case, it should be noted that provoking a prisoner was specifically prohibited (61).

There was nevertheless a general feeling among senior staff (45) that discipline had suffered through a let-up over prisoners but it did not show statistically, "I am not talking about beatings up; the slap or cut across the backside with a swagger cane did no harm and kept them on the move as in military detention camps. I was sorry that the new prison laws (62) did clip our wings to a certain extent on certain types of punishment but there it is - a pity". Discipline was usually administered tolerantly as the prison ran without the need for such activism.

The other attitude was possibly the consequence of their conception of the good prison being a prison in which little occurred to upset their routine. The occasional prisoner who really attacked the
system and caused constant trouble drew attention to himself far out of proportion to the trouble which he was alleged to have caused. In the prisoners' records, only one convict had had as many as seven prison offences listed against him.

Possibly because those convicts were unusual in that they did attack the system in a minor way and did not accept their sentences with the general equanimity of their fellows, their importance tended to be over-rated by the senior staff who reacted sharply. For these offenders, they (45) had no doubt that "the greatest deterrent to a convict was six strokes laid on by two hefty warders - it had always, in nine cases out of ten, brought about a complete change and in two cases I remember, they became model reliable prisoners". A convict (63) described such a prisoner and stated that "that young man who had the habit of liking a war all the time and got punished just as regularly but he never seemed to get enough and has lost a quarter of his remission already". The theory and practice of discipline was related only to the few troublemakers who upset the prison's equilibrium.

The same school (45) felt that the best way of maintaining discipline, and in this they grouped the warders and prisoners into a single category, was to maintain a sharp administrative and personal distance between senior officers and the subordinate group. "The greatest problem of African promotion to senior grades was familiarity. They were far too familiar with warders and some prisoners. There was no deliberate connivance in this. They mixed off-duty in our canteen. They were too lax. You saw prisoners leaning on the wall chatting to the gate-house officer whereas if he had been a European officer, his feet would not have touched the ground, he would have been on a charge so quickly. Rarely did you hear a warder, even a Chief Warder, refer to a senior African prison officer as Mr. So-and-So. Before there was some inherent respect - the reasons for it being whatever rank they may have been. I didn't foresee trouble because the prisoners would realise that they were on to a good thing and would not provoke them". Much of this attitude to discipline was quasi-military in character, that neatness in uniform, cleanliness in the prison and regularity were good in themselves as a means of training. A high proportion of the British Senior Officers and a
small number of warders had had military service. The urge for
discipline was principally satisfied by observed cleanliness.

Some prisoners commented on the development of the prison system
to a lighter discipline in comparison to what they considered to be
the harshness of the past. This was not due to any consequences of
political independence but to the conscious policy of the Prison
Department to utilise as far as possible the results of successful
prison reform in Britain. Convicts did not see these changes in the
light of penological theory and practice and one (126) commented that
"we were more easy to get on with than in the past - not so trouble-
some. If the prison staff relaxed their discipline, we naturally
relaxed in our opposition to them. If they had tried to turn on a
harsher discipline again, the prisoners would have reacted at once
with trouble of their own making. Similarly if we caused trouble,
the staff responded with harder rules. It was nonsense to suggest
that the staff did just what they wanted here in the prison".

The recidivist with a long criminal record was emphatic that
prison was easier than it was before (58) when they alleged that
there was a certain amount of beating and the work was harder. They
did not regret these times, only observed the differences. Most saw
their relationship to the prison as complying with government's legiti-
timate rules or even as assisting government. A convict (64) stated
"from time to time, a prisoner could get himself charged because he
had quarrelled with the prison laws which did not allow a prisoner
to behave either as he liked in prison or as he would at home".
Another (65) gave the example of "the prisoner who abused the warder
and got into trouble. I did not see the badness of these warders,
they were our guardians only in the prison to which we had been
brought because of our own crimes. For this reason, it was useless
to abuse them - they were not the ones who brought you here. If a
prisoner obeyed the rules, the warders wouldn't charge him with any
offence, but if he broke the rules, he would certainly have cause to
feel that the warders were unpleasant, although they were not naturally
so". In other cases (66) the prisoner felt that he was being tempted
into crime by warders who tried to get from prisoners, goods and ser-
VICES to which they were not entitled.
While the staff grudgingly accepted the fact that they could not run the prison without the assistance of the convicts, few of the convicts saw this and regarded their work as underpaid, but nevertheless a highly valuable contribution to the national economy rather than to the costs of running the prison.

Physical force as a means of enforcement of discipline was very little used except for the use of handcuffs when prisoners had to leave the prison. Although no cases were seen these mechanical restraints would be more likely to be used on mentally disordered prisoners than on offenders against prison rules. In minor disturbances the violence soon evaporated and it was rarely necessary to restrain the offenders further as they walked of their own volition to the punishment cells. The possibility of violence when the prisoner was up before the officer for punishment did not seem to be a serious consideration in the management of hearings.

The use of restraints and confinements were covered by detailed institutions (67) which prevented their use except under the authority of the senior officer in the prison and on being passed fit by the Medical Officer, except in cases of urgent necessity. Mechanical constraints were not part of the day to day life of the prison and they were never mentioned in any interview or document.

The use of force by a prison officer allowed (68) him to use reasonably necessary force to make the prisoner obey lawful orders or to maintain discipline, which covered manhandling when necessary. The use of weapons did not differentiate between the baton which every warder carried attached to his belt on duty and the firearm issued to him when he was in charge of an outside work-party. Their use was allowed when a convict was escaping or attempting to escape and did not stop when called upon to do so, also when there was a riot which would not stop or when a convict was endangering any life or likely to inflict grave injury. The proviso stated that in the first three circumstances, they should only be used unless "the officer had reasonable cause to believe that he cannot otherwise prevent the escape or riotous behaviour". In the event of a prison officer striking or using force against the prisoner, the latter must be medically examined as soon as possible and the incident reported to the officer.
in charge.

The injunctions concerning restrictions on the use of force could be treated casually in any organisation in which it was not positively controlled. In the Prison Service, particular care was taken not only that the use of force should be controlled by the law but also that each and every prison officer should be personally aware that if he used force without the benefit of legal coverage, he would not only be breaking prison regulations but would be liable to court action as well. Each personal file contained a printed form containing this warning, signed by the officer concerned. This undoubtedly was part of the reforms instituted after the Hola incident (29) but the expressed fear of a prison officer (45) was not the use of force under conditions in which he would be in control but "the danger of warders getting out of control in an emergency and their need in such circumstances to be carefully supervised." Certainly the use of force was carefully controlled in a positive manner throughout the Prison Service and during this research no cases were seen in which prisoners were subject to illegal force.

To a certain extent the rules related to circumstances or conditions which no longer applied. Convicts referred constantly to their freedom from manhandling which had occurred in the past and the unpopularity of two senior officers during this research related to their pushing men into line or hurrying them on with a shove, and a short strike was caused by this unpopularity and resulted in the transfer of one of the officers and a noticeable change in the behaviour of the other. The serious assault on a Chief Warder in which he was injured on the face was allegedly caused by manhandling a long-term prisoner once too often. There was no violence in the prison but even minor manhandling without cause initiated positive convict reactions.

The few cases of violence against officers or between prisoners made it questionable whether there was any need for weapons. An officer (45) stated that "the value of carrying a rifle was the uncertainty in the mind of the prisoner as to what the warder would do. The carrying of a rifle gave him pride". There was considerable discussion within the prison service at one time as to whether batons
should be worn visibly or inside the shorts as the Commissioner concerned thought that the sight of them might provoke prisoners. In the opinion of the same officer "the carrying of batons was not seen by the prisoners as a challenge since in the event, they were drawn not more than once a year, when a warden had to defend himself. But it was useful in breaking up trouble between prisoners; when warders saw a fight, they drew their batons and came at the run, and the prisoners saw the batons coming in the hands of the warders and usually stopped their trouble". Legally correct violence by the warders was very infrequent and the potential use of the baton stopped occasional trouble.

VIII. Incentive for the convict

It has been shown that compliance within the prison was not caused by fear of punishment and the actions of disciplinary officers, it was therefore necessary to examine the privileges which the prisoner could gain or lose by good and bad conduct. The main privilege of one-third remission was gained on conviction, stencilled on the prisoner's uniform and entered on all his papers as the anticipated date of release, so that without regard to conduct, he had gained a substantial reward which he could only lose by proved prison offences. He did not have to behave well in a positive sense to retain this remission, but only to keep out of trouble which was a much easier requirement to some extent independent of the prison authorities.

Other privileges such as visits and letters (69) were ordered in accordance with the prisoner's stage and no matter what the degree of misconduct of the prisoner, his entitlement could only be postponed (70) and never forfeited even when he was undergoing punishment. The prisoner was also on admission issued with clothing and personal equipment (71) which was common to all prisoners.

In the eyes of the Prison Service the Staff System was basic to the control of their prison population and insured that through a series of carefully graded stages earned by good behaviour, the prisoner would receive more and more privileges which he appreciated and was loath to lose again by bad conduct. The first point to remember was that the vast majority of all prisoners never rose beyond the
Third Stage because they were in prison for a short sentence and that substantial privileges (72) were only earned by a small minority of Stage I and Special Stage prisoners.

The differences in privileges between the first three Stages were minimal and depended more on the officer in charge dividing differences than on statutory obligations. It has already been shown that it did not restrict movement, and the officer in charge was almost always too busy and disinterested to devise special schemes which would have had to be instituted and maintained against the dead weight of both warder and prisoner conservatism. Stages did not appear to affect attendance at classes, entertainments and general movements.

Promotion from stage to stage required a written report (73) which allowed for as much as five lines of comments from workshop and block officers as well as the schoolmaster before the Superintendent could make an order. Almost all forms seen contained minor stereotypical remarks so that the process had not in fact become a system of rewarding good behaviour but of automatic movement, except to those who had been actively ill-disciplined and idle. The senior officers concurred (45) with this assessment and said that "the Stage System had been over-rated - it had become automatic. We knew too few of the prisoners personally to be able to make any assessments". The Stage System worked automatically and was only a positive inducement to good behaviour for a few long-term prisoners who wished to obtain and retain material comforts.

The convicts themselves did not appear to see the Stage System as a method of inducing good behaviour and one commented "Whether you were a good prisoner or a bad prisoner when release came you were just released like anybody else. The well-behaved prisoners didn't get the good jobs, someone with a bad prison record may have had a good job. Look at that chap who had a better job than mine and a bad prison record; he wasn't given that job because he was a troublemaker, it was just luck which job you got". They regarded it more as an inefficient system of keeping convicts in pre-determined groups. A prisoner (74) stated that "stages did not separate or keep people together, and if there was special reasons like being a cook or an
escapee, stages were not followed at all. Some avoided rising in
stages so that they could keep their associates or their homosexual
"wife". Even in the cell blocks, stages were not followed in cell
allocation, as for the peace of all concerned, it was better to leave
together those who got on together. In my opinion, the Stage System
when it was followed provoked trouble".

The long-term convict with a record for making trouble in prison
may have come to a turning point in which he realized the advantages
of conformity only after he had been severely punished, but it was
not in fact a response to the Stage System as such. Such a prisoner
(75) described such a situation and said "my head was all upset and
I didn't follow the rules of government and I lost many pleasures —
things of value. If I went on making trouble my children and my
mother would have been in trouble even more. If I behaved, maybe my
time would be reduced. I might be given a present for behaving well —
like being made into a trustworthy convict (76) — it would help you to get
over your sentence". The prisoners in general did not recognize the
Stage System as inducing good behaviour.

The convicts did not seem to have any views at all on what were
their rights and privileges, the class of the "barrack room lawyer"
did not exist except possibly for a few highly literate convicts who
drafted appeals and petitions for their friends in return for gifts.
The prisoner saw everything as being within the power of the officer
in charge or an even more senior official out of sight, if only he
could put up a good enough case to allow them to agree. It seemed
that they sensed that individually they could do nothing to benefit
themselves by claiming rights and that they preferred to manipulate
and plead. The officers in charge sought to impose uniformity on
their prisoners, not so much it was felt, because the rules demanded
this, but because the more minor deviations which developed as a con-
sequence of special requests, the more difficult it would be to ad-
minister the prison.

Those who complied as a personal policy did so to gain benefits
which were not in the Stage System. These benefits were in the gift
of the senior staff and were given to particular convicts who were
noticeably not trouble-makers and appeared to be helpful, and had no
relationship to stages. These jobs were for convicts who assisted in working out the monthly earnings, assistants to storemen, cooks and the cell-cleaners who earned without having to go out to work. It was by getting special jobs that significant personal rather than material gains could be obtained, since the majority of the work was dull and monotonous from which the prisoners could learn little of value.

Most prisoners seeking special jobs did not do this in order to get better opportunities for trafficking, and trafficking was the consequence of getting it. The main incentive was some degree of individualism as he was more his own master and could make his own personal life. The prisoner who carried the tea round the prison offices twice a day was prepared to play stupid and meek for months in order to get this opportunity, and he was chosen for these characteristics. The cleaner was alone all morning in the cell block and moved about unescorted. In a world of uniformity these could be a supreme pleasure.

Not only did these prisoners benefit directly from getting such specialist work but they also got the opportunities to enhance their status by being the main source of information to other prisoners. They were so unobtrusive that administratively they were not noticed so that the tea-maker saw files, the earnings clerk's assistant heard that transfers were being arranged. This information could be retailed inside for status and popularity, but not apparently traded for tobacco. The specialist worker was the principal source of prison information which gave him some increased status but the main benefits were some limited freedom to move and act on his own volition.

Although these jobs were usually obtained by conspicuous compliance, they could sometimes be obtained by aggressive non-compliance. One convict (75) who had caused constant trouble and had been given corporal punishment without any effect was eventually put in charge of the suspected lunatics under observation by a discerning officer and his conduct became exemplary so it was possible for the allocation of this type of work to be used by the staff to stop trouble. This man said that "no other prisoner wants my job as they look on me as a sort of warder, and call me an enemy and an informer. When I did my job, I was not accompanied by a warder, I was trusted. I tried to
quiet down some new admissions so that they didn't get into worse trouble. A further case was reported (58) that "a prisoner was always violent and indeed once held up the kitchen with an axe. He was always hungry and could eat six people's rations. He caused constant trouble until he was put on the kitchen work. They couldn't give him extra food but the officer in charge was sensible enough to put him in the kitchen where he would find his own extra food and there he settled down."

Removal from these privileged jobs was the usual result of any such prisoner breaking prison rules, although the rules only allowed for a reduction from Grade A Earning Rate with the approval of the Commissioner (77) and not for a job change as a specific penalty and it was this loss of a privileged job which was the main sanction for their good behaviour. The majority of these workers were in the lower three stages and the higher two stages tended to be in the workshops which was just as satisfying. They were less likely to be in trouble there because the work was both individualised, rewarding and leading to post-imprisonment employment. In fact the former jobs were particularly aimed at by those who could not get workshop places. The prisoners did not see that there was anything arbitrary in this system since even if they knew of it, they would not accept the necessity to conform to the prison administration's theoretical structure, instead of the incentives and excitement of personal manipulation.

More important than this allocation to work which could only affect a small proportion of the prisoners was the Earnings Scheme which applied to both short and long-term prisoners in all grades. All prisoners were put in three grades (78) according to the work which they performed in the prison. Grade A earned 20 cents per day for those prisoners who were skilled and of exemplary character including all Special Stage Prisoners, Grade B earned 15 cents per day and included those of good conduct and semi-skilled standard, Grade C earned 10 cents per day for all other prisoners. The rules stated that all prisoners shall participate in the earnings scheme so that it was a right and not a privilege. These were flat rates in which only Grade C could increase the sum by exceeding daily tasks and then not in excess of 20 cents per day. It was thus a scheme which induced
conformity to the average standards of work and discipline rather than effort since to complete the daily task quickly brought no particular benefits since they could not leave their work place or talk to their friends.

The rules for the Earnings Scheme (79) allowed for a prisoner to spend two-thirds of his savings on canteen purchases once a month, and to save one-third for use on his release. These purchases were kept in bags in a cell chest which was opened after working hours. It was an offence to be in possession of canteen goods during working hours. The earnings were also given if a prisoner was off-duty on sick-parade or under doctor's orders unless through his own fault. Prisoners who had to work on Sundays and Public Holidays (80) also received earnings.

The recording of daily attendance at work with the appropriate rates, the calculation of monthly earnings, the listing of the prisoners' requirements their purchase and subsequent issue, added substantially to the amount of clerical work in the prison, in which literate prisoners were only allowed to assist in the recording of requirements. It was occasionally necessary to employ convicts in clerical capacities in contravention of this order, so that the work could be done on time.

The Prison Service did not see the Earnings Scheme as an inducement to effort but only in terms of the control of discipline, stating (79) that "it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the value of the Earnings Scheme and consequent control of discipline will be negative if the officers in charge do not make it their personal business to see that slackness at work, absenteeism, inefficiency at work, indiscipline and lack of full co-operation are punished by fines, deduction of savings and even in serious cases removal from Earnings Scheme. The Earnings Scheme is one of the strongest disciplinary controls available in a prison and failure to implement the principles of the scheme properly will deprive the officer in charge of his powers of control afforded by the Scheme".

In the opinion of a senior officer (42) "Its powers as a deterrent were vastly over-rated particularly over the penalty of removal from the Earnings scheme - he didn't worry all that much, a prisoner in a
prison here could get almost anything he wanted through the warders".
The officers were indeed instructed to "make it their personal busi-
ness" to see that the prisoners earned their pay, but this was not
possible in a prison containing about one thousand earners.

The same senior officer stated that "even if we did lay down
piece work, we were still dependent on the ordinary warders to see
that the work was carried out. For example if the task was to pick
so many yards of cotton and the prisoner goes along the tops of the
plants. He reported task completed and the warder sees that there
was no longer much cotton visible. He did not go along the line,
bending down to see how much cotton was unpicked below the top".

If he was to catch someone, it became essentially an arbitrary
act and the punishments suggested became attached to other offences
which could be more easily proved or came more easily to notice than
'slackness'. The reference to daily tasks was also difficult to im-
plement as throughout the work period, marks could be and were moved
and work loaned and borrowed so that even the task of 300 feet of
string per day in the mat shop became more of a test of ingenuity to
circumvent than of hard work. It was impossible to implement the
Carrings Scheme according to the principles laid down by the Commis-
sioner and it was not much use as a method of discipline except as a
general payment from which only offenders could be excluded.

Even removal from the Earnings Scheme as a penalty had serious
drawbacks because the prisoner was not seriously penalised personally
if he had the normal ingenuity to traffic or had a semi-permanent
group of associates. The rules required that he should not have access
to his canteen bag in the cell's canteen box during the period of
punishment and by inference to the bags of others, so that he had to
be moved to another cell where there were no canteen purchases available.

Thus depriving a prisoner of the ability to earn (61) would not
deprive him immediately of much, since persons and goods moved rela-
tively freely about the prison, but induced him to undertake serious
trafficking.

The system of paying for daily work was important in giving the
prisoners some inducement to work and undoubtedly contributed to the
smooth running of the prison in reducing conflict aggressiveness and
reducing the need to traffic in forbidden property. This system of inducements worked well enough when the convict was considered as responding only to economic pressures. A convict (122) said "if you didn't want to work in the rope making section and worked as a domestic, you would be marked absent from the rope making section and get no money so that you worked in the domestic section for nothing. Nothing happened; I have been marking some people absent for one month; no one knew where they were in the prison. You would only get caught if you claimed work payment. Some did this because they found the daily task in the rope section difficult to fulfil, some didn't like working outside because it was too hot, some had got friends in another gang and they wanted to stay together". The prison was very much a bureaucratic system which functioned along the lines intended but not beyond this.

The prison's principal concern was over custody and provided the total number of prisoners was correct, their position in the prison at any one time was almost impossible to find out. The attendance record in one gang might show a convict absent and other convicts said that he was sick, on request or doing other work, might not be any more helpful or correct than the warder's own guess-work; certainly he could not check-up on the information or his own work would be seriously delayed. Thus in a bureaucratic system which only cared about the total numbers there were endless opportunities for ingenious manoeuvring. A convict (98) said "you could not refuse to work or you would be taken to the small cells. In the morning names would be called and after finding that you were all there, the Chief Warder would distribute the work saying: five to this, twenty to that. The roll-callers for each gang call the names of those who were there after you had lined up in the different gangs. He didn't check whether the people were there and the names in the book corresponded. The ones who were not there, he marked absent. He wouldn't notice if there were too many. When all this was going on there was plenty of movement so it was possible to slip from one queue to another. Someone could slip into the kitchen and wash a few plates and the Corporal thinks he was there as a helper".

The ingenuity required in evading this system may have been an occupation for those who would other wise concentrate their activities
in opposing authority more openly. Describing such a man the same convict (123) said "there was one chap who often slipped from the rope gang to the sick-bay and when that queue moved on he stayed with them until about ten o'clock and then goes to the kitchen. This man came and went in and out of prison. I don't think he was lazy because he worked hard when he got to the kitchen. In fact he did more work by doing this and going to the kitchen than if he had stayed in the original rope gang and came off work at mid-day. He might have been finding things for his brain to do but he was queer in many things. He would quarrel with the warders".

The Earnings Scheme has had several consequences, firstly to make available in the prison as of right, a minimal amount of goods which had been previously forbidden. This money was even seen as a salary (82). To the average prisoner, who had no interest in challenging the prison system, it was a source of additional contentment with the conditions in the prison in which he had to remain.

Secondly, it allowed a certain amount of trafficking to be beyond the powers of disciplinary action. The prisoner was found in possession of cigarettes, sugar, tea, milk and other commodities which he may well have obtained by trafficking but when challenged, it could become part of his own canteen purchases, or if he did not purchase a similar article, one he had exchanged with another prisoner. Endless trading ramifications could be explained to the enquiring officer which could rarely be disproved although the staff knew that there was a considerable amount of trafficking going on particularly in cigarettes, it was difficult for a particular incident to be proved. The canteen list for each month would contain cigarettes of almost every local brand legitimately ordered and obtained and the suspected cigarettes would belong to one of these brands; provided that the quantities were small, it was almost impossible to track down whether they had been legally or illegally obtained. A convict (127) said "if you were caught with two packets of Sportsman cigarettes and this was less than a month's earnings there was a good excuse as somebody here was my friend; he could give me anything he wanted from his canteen issue".

A convict (115) said "if you were found with more cigarettes than you could have bought yourself you could always say that you got them from
someone released. Prison authorities when they searched the prison
must see 15 to 20 packets of Sportsman cigarettes although only 2
packets were ordered on the monthly canteen list. The officer in
charge leaves the subject alone as the prison was quiet, he was
clever. The convicts concerned of course thought they were clever.
Also they did not hide certain contraband as they had some things so
long that they had forgotten that the law existed”.

It would have been possible for a prison officer to try and
check back on the actual location of such issues but at every stage
he would be blocked by conflicting evidence; even if he found more
cigarettes than had been bought in the previous month, he had proved
nothing as convicts would say that they had been kept from previous
months. Again it would have been possible to search the whole prison
in theory but there was not the staff to do this and contraband would
either be efficiently hidden in the yards or passed from one yard or
cell to another during the search. Nothing would be accomplished
except perhaps to irritate the warders and prisoners involved in such
a mass search and to disorganise the work schedules for the day con-
cerned. The prisoners (127) recognised that provided they kept within
reasonable limits, the staff were not going to take extensive action
against contraband cigarettes, and said “the staff people behaved on
the basis of what they didn’t see, we hadn’t got. They didn’t see any
harm in prisoners having cigarettes. A sensible officer didn’t inter-
fere with other people. While going round on inspection he would find
50 packets of Sportsman cigarettes while only two packets could be
here legally. He would check but he didn’t do it. He’d say to him-
sell these people will get cigarettes and the warder brings to them.
If I tried and stopped them, I couldn’t do it, no matter how hard I
tried. They can keep their cigarettes and behave well and my jail had
no trouble, it was all right”.

While this may have been the attitude of the experienced and in-
telligent officer, very few convicts recognised that there was this
balance of tolerance, and assumed that because they had obtained and
retained their illegal cigarettes they were clever. The same convict
(127) said “they didn’t hide them because they think they had good
excuses. They had forgotten that the law existed as they had been
accustomed for a long time that no one took interest in them. It also gave the prisoners a stock in trade over and above prison property, with which to initiate trafficking with warders. Canteen purchases thus could cover and enable prisoners to traffic with the staff.

Lastly by allowing prisoners to have certain goods in reasonable and regular supply, it contributed to the quiet running of the prison in general, as goods never became so scarce that certain prisoners were able to build up trading positions from which they were able to exact interest and services from other prisoners. It also cut down on the necessity to traffic with the staff to obtain everyday luxuries. The availability of these small comforts in relation to the usual low standard of living of the convicts certainly reduced illegal trafficking and prevented the formation of extorting individuals trading on scarcity as occurred elsewhere.

It was significant that the minor details of the scheme as to whether the sums allocated were correct and whether the days at work had been entered in the register under a prisoner's name, never seemed to be questioned. The prisoners never suggested that they had been cheated of their entitlement. They were very obviously satisfied to receive such sums and the canteen purchases.

The Earnings Scheme in a poor and newly independent country was an expensive luxury and a senior officer (45) stated that "the first thing to go after independence would be the earnings scheme, we had been warned and the prisoners know it too". Prisoners with whom this was discussed agreed that this was likely but it did not seem in any way related to their uncritical acceptance of the running of the current system. The prisoners were very satisfied with the existence of an Earnings Scheme and its day to day running.

IX. Effectiveness of Incentives

It is necessary to summarise the effectiveness of reward and punishment. Reward had been put first because the prison must be seen not as an isolated community comparable to a prison outside Africa, but as a prison inside a country which was poor and the livelihood of most of its inhabitants hard indeed. The prisoner entered confinement
and received a standard of living which was above that of the ma-

jority of the country's inhabitants, ignoring the fact of imprison-
ment as the greatest unpleasantness. A senior officer (45) summa-
rised his long experience by saying that "I do not think they felt
deprieved. The majority were far better off inside than outside. I
accept that they miss drink and women". He was in fact rewarded for
conviction by getting two blankets, running water, soap, electric
light and clothing, which few of them have ever experienced all to-
gether, and so frequently as to become used to them. This point was
stressed by the cost of feeding a prisoner given as 80 cents per day
or 260/56 per annum (84). Combined with his tendency to obey govern-
ment this was not a situation in which he was going to initiate non-
compliance with the prison system.

Above the basic facts the prisoner was further rewarded for com-
pliance through the earnings scheme which he enjoyed from the start
of his sentence if he did not obviously commit offences. Prisoners
mentioned the scheme as a positive asset in prison life, but never in
the context of making them behave. It was doubtful whether penalties
involving their ability to earn or to be fined had any noticeable be-
aviour, and certainly prisoners did not think of it as a positive
control over them. Perhaps it added to their passivity towards the
system.

These two conditions provided the background in which the pri-
soner was predisposed to behave but not induced to acquire and main-
tain the positive virtues of hard work and co-operation. None men-
tioned that they worked hard in order to obtain these rewards although
many mentioned the hard work as a continuing prison condition.

There were too many prisoners and too few staff for any system
of rewards by individual effort to be even marginally workable. The
same officer expressed it that "it was difficult to get a day's work
out of convicts. It was in our own interest to get as much cotton
picked as possible but 5 warders to 100 convicts working was insuffi-
cient supervision".

For any prisoner who was undecided whether to be passive or to
combat the prison system, the loss of remission was a very deciding
factor mentioned by many prisoners. They talked of the punishment
cells and penal diet in passing rather than as something which had seriously hurt them, but they did not like losing remission. Dietary punishment could always be circumvented by special systems of trafficking. Remission was not a reward for good behaviour as it was given under law from the start of the sentence, but its loss for prison offences was definitely felt.

Again the official system of rewards failed because it was not implemented consistently and fairly. This was not a failing in individual officers which could be rectified by pressure from headquarters, but the failure of a system which could not be rectified by any alternative system of bureaucratic controls. The good jobs in the prison were given to those with very long sentences who would be most valuable to the workshop in terms of productivity or who would get adequate time to be trained and productive; to get to this state did not require any action of the prisoner other than compliance. In fact he would get preference over prisoners with minor offences and short sentences who had not outside employment to return to and no skills.

The second series of good jobs in which a prisoner was largely his own master were distributed in effect arbitrarily to prisoners who were unusually clever in manipulating authority, or sufficiently literate to be needed to help work the system and overtly obedient, or so aggressive and intractable that they could only be controlled by such a positive reward.

Probably all staff both senior and warder grades were not seriously concerned about discipline and the need for powerful negative sanctions. Perhaps the senior staff reflected unnecessarily on the few serious prison offenders and saw them as challenges to their personal authority and to reflect on the importance of corporal punishment. In general despite their misgivings they had seen that softer conditions meant less trouble all round and did not provoke ill-discipline.

They were only too satisfied when the prison ran itself without any overt trouble forcing them to take special action, and provided that they got compliance to their minimum standards, they were not going to provoke reactions by assertiveness. A convict (85) expressed this by saying that "the authorities had special campaigns and passed
special orders but this was only kept up for 2 or 3 days and after that it was all forgotten again, even the warders forgot.

Perhaps this attitude of tolerance was related to the isolation of the prison staff from outside social life and the fact that with long-term prisoners, the staff had to live with them for very long periods and vice-versa and none had any serious interest in making life unnecessarily difficult for the other. This accounted for the fact that the majority of offences in prison were committed by short-term convicts, and it was possible that they felt the need to challenge authority and saw no need to control it, or equally that the staff, when they felt the necessity to exert themselves, took it out on the short-term convict as the person who was less likely to be continuously troublesome to them.
Any prisoner who
(a) disobeys any order of the officer in charge or of any other prison officer or any prison rules; or
(b) treats with disrespect any officer or any person authorised to visit the prison; or
(c) is idle, careless, or negligent at work or refuses to work; or
(d) uses any abusive, insolent, threatening or other improper language; or
(e) is indecent in language, act or gesture; or
(f) commits any assault; or
(g) communicates with another prisoner or any other person without authority; or
(h) leaves his cell or ward or place of work or other appointed place without permission; or
(i) wilfully discloses or damages any part of the prison or any property which is not his own; or
(j) commits any nuisance; or
(k) has in his cell, ward or in his possession, any unauthorised article, or attempts to obtain such an article; or
(l) gives to or receives from any person any unauthorised article; or
(m) makes repeated and groundless complaints; or
(n) in any way offends against good order and discipline; or
(o) attempts to do any of the foregoing things; or
(p) aids or abets the doing of any of the foregoing things;
shall be guilty of a minor prison offence.

Section 67. Any prisoner who
(a) mumbles or incites to mutiny; or
(b) commits or takes part in an assault or attack on a prison officer; or
(c) commits any act of gross misconduct or insubordination
shall be guilty of an aggravated prison offence.
By regulations each prisoner was required to have his number and release date stencilled on his shirt. Many defaced or hid their date of release. Escapees with their broad brown strip on shirt and trousers often hid this requirement so that they could get into other parts of the prison and also on football parties but not with any deliberate intention of engineering an escape.

---

| Prison Rules (1963), section 107(1) and (2) |
| Prison Rules (1963), sections 109 and 110 |
| Conversation with Visiting Justice June 1963 |

---

United Kingdom Prison Rules (1952), rule 42
Prison Rules (1963), section 124 (1) (x)
Prison Rules (1963), section 71 (a) to (d)
Prison Rules (1963), First Schedule

---

Per day 2lb maize meal or bread or flour or 8oz. rice
25 mgs ascorbic acid and water as required.

---

Prison Rules (1963), section 68(1), Prison Ordinance, Section 57.
Treatment of Offenders Annual Report (1962), page 17
Informant 7/8/2 and 4 English
Informant 35/3/2/1 Trans.
Prison Rules (1963), section 65(1)
Prison Rules (1963), section 107(1) and (2)
Prison Rules (1963), sections 109 and 110
Conversation with Visiting Justice June 1963

---

Prison Ordinance, section 66(5)
It can be assumed that this power is being used by the officer in charge as he was recommending restoration of forfeited remission.

---

Informant 35/83/31 Trans.
Informant 35/8/2/1 Trans.
Informant 35/8/2/3 Trans.
Informant W10/13 English
Informant MS/35 Trans.
Informant J8/46 Trans.
Informant 35/8/2/2 Trans.
Informant NN/1/64 English
T. and P. MORGIS, Fentonville (London 1963), p.156
Informant 35/8/2/1 Trans.
Informant J/2/35 Trans.

---

By regulations each prisoner was required to have his number and release date stencilled on his shirt. Many defaced or hid their date of release. Escapees with their broad brown strip on shirt and trousers often hid this requirement so that they could get into other parts of the prison and also on football parties but not with any deliberate intention of engineering an escape.

---

Average Daily Number of offences 1959, Local Prisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Daily Number of offences 1959, Local Prisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily average population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fentonville</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

283
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Handsworth</th>
<th>Manchester</th>
<th>Liverpool</th>
<th>Wormwood Scrubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1444</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Prison Offences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mombasa</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Fentonville</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapes</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trafficking</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insobodination</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Offences</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idleness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1328 100.0 560 100.0

(51) Informant J/1/47 Trans.

(52) R.E.S. TANIER, Unpublished research.


(54) Prison Form 31


(56) Informant W22/p/1/1 Trans.

(57) Informant 10/3/1 English

(58) Taped interview 35/8/3/60 Trans.

(59) Taped Interview 15/1/3 Trans.

(60) Resident Magistrates occasionally were the subject of attempts to influence them by occult means.

(61) *Prison Rules* (1963), section 45(2).

(62) *Prison Ordinance* Cap. 90, commencement 1/2/1962, repeating the *Prison Ordinance* Cap. 78 (1948).

(63) Informant 12/5/3/35 Trans.

(64) Informant 12/6/3/1 Trans.

(65) Informant 15/6/3/48 Trans.

(66) Informant 15/6/3/38 Trans.

(67) *Prison Standing Orders*, Chapter 51 and *Prison Rules*, section 82

(68) *Prison Ordinance*, section 12 (1) and (2)

(69) *Prison Rules* (1963), section 53

(70) *Prison Rules* (1963), section 55

(71) *Prison Service Orders* (38/60). Scale of clothing and equipment - prisoners.

(72) Stage 17 and Special Stage. Means of recreation in cell. Three instead of two blankets, mattress and bed, pillow. Special Stage not locked up at mid-day, one hour after others in evening, may move about prison without escort.

(73) Prison Form 51

(74) Informant 35/3/2/55 Trans.

(75) Informant 15/3/1/2 Trans.
(76) 'Trusty' convicts no longer exist and were abolished when
Prison Ordinance Cap.78 was repealed.
(77) Prison Rules (1953), sections 71(a) to (d).
(78) Prison Rules (1963), section 19 (1) to (4).

Prisoners Earnings Scheme — Extracts from Ref. 20/13/13/33 dated
4.1.19.

1. On sentence prisoner in Grade C earning category.

2. Promotion to Grade B until officer in charge certifies on
prisoner's record that such promotion may be made.

3. No promotion to Grade A until he is promoted to Special Stage
or officer in charge certifies that prisoner is skilled,
excellent behaviour and Committee has approved.

4. Grade A: 20 cents, B: 15 cents, C: 10 cents.

5. Prisoners engaged on piece work may be paid a sliding rate of
earnings not less than 10 cents or not more than 20 cents a
normal day's task shall earn 10 cents per day or work performed
in addition shall raise daily rate according to amount of work
done.

6. Supt. Prisons (Industries) shall circulate minimum requirements
for workshops officer in charge shall set daily task elsewhere.

7. No earnings if absent. Absence exceeding 4 hours will count as
absent for whole day. If has fault, no deduction unless through
own fault. Sick parade no earnings if off duty sick.

8. Cook, livestock workers, latrine emptiers earnings for Sunday
or Public Holidays.

9. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the value of the
earnings scheme and consequent control of discipline will be
negative if officers in charge do not make it their personal
business to see that slackness, absenteeism, inefficiency,
discipline, etc. of full co-operation at work are punished by
times, deduction of savings or even (in serious cases) removal from the
Earnings Scheme.

10. The Earnings Scheme is one of the strongest disciplinary con-
trols available in a prison and failure to implement the prin-
ciples of the scheme properly will deprive the officer in
charge of his powers of control afforded by the scheme.

11. Removal from Earnings Scheme shall if in prison serving over 6
months automatically mean that the prisoner is at the same time
denoted to Stage II for the period he is removed from the
Earnings Scheme.

12. In every case where a prisoner is removed from the Earnings
Scheme, he shall be segregated from earners during the period
of such removal and on no account shall be permitted to con-
tact prisoners who enjoy canteen facilities.

13. Prisoner may spend up to two-thirds of his month's earnings
required to save at least one-third.

14. Literate prisoners may be employed for recording prisoners'
requirements from canteen list but on no account will a pri-
soner be employed in computation of earnings.

15. Goods to be kept in canteen bags, locked up while at work.

16. If prisoner removed from Earnings Scheme, he shall not have
access to canteen bags.

17. Offence during his period of work to be in possession of any
article acquired under Earnings Scheme.

18. Those in Earnings Scheme not permitted to take possession of
canteen bags unless they are segregated from prisoners not in
Earnings Scheme.

19. No restriction on type of release provided not prejudicial
to security and good behaviour.

(79) Prison Service Circular letter 20/15/15/33 dated 4/1/1961

(80) Christmas, Easter, Independence Day, President's Day, Muslim
Holidays such as the end of the Holy Month of Ramadan.

(81) Prison Rules (1963), section 71(d), 72(e), and 74(d).

(82) Taped interview Mi/33/3/2 Trans.


(84) Treatment of Offenders Annual Report (1962), p.2
(85) Tape interview 35/3/2/75 Trans.
(86) Informant T/3/2 English
(87) Informant JK G/1/3A Trans.
(88) Informant AB G/2/7 Trans.
(89) Informant H/2/35 Trans.
(90) Informant AJ C/2/3 English
(92) Informant AJ C/16 English
(93) Informant AJ G/17 English
(94) Informant AJ C/2 English
(95) Informant AJ C/29 English
(96) Informant HS G/44 Trans.
(97) Informant AB H/12 Trans.
(98) Informant AB H/24 Trans.
(99) Informant AB H/77 Trans.
(100) Informant AB H/19 Trans.
(101) Informant AB H/21 Trans.
(102) Informant AB H/22 Trans.
(103) Informant AB H/3 Trans.
(104) Informant JK H/135 Trans.
(105) Informant AJ C/27 English
(106) Prison Standing Orders. Chapter 58, sections 1-8
(107) Prison Standing Orders. Chapter 58, section 4(1) to (VI) which involves standing naked while the uniform is searched but states "there must be no unnecessary delay in returning clothing to a prisoner".
(109) Informant AJ C/86 English
(110) Informant AJ C/134 Trans.
(111) Informant AJ F/134 Trans.
(112) Informant AJ C/160 English
(113) Informant AJ C/2/7 Trans.
(114) informanT T/3/2 English
(115) Informant AJ C/1/2 English
(116) Informant AB H/26 Trans.
(117) Informant AB H/29 Trans.
(118) Informant T/3/1 English
(119) Informant AB H/142 Trans.
(120) Informant A3 3/31 Trans.

(121) Figures from the Judicial department report 1961-1963. Table 19 give 14.4% discharges and 3% acquittals in 1961 for all cases before courts other than the Supreme Court.

(122) Informant NN C/24 English

(123) Informant NN C/26 English


(125) Informant NN C/23 English

(126) Informant A3 3/21 Trans.

(127) Informant NN C/83/84/85 English

(128) Informant 654/44 Trans.

(129) This incident involving the use of force on prisoners as part of a policy of rehabilitation, resulted in the Prison Service taking a more positive stand on violence.

Report of the Committee set up under Colonial Regulation 60 to enquire disciplinary charges against Superintendent Gerard Sullivan and Assistant Superintendent Alexander van Gouthe of the Kenya Prison Service.


The background to this incident is dealt with in some detail in E.A. Reuben and J. Rottingham, The myth of Kau Kau nationalism in Kenya, Nairobi 1966, 334-347.

(130) Prison Rules (1963), sections 138, 143 and 144.
Chapter I - Social relations in the prison community

I. The background to social relations

This prison contained only a small minority of recidivists so that the majority would have been experiencing imprisonment for the first time in relation to themselves as personalities, and to the prison as a social institution in which they had to participate. It could be seen then that unless this minority could have been able to insist or induce the majority to conform to a behaviour pattern which they had learnt in previous prisons, the majority would evolve their own social behaviour appropriate to this prison. This appropriateness therefore would be a response to a particular way of life and the fact that it coincided in many particulars to the responses in other prisons and in other countries was an important theoretical point.

Both the prison staff and prisoners were largely unaware of this except in terms of an assumed uniformity for all penal institutions.

This behaviour pattern would have had fundamental principles which would not include an essential element of uniformity. An expectation of conformity probably came from the appearance of the convicts and warders in their respective uniforms and the knowledge that the prison community ran to a timetable under a complex series of general and local rules and orders. This uniformity was probably no more than a framework which generally limited and guided the prison's social behaviour, subject to considerable variation from personal and circumstantial pressures.

While there was a pattern of convict behaviour, there did not appear to be a code of conduct which the prisoner community attempted to teach and enforce. They certainly learnt to serve their sentence but although much advice would have been directed towards manipulating authority, at least a substantial minority, received advice which if not entirely the same as that given by the authorities, was not in opposition to it. A convict (46) talking about the best advice to give new convicts said "think before you do anything or talk, and try to keep your tongue under control; if you can't do so you will never improve yourself. If someone comes to give you any type of idea, you must try to listen to him and try to gain something from it". A con-
vict (47) said about the advice given against the prison authorities: "they will not tell him what he should do to keep the prison rules but what they do to break the rules and get away with it. In other words he is taught the law in order not to obey it. For example he will be told the restrictions on smoking and the ways of getting tobacco illegally, and for keeping it without being detected. He has no doubt started on the wrong path - always planning how to break what he knows to be the law".

So although most of them would learn how to exploit their prison environment, it was not taught in a form which showed blatant hostility to the prison staff as such. Contact with the staff was not severely censored and when it occurred it was not taken to be a sign that the prisoner doing so had capitulated to the opposition and became an informer; as has been shown even the informer was not seen as a serious enemy and he was written and spoken about with little deep animosity, in fact more often with a touch of pity.

The general theme of life in this prison might more appropriately have been described as co-operation with the authorities and each other whenever it seemed advantageous; not a special prison code but a behaviour pattern common to almost everyone in a disadvantages institutional environment. Group behaviour was not regular or uniform but the types and numbers of prisoners who were incapable of minimal co-operation with their fellow convicts and the prison staff were small. There were few in fact who were congenitally in opposition to authority and association within the convict community, these included the mentally disordered and the aggressively selfish. Those with pariah status were not clearly demarked as although sex offenders were disliked it was often not really known who had been sentenced for such crimes. Perhaps the European convicts might have been included here as being a socially marginal group both seeing themselves and being seen in rather ambivalent roles.

If the prison population was static it was possible that uniformity would have become a more important issue but of course it was not so even for a single day. Both the staff and prisoners were constantly changing, so that the social relationships were in a constant state of flux. If it could be postulated that such relationships in
the outside world had a certain rate for their creation, usefulness and termination, it could be seen that this rate within the prison would have had to be much faster if these relationships were to serve equivalent social purposes (7). The whole social process of association had to be speeded up because convicts may have been together not so much for the length of the sentence, or the first to be released, but for the period in which they were in association in the same cell-block. Relationships had to be created on much slenderer social ground than they would have been outside, and since they had shallower roots, could be broken and changed much more easily.

The prisoners were all different, and moreover into the prisons came convicts who were much more diversified than those in Western-European prisons. Not only did they differ in their biological characteristics as old or young, crippled or infirm, intelligent or stupid but in their social characteristics. These variations would make the prison population in any case far from uniform but in addition they came from communities which had little in common, often not even a common language. The classifications by race which had political origins, did not really suggest the division within the prison community. Although it may not have been entirely possible for example to separate Luo, Kikuyu, Masai convicts by sight, their language and food preferences were totally different. Thus to have considered African convicts as a uniform group was quite illusory. While tribalism should have been the easy answer given for most convict to convict, and convict to staff problems, this was not the case although such answers were specifically searched for. The convicts' ideas on influence seemed to suggest personal networks on which tribalism had comparatively little effect. A convict said "to a certain extent you are able to get things more easily from people of your own community. There is not only tribalism but favouritism according to acquaintances. You might be acquainted with a person dealing with correspondence, then there is a possibility of you sneaking in and getting a letter even when you are not due to receive any. If there was a warder of the same tribe as myself working in that office, to a certain extent I probably might get but I don't think I would. What I have only seen is favouring of their friends who are not necessarily of the same tribe."
There were also wide variations in previous occupations apart from tribal differences between cattle keepers and agriculturalists. The prison at any one time would contain fishermen, shop-keepers, drivers, dock workers, seamen, trade union officials, teachers, agents and clerks. While there was always a tendency for convicts to inflate the status of their previous occupations there was nevertheless a wide variety of occupations, although it was probable that only the mechanics and craftsmen would get prison work directly related to their outside occupations.

Despite the lack of uniformity in a fluctuating society, there were nevertheless persistent patterns of behaviour in the prison society which had continued for decades. Neither senior staff members of many years service nor recidivist convicts with a comparable length of imprisonment, produced evidence that there had been any radical change over the years in the fundamentals of social relations in this and other prisons in this country despite changes of policy and discipline.

There was then the paradox of a social system persisting which was no part of the officially supported social structure and which persisted, despite a rapid turnover of its component people, and the separatist strains inherent in such a body of strangers, who had no political, religious or social beliefs to unify them.

A further point was the extent of impersonalisation which was attempted in staff-prisoner relationships. This was not only the impersonalisation which was a necessary part of any western type structure - the convicts were known much more by their numbers than by their names but from several further factors. Firstly that social change had not yet broken down the personalised social structure of the traditional societies from which the convicts came. Only a small minority would have been entirely urbanised and industrialised, and the remainder if they had had any of this experience at all, would only have had it as an interlude to a life which was essentially traditional and in the vast majority of cases agriculturally based.

Secondly the senior staff both officially and unofficially were nervous of any personal relationships with prisoners. This was not only that they knew very few of the prisoners because of the strains
of administration and the turnover of the prison population which they may have hypothetically regretted. It was also because the social differences within the convict community applied just as much to the overall prison community of staff and prisoners. Even excluding the British staff, there had always been a generalised communication barrier, since only minority groups could communicate adequately between themselves. The lingua franca Swahili was the mother tongue of only one such minority and its use by the community was as a whole impoverished by the limited vocabulary and a diminished use of its grammar. Communication therefore was carried out with a Swahili vocabulary markedly smaller than that for basic English and the use of a very small number out of the available tenses. Impersonalisation thus came from a purely functional inability to communicate on a more personal basis outside these linguistic minority groups.

It was thus an interesting paradox that British senior officers were able to administer these prisons according to the required standards of the government and their department without any overall linguistic contact of any great depth. To do this moreover with an understanding of the language from which the lingua franca developed as a dialect, which was not superior to the equivalent requirements of English in the lowest forms of a British primary school. Prison officers were only required to pass the Lower Standard Swahili examination and the sanctions to enforce even that standard were laxly enforced. Thus when personal relationships were possible on the daily request parade, the ability to understand each other was dependent on a limited vocabulary without more than an approximation to the correct grammar and such ancillary methods as facial expression and gestures. Impersonalisation of relationships occurred then because the proper linguistic basis of communication was absent.

There was also impersonalisation because of the fear or nervousness of the consequences of such involvement. In this the prison staff's attitudes were ambivalent. The prison rules referred to fairness and firmness, influence by example, encouragement and so on as the guide lines for prison administration.

Apart from any of the difficulties inherent in closed institutions, these rules were written in English with which only a minority of the
staff were conversant enough to understand their implications and no translation into Swahili was available. Prison staff of all ranks were required to follow the rule book as their best protection against the possibility of being accused of dereliction of duty. The rules indeed took cognizance of personal problems, in that they provided a method of dealing with them as impersonally as possible. Attempts to deal with them on a more personal basis were subject to serious doubts concerning the truth of the convicts' stories and the use to which they might have put the advantages gained through such a personal relationship, particularly with the warders and senior staff ever present worry over trafficking between them and the convicts. Certainly to have been seen too closely involved with convicts would have been taken as a sign of weakened disciplinary powers rather than as aiding their rehabilitation. Impersonalisation was generally considered much safer than attempts at more personalised relationships.

The administration of the prison also stressed impersonalisation in the relationships between the prisoners themselves. They entered the prison as individuals and their association with other prisoners was regarded with official disapproval on the one hand and the personal distaste and dislike of the prison staff on the other.

Although rules were largely ineffectual in keeping certain categories of prisoners apart in order to prevent the professional or persistent criminal from contaminating the newcomer to crime or indeed to prevent them communicating with each other, a great deal of time and effort was spent in trying to achieve this.

Almost all staff regarded the close association of any numbers of convicts, if it came to their notice, as something intrinsically dangerous to be watched with care, or broken up immediately. It would have been regarded as evidence of incipient opposition to authority, homosexuality or as a network for trafficking in contraband. Although there was no general silence rule in the prison unless specifically ordered, communication between prisoners remained something which was tolerated but not something which two prisoners could have demanded as a right.

However this dislike of personal relationships between prisoners was not nearly so absolute as in western prisons containing small cells.
In this prison the large prison wards sleeping up to 25 prisoners which were grouped in blocks allowed the prisoners considerable variation in their social relationships without much recourse to illegal communication and the manipulation of transfers to other blocks.

Also the fact that the divisions and the doors between the cell blocks and the central courtyard were iron bars, enabled communication between separated prisoners. So despite the attempts to prevent contamination and the staff's dislike of personal relationships, verbal communication between all parts of the prison was easy. Thus the construction of the prison which allowed convicts to associate and communicate with little interference from the prison administration allowed them to build up social groups and functions which contributed sufficient satisfactions to their lives to reduce much of the animosity towards society and introversion of the personality which distinguished the western experience of imprisonment.

Since the majority of the prisoners were illiterate the medium of communication was rarely by the passage of notes, the openness of the prison to verbal communication made it unnecessary for the prisoners to have developed any complex and illegal system for the passage of notes(1). Since in other prisons communication between separated prisoners seemed to have been their primary preoccupation both as a necessity and a hobby, its absence here left a theoretical void in the convicts means of reducing their own boredom.

The prisoners stated that they had a special dialect with which they could communicate without the warders being able to understand, it was very doubtful whether this could be correct as there was no difficulty in getting to know the vocabulary, particularly as the prisoners stated that the dialect was common to all the country's prisons and the criminal fraternity. Some words are listed (Table 49).

TABLE 49. Some examples of prison slang.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warder on the gate</th>
<th>Swahili</th>
<th>Prison Slang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blanket</td>
<td>Askari wa mlango</td>
<td>Khalifa, Hassan, Kisuguu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>Blanketti</td>
<td>Lagulapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless</td>
<td>Karatasi</td>
<td>Chupuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>Simu</td>
<td>Kago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambling shells</td>
<td>Vlatu</td>
<td>Hasandrosi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go away</td>
<td>Hasimbi</td>
<td>Chaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nenda Zako</td>
<td>Shingafra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However in a prison such as this in which only a small number of recidivists existed and the vast majority of prisoners were short-term, such a specialist vocabulary was not likely to be extensively used. Certainly in interviews convicts did not use words from this dialect and its existence came to light from recidivists' explanations of the consequences of continued criminality.

As the period of research covered the time of independence and the replacement of all but two of the British staff by local promotions, many staff and convicts assumed as indeed did many citizens as a whole, that the mere fact of independence, would make prison a better place, and that in some indescribable way, all involved in the prison, staff and convicts would get on better together. An idealistic warder and a cynical convict carried out this (21) reported conversation "we in the prison don't want a colour bar. In the old days the Europeans really gave us a lot of trouble, but it wasn't really the truth as we ourselves did most of our own troubling. The Europeans were so few and we Africans did what we were told - just blind obedience. Now all will be well in the land. I replied that it would not make much difference in the prison where too much thinking always went on and nothing will be better than before. And why will it not be better than before - just jealousy; whoever gets promoted, no matter what the reason, will be the cause of jealousy from the others. Why has he been promoted and we joined the service on the same day so I go off to find some secret method of getting him out of his job".

Another aspect of this new sense of oneness were some objections to the diet scales which were racially based on the reasonable grounds that any prisoner should have the diet to which he was accustomed. A convict said "there was a rumour that everyone would eat the same food. Not some people eating rice and other porridge. There will be no saying that this is an Arab to eat rice, this is a Somali he must take Somali diet. This is a European, this is an Asian, all must take the same food" (4).

Although they did not want a colour bar, they were emphatic that
this meant that all important convict jobs should be held by
Africans and that even non-African citizens should not get such posts
regardless of their length of sentence and qualifications. A convict
(5) described an incident and stressed this racial issue and said "a
Sikh works in the kitchen district and milk to those who have been
ordered it by the doctor. He was supposed to be blocking the way
in the kitchen when he was issuing the milk and a fight started and
the Sikh ended up in hospital. He hasn't been in any other trouble
because they think he shouldn't have any position over anyone. They
really disliked him because he is an Indian; they don't want their
leader to be a European or an Asian or an Arab - just entirely
African. I personally told this Sikh to leave this job, particularly
as the ration clerk. As an Indian, they think you both do a racket".

The problems consequent upon the "Africanisation of the Prison
Service came up for much discussion among the convicts. An intelli-
gent long-term convict discussed (28) these issues after he had sug-
gested that African senior staff did not receive much respect from
the prisoners and said "even with our own flag flying outside the
prison there is no difference with the prisoners. They would prefer
the European so the new officer will find the work very difficult
because the mentality of the Africans is this; that the European is
superior to him. It is only the European who can bring good things.
So when he is in trouble the only man who will save him is the European.
So it will be very hard to turn, and admit that a fellow African will
help him. Last Saturday two warders attended a selection board for
promotion and one told me afterwards that he wished he had been inter-
viewed by a European who would not have asked so many questions as he
would know me from my work here. The African officer doesn't like
him because he was of the same tribe and he wouldn't like to see the
warder promoted".

It was essential to recognise that this convict was looking at
the utility of any particular prison officer towards himself and his
fellow prisoners and this was not an abstract conception related to
ideas of justice and fair play. The Europeans kept to the rules and
because of linguistic and social differences did not know or try to
know the minutiae of convict life; essentially two different spheres
in which the convicts were able to recognise their boundaries for social and administrative contacts. With the African officer the convicts were at a disadvantage as there were no such social and linguistic barriers to keep them effectively separated apart from obvious legal differences. He understood without an interpreter the nuances of conversation and could pick up overheard gossip as well as understanding the customary background to convict problems. So if the new African officer wished, he could have become active in spheres where previously the convict could have invented plausible stories. The convict theoretically then was at considerable disadvantage with African senior officers and was inclined to resent their presence initially. Since the prisoners could not become prison staff, Africanisation as an administrative or political issue would have had no particular attraction for them and in their prison circumstances the more distant the senior staff the better.

With the earlier staff rapid promotion within the service was bound to be both an exciting attraction and an irritant. The retirement of almost the entire senior staff of an organisation and their replacement of men of a different race and of much shorter service was bound to be a strain. Jealousy of the newly promoted was a very human reaction and in the circumstances of a newly independent and newly created nation state, it was inevitable that promotions would be attributed to long standing tribal differences. The erosive force of tribalism then allowed itself to be the reason for or against any administrative move, but despite its potentially disruptive nature, particularly in the post-independent period, there was little evidence in this prison that tribalism was much more than a frequent but by no means dominant talking point among either staff or prisoners.

Despite the gulf between staff and prisoners which both sides accepted as axiomatic in any prison situation, there were three types of associations which bridged this administrative gulf (54). These were associations of friendship, reciprocity and administrative assistance. Unless they had their origins in associations before the current sentence of imprisonment, they must have occurred mostly with long service convicts, as most prisoners were not recidivists with the necessary experience of imprisonment.
So not only were few convicts eligible for these bridging associations because the short sentence prisoners formed the majority of the prison population, but also few of the prison staff, because only a parallel small number were in one position in the prison long enough to build up friendships and reciprocities or were in administrative positions which received convict personnel as assistants.

The fact that there were few convicts in administrative positions and that they were not recidivists was probably a major factor in the low level of tension in the prison. While the long-term prisoner was able to boast of his experience, there seemed to be little dependency on him for goods and services, so there was little evidence that knowledge was power (55). There was also the contributory fact that information may have been relatively easy to obtain. Firstly because this was a tropical prison light and airy, bars with no windows or doors behind them so that eavesdropping was quite easy, and did not require any particular talents, and secondly because the warder staff with many of its sympathies at least passively with the prisoners they guarded, would have been more likely to pass on information than not if it kept a conversation going. Thus the prisoners ease of access to the staff as well as to information prevented the creation of a clique of prisoners who were able to maintain power because they had special contacts with the staff or access to secret sources of information. The inability of experienced convicts to use information as a commodity was probably due to a combination of inter-tribal and inter-educational mistrust, the absence of an effective lingua franca and to the convicts acceptance and experience of western bureaucratic systems as something in the main which was beyond their need to manipulate and understand.

There was something here of the premise of inequality (56) in which the convicts saw more personal, social and emotional profit in accepting their overall subordination than in either trying to manipulate the system or even to form hostile stereotypes of their superiors. The prison protected and provided and it was only the educated prisoner who did not experience these benefits and therefore formed stereotypes of the staff as stupid and malevolent towards them.

Possibly because there was this little dependency on the experienced
prisoner who was able to give protection, security and knowledge to his particular convict associates, there was the absence of much overt aggression towards the informer. Certainly those convicts involved in illegal processes dependent on some regularity in the prison's administrative processes, disliked tension which might upset their operations, but they were not leaders in the accepted sense who would have been able to reduce tension for their own ends.

II. Staff attitudes to prisoners

In hearing the opinions of staff and prisoners of each other, one was immediately struck by the absence of stereotypical remarks. Some of the British staff may have tended to think in such terms but only as a consequence of strain and in particular as a result of their difficulties as aliens at a time of very rapid political and social change. The African senior staff and the warders certainly appeared to have had no overall stereotypes of the convicts and only used them on some occasions in tribal context doubtless muted by the overt non-tribal policies of their new political superiors. Probably the only consistent hostility shown in stereotypes was towards Kikuyu or Luo prisoners who came from the two main tribes in the country who were constantly in opposition to each other.

The absence of stereotypical remarks by the senior staff may have been due to the embarrassment of expressing them to a research worker and secondly to the absence of prolonged stressful conditions which might have resulted in their use for personal release and satisfaction.

It may also have been due to the fact that the senior staff had very little personal contact with prisoners and for this reason to have viewed them differently to the warder staff. A senior officer (7) said "I know very few convicts personally; certainly not more than 30 to 40 — the trouble makers who come in front of me on disciplinary charges. The second in command of the prison might know double that number such as the cooks, the older craftsmen and the petty offenders. I only know the ones I do know because something has brought them to my notice."

Both senior and warder staff did not personalise the sentence of
the court on any particular prisoner. The prison institution itself
punished, and they did not add to this punishment as if they had been
entrusted by society with some special duty to see that the punishment
was more personally directed.

This was not because the staff did not have resentments which
could not be canalized onto particular prisoners, but because of some
factors in their joint prison lives. The horror or dislike of parti-
cular crimes lose their impact when they become commonplace because
of the number of prisoners admitted for such crimes over a long period
of prison service.

A more important point was that the prison was not a point of
internal drainage for all the perverts of a nearby industrial and urban
watershed. The majority of these convicts were young and healthy
adults with only a small minority of perverts and derelicts. There
were only a few prisoners who had committed crimes which both the staff
and prison population found equally revolting, because of which some
individuals were detested. Further the physical atmosphere of the
prison was neither squalid nor depressing in appearance and was more a
combination of the appearances of a zoo, factory and a power station
annex, and this absence of a depressing feeling about the prison must
have been a decisive factor in the absence of staff hostility towards
the prisoners.

A more important factor lay in the area of penal policy. A harsh
primitive policy was comparatively easy to administer since both con-
verts and prisoners knew what was expected. In most modern western
penal institutions there was stress on both the safe custody of convicts
and their reform and considerably less stress on their punishment. This
was not only a pair of incompatible aims in theory but involved the
prison staff in a constant series of choices in all the work which they
 undertook (8) which certainly may have added in some cases to the
stress and dissatisfaction with their work.

In this particular country’s prison administration there was for-
mall stress on those same western principles of reforming the criminal
without the human and bureaucratic resources to successfully attempt it.
Some of the senior staff were receptive to these aims in the sense that
they did not immediately deny their efficaciousness under certain hypo-
thetical circumstances. They were however emphatic that no such policy could be carried out when they were overloaded with bureaucratic obligations under specific local conditions, and secondly when the warder staff on whom they would have had to have been dependent in implementing any such policy, were not so much illiterate as uneducated up to the minimum necessary for intellectually appreciating the need for and commitment in such a reform policy. In these circumstances the senior staff insisted that they were fully involved in seeing that their minimum custodial obligations were followed by the warder staff and that to introduce any penological principles into the work of the warders would have been impossible. Thus the prison staff of all grades were released from one of the principal sources of tension in western prisons.

While there appeared to be few structural tensions leading to persistent hostility between staff and prisoners, the warders did have the problem of being socially very similar to the prisoners whom they were guarding. Thus the relative status of warder over convict may seem to have been the former's principal preoccupation in a hierarchical organisation there as have been other factors involved. Here there was a prison community which included both prisoners and staff which had many of the characteristics of an institution in which both staff and inmates lived in together. The prison staff lived near to the prison in prison houses and on prison land, isolated from the local community of totally different social custom and speaking a different language to the majority of them, so that they were not socially integrated into the outside world. Some felt that there were special hardships in their job, and in their isolation from status regarding roles on the outside, become more dependent on status within the prison. This was signified by arguments over the relative education or knowledgeableness of warders and convicts (14), frequently shown in the repetitive use of certain vernacular words of abuse such as "stupid", "illiterate" and "unable to understand" in situations where the more common sexual abuse used outside would have been appropriate although both situations had a comparable amount of tension.

The most important feature of staff-convict relationships was an almost complete absence of generalised hostility. There were no
"stylised myths of cruelty and victimisation" (8) abounding in the prison. Perhaps it would have been incorrect to talk of a general tolerance but not far wrong. In conversations with warders and prisoners in Swa III there were few generalised remarks typical of western service institutions such as "bloody officers" or the "men are a pretty poor lot". Since there was no generalised hostility from the staff, there was no generalised reciprocating hostility from the prisoners (58).

The tolerance which existed between warders and prisoners seemed to occur because each party kept within accepted limits. The prisoners knew what they were expected to do and did it while the warders knew the same routine and had little or nothing to enforce. The warders in charge of a work gang were in command of the party which must have been an authoritarian role but observations showed that such a warder was not in charge. He accompanied the gang and showed them areas of work which they had to do and which they accepted doing. There was a break in this tolerance relationship when the warder ordered and the prisoner felt obliged to object. However it seemed that the warder only felt obliged to order the convicts about when his role of the tolerant supervisor liked by his men was compromising his role as a prison warder in a hierarchically structured organisation in which he might be either disciplined for failing to carry out his duties properly, or promoted for being seen to have carried them out. Obviously then the points of tension were occasions when the warder was being overseen either during an inspection of the work gang, in which he immediately became somewhat loud voiced and belligerently active or in places in the prison where he may have been liable to supervision without knowing that it was taking place.

A convict (13) described such tensions and said "everyday at one of these gates between yards there is a quarrel. Always the warders do not want to open. They do not ask the reason or see that the reason is correct by seeing to where the prisoner is going. In this yard outside the offices the warder will tell somebody to come and clean the drain. The prisoner knows that it is his job but he doesn't want to be told. Sometimes I sympathise with those warders. I know my work in the prison store and I do it. There is no reason
why somebody should come and pull me up every now and then - do this do that. There is no reason to tell me, to force, to pull me, to quarrel with me. The warder will be just abusing me as I am a prisoner. They stop this quarrelling when they leave the work and each other; when they go the quarrel is finished.

The 'despairing cynicism' of the staff towards the convicts and their work with them was also absent not only because of the factors already mentioned but because recidivists did not come to this prison as a policy, and also because recidivism in terms of numbers of persons and number of convictions (9) was not so high as to personalize the problem of a failure of a penal policy to which they were not personally committed.

Much of the conflict between warders and convicts came from the fact that the former were often too rigid in their interpretation of the rules when they should have been more pliant, and pliant when they should have been rigid. It was easy to find repeated cases in which the judgement of the warder concerned had been at fault if such incidents could have been judged in isolation. Judged against a known background of convict illegal manipulations, their known criminality and possibly the warders' intellectual incapacity to appreciate the functions of a closed institution, it was not surprising that there were numerous abrasive situations. A convict (11) described such an incident and said "a prisoner comes from the kitchen and he lives in the cooks' yard. He wants to go where he lives, because he has been asked to leave the kitchen unless he is working. Then he finds the warder at the middle gate. The man tells him, the warder tells him to go back to the kitchen. The prisoner tries to explain to him that, well I have been told to leave the kitchen because I am not working there. I want to go to the place where I live. The warder also tells him that he had been ordered not to allow anybody to pass through the gate going to the other side, because all the people are wanted to be kept in that particular place. Then the prisoner gets angry and tells him that he is forgetting his work. 'You are forgetting that you came here to open and shut the gates, for people to pass. You should come and open for us. It is part of your job, I am telling you to do. I have not asked you a favour by opening the door for me, but exactly
what you come here to do. You come here to lock and open the door, whenever somebody wants to go through you must open for him. It is not a sort of privilege, you know what I mean, but you must go, I am persuading you to come and open the door. Then the warden tells him that 'I know you are a troublesome lot. I won't be bullied by you. I will see whether I shall charge you or not'. The person tells him I am not scared of your threats, you can go ahead and threaten me, I know that you come here to work, and you must open the door for me to go through. You came here, and that is why you have been given that bunch of keys, by keeping those keys so that you can open for people. I did not abuse you or call you any bad thing. I only asked you kindly to come and open the door of me. Then the warden comes just a bit cross because he has been told that by the prisoner that he is forgetting his work, and that he is forgetting whatever he came here to do. He says I will open for you and take you. I might charge you, because you have insulted me. He opened the door and they walked to the duty of officer, trying to charge the prisoner because of abusing. They walked to the duty officer, who did not accept the charge although they carried on arguing. Then after five minutes like that they both came out, and he opened for the prisoner to go to the cooks' yard. Later I went and asked the prisoner what happened when they went to the duty officer. He told me that, he had explained to the duty officer that I was coming from the kitchen and I wanted to go to the place where I live, because people were not wanted in the kitchen. There were far too many people in the kitchen, and all of them were found not to be working. They were found that they were not cooks, so they wanted to get rid of them, so that those who remain there will be known that they are cooks, and they will be given respective duties. And so the warden didn't say anything, he only said that I abused him. When he was asked how I abused him he couldn't say a word. Then he was told to go back and do his work. Because he came here, to do the job, and he must do it; perform his duties well'.

Another more difficult state in convict-staff relationships was the convict who had been upset by some act of authority and therefore acted in a troublesome way, which was found to have caused continuing conflict with some warders but this was not set in any general atmos-
phere that warders were ever-ready to victimize convicts. A convict
(12) described his own participation in such an incident and said
"when the officer in charge had refused m. request for which I had
schemed, I was angry. By attending the request parade, I had missed
food time in the cells so I went straight to the kitchen. I was not
allowed into the kitchen at any time as I am classed as an escapee
and there are knives there. When the warder saw me there taking food,
he got hold of me, telling me to put the food down and get out. I
refused. He explained that he would give me the food if I waited out-
side the gate. I still refused. He still tried to persuade me so I
took off my shoes and shirt and refused again. I invited him to hit
me or to blow his whistle to get help so that I could be removed by
force and I caught hold of the bars to prevent him pulling me out".
In this case the warder did not call for assistance although the con-
vict's own story would have made this quite justifiable since a member
of the convict kitchen committee intervened and persuaded him to leave.

Although in this case a convict persuaded another convict to be-
have, in general convicts preferred to be neutral and not to give
active assistance to a warder who had trouble. The same convict des-
cribed an incident and said "the warder who could not get a convict
to obey him, called on the kitchen detail to seize him. This group
said that they did not see how they could come to his help when the
convict was potentially violent. He was the warder in charge and if
he could not control the prisoner they couldn't see how they could
do it".

The absence of cynicism among the warder staff may also have
been due to the background conditions for their employment. They
were recruited in a country where regular employment had a high value
in itself and diminishing numbers were able to achieve it, but also
under conditions which stressed the importance and potentialities of
joining the Prison Service as a warder. They were not told that this
was a worthwhile job dealing with people who: it was hope to reform.
Since they were not approached in this ideological manner a large
area of possible confusion and subsequent cynicism was inadvertantly
avoided.

It may also have been avoided by the fact that the prison did
not contain many human derelicts to strain the human and physical resources of the prison; there were few prisoners whom the staff and indeed their fellow prisoners might have found physically revolting. There may also have been the additional factor that the idea of a central government imposing law and defining criminality was too new for the warders to think of prisoners as both moral and criminal delinquents. There was thus an absence of the foundations on which the warders might base their opprobrium except to specific prisoners from their own community who had committed certain tribally accepted offences.

There was no obvious persistent confusion of "reformist, punitive and apathetic attitudes"(10) but rather an overall view from both senior and warder staff that the prison had many of the outward characteristics of a chicken-run which did neither harm nor good to the prisoners but fulfilled government's order that they should be kept out of the way of society in general for a predetermined period. Beyond that the majority of the staff appeared to have had no overt concern, almost certainly because their jobs in the prison did not make it necessary to be concerned; they could do their jobs without having to have any positive views about the convicts or indeed to insist on their compliance. They came on guard duty, did no more and no less than the minimum requirements of their jobs and then went off duty; their involvement was minimal. They did not have to negotiate to get the compliance necessary for their work to pass muster, as the convicts recognised that they would resort to force whenever necessary and anyway the majority complied with their orders of their own volition.

Thus it was only the specialist staff, not the senior officer nor the warders who may have had to have the compliance of the convicts with whom they worked; the warder-cooks, industrial instructors and warder clerks. Perhaps this pressure was not high in the workshops where skilled work was done because the few prisoners working there were in enviable positions in the opportunities they provided for relieving their boredom as well as getting the industrial training required, and would not therefore have had to been induced to turn out a reasonable amount of work.
In the cookhouse it was almost certain that the convict community exercised a stronger pressure on their fellow prisoners than the specialist staff (59). The possibility of corruption there meant a rapid turn-over in both cooks and supervisory staff rather than the building up of particularised working relationships. The cooks therefore were the subject to the contempt of the others though this may also have been minimised by the segregation of the cooks into a separate ward for the duration of their cookhouse duty because their hours of work were longer than those of the other prisoners.

There would have been greater pressure among the warder clerks to get compliance from their convict assistants because the work was more easily checked by their supervisors and the implications of inefficiency would have been damaging to their self-image of educated persons. They were also under pressure to produce satisfactory work because the majority of warders would have preferred to do office work as it was more prestigious and less boring, and if a warder clerk was removed, there would be several applications for consideration to have been his replacement.

While the general impression may have been of connivance and corruption in these bridging relationships, there were certain warders particularly in the workshops and farm who provided incentives for the prisoners to work well by a combination of intelligence and personality.

III. The problem of contamination

The social and economic interactions of warder staff and the prisoners they were guarding which went beyond their legal obligations, were undoubtedly the principal concern of the prison authorities. Even if the warders and prisoners did not come from the same semi-traditional agricultural or grazing communities, work and custodial duties in the prison brought them extremely close together.

Admittedly the warders lived in quarters close to the prison built in lines with all the small houses close to each other, but the warders off duty did not have to associate with each other. In the prison however the warder in charge of a group of convicts was forced into a very close social relationship with them. An eight hours tour of duty could be very tiring if the warder kept himself to himself
and did not talk to the convicts under his supervision. Wherever
he was working there were unlikely to be any other warders nearby so
he had to talk to the prisoners or keep silent. In the development
of these relationships between warders and prisoners an important
factor was that both parties were essentially bored and were thus
quite ready for minor diversions to relieve the monotony of a long
period of cell duty for the warder, or confinement in the cells from
the early evening until dawn for the prisoner. Contact between them
was also facilitated by the fact that many doors were only barred
grills and it was a common-place sight to see a warder talking to one
or two prisoners on the inside of the gate. If those doors had been
solid such an easy contact would not have been possible.

The intelligent prisoner (16) could develop a relationship with
a warder by causing him to react to conversational gambit when a
direct approach to get something had been rejected.

"I asked for a light as the cloth in my tinder box was finished
but the warder on night-duty outside the cell told me not to trouble
him during working hours. I could not budge him from this so I gave
him a newspaper which I had in the cell as they cannot bring with
them anything to read when they come on duty. After he had read a
bit, I asked him if he was really a true son of the nation as I was a
fellow citizen in the same country. He asked me what on earth I was
talking about. I went back to my bed and passed under the door all
my stock of newspapers telling him to choose whichever he wanted".

"After a while I called out to him again as Mr. Fellow Citizen
saying that he wasn't much of a chap not to let me get the cloth for
a match, and he told me to shut up. I replied that he was wearing
the uniform of a colonialist not of the independent state as indepen-
dence is to help one another; cannot you even do this little thing
for me. He then took out a match and gave it to me saying that I
oughtn't to make a habit of talking to warders like that. I know that
tomorrow night I will be able to have further talk with him until he
is much more on my side".

Some convicts considered that the warders were drawn into conver-
sation with them by stereotypical phrases to which they felt compelled
to reply. A convict (17) said "I'll tell a warder that we are all
Africans, he feels inclined to talk to you more and to be on your side. The lead that we now must all get on together - the national slogan has even better results". This slogan of Harambee "all together now" was considered by the convicts themselves to have had a marked influence on their behaviour and that after it came into political use there was much less quarrelling amongst themselves as if they felt an obligation to keep the peace better.

The relationship between the warder and the convicts in the work party which he was supervising has been described as similar to that of socially related but acrimonious women. A convict (18) said "the quarrelling goes on and on. The warder will say shut up but the other will not keep quiet as although he is very annoyed he cannot slap the warder. So it is like two women who may quarrel the whole day without fighting. The warder cannot charge the convict for a prison offence as he has not got sufficient reasons to justify himself to the Chief Warder".

Thus it seemed that the convict was in a relatively stronger position to provoke or make uncomfortable such a supervising warder who could not retaliate. The system of discipline in so far as it related to supporting the differentiation between the warder and convicts in which the former's dignity was an essential ingredient, reached a stalemate. The warder had to learn to take a situation in which he may have appeared to be unable to control his convicts. The same convict described such an argument, "the prisoner became a little bit annoyed because he thought that the warder was trying to press over him by telling him that he was uneducated when he was uneducated himself. He said that he wanted to be supervised by a warder from whom he could learn something. I deserve going along with somebody who at least knows something - who can teach me something, not you. Then that really made the warder boil up and told him that he was not going to the farm or else he was going to take him to the duty officer in charge for abusing him. The warder walked out of the farm office, I thought he was going to report him. He came back a bit quiet and told him, I am giving you another warder. If you happen to refuse the job we will give you, I will have to ask him to report you".

The prison authorities were quite correct in forbidding any social
or economic contacts between disciplinary staff and convicts and it
might have been theoretically possible to enforce this if they were
not in daily continual contact with each other. Contact moreover in
which both parties had goods and services which the other wanted to
obtain. A convict (15) described the development of an illegal
nevertheless human relationship and said "never forget that the warders
are human beings just the same as ourselves. It is easy to make friends
with them because they want things which they haven't got all the time,
even the small almost useless things which we prisoners have. Once
they catch sight of something which they want, they are as good as
cought. They ask about it; maybe it's only an old newspaper or an old
second-hand school book and do you give it to the warder who wants it.
He will give you something; he will come to you and so it goes on.
When other warders are stirring up the yards looking for something or
some sort of offence, he will turn a blind eye."

The convict who had been in the prison for some time just as much
as the warders recognised the limits of this relationship just as much
as they expected these illegalities to be practised and tolerated; it
was part of their mutual adjustment to prison life. When a warder
did not follow this pattern, the convicts (20) were surprised and said
"the new corporal is a very strange person. I personally advised one
convict because this corporal seemed to be very tough. You can cool
him by giving him a cup of milk or a good piece of meat; if he eats
you know he will be all right. He will be friendly with some of them,
Then you know what happened when that cook gave him a cup of milk, he
was sent to the punishment cells. He's got very funny ways of thinking.
I have tried even by best. He is not so cruel, he is just following
the rules as he is supposed to do. Once you follow the rules then
people find you cruel if they have been accustomed to some wrongs in
the rules". The fact that this corporal had only recently arrived in
this prison made it possible for him to follow the rules so rigidly
and since food was of central concern to all the convicts his actions
in stopping petty infringements of the kitchen rules was well justified
and met with the approval of the convicts. But for the even working
of the prison system it may well have been as unfortunate in the long
run as slackness and discipline.
The next stage in the clean-up of the kitchen was described by a convict (21) who said "in the morning he said that today he will show everybody that he can be strict. So he started with a trust, the ones on the special stage. One came to the kitchen and was given an extra large ration which was spotted by the corporal. He asked the cook who said he gave him more because he asked for it which I could not argue about because he is a trust. He was put on a charge and sent to the small cells. The first trust to have been sent to the small cells for many years so I understand. He lost four days remission and was removed from the Special Stage". In this case the Special Stage convict had been charged and penalised with receiving the everyday privileges of his rank which he had obviously been getting for some time with the tacit agreement of all those involved.

The possible high degree of illegality may have justified this severity against individuals but its extension to large numbers of convicts may not have turned the popular move of reducing illegalities to sympathy with persons who have done no more and no less than any convict would have done had he had the opportunity. The same convict (21) went on to describe the continuation of this clean-up in the kitchen and said "one cook was caught with an extra rations of beans so he got four days in the small cells, four days loss of remission and removal from the kitchen. The same day another convict was caught with extra meat, he got the same; in the evening another. So the corporal has removed all the old cooks but not in a mass but by tricking them. Only four people remain now of the old group. You know the convicts inside have no sympathy for the cooks. Even if a cook is charged they don't feel much. They think he deserves it. They don't feel that he cooks for them as a favour". Thus the corporal had probably gained for himself a good reputation with the convicts but it was possible that the severity may not have been so popular with the staff when he could have got exactly the same results by getting the entire prison staff changed administratively without the bureaucratic difficulties of charging the offenders and the possibility of convict reactions against harshness to senior and probably influential prisoners. It was hard to consider this illegal trading as corruption even though it was contrary to the law and heavily punished if
discovered. Probably one warder benefits greatly from trading with
the convicts in the sense that one man among many benefits financially
in a way that made him exceptional. It was not that standards of
probity and honesty were different but the sums and material worth
being involved over, were much smaller and therefore had a wider
applicability.

It was not only that the warders had a standard of living com-
parable to that of the convicts but more important that the convicts
had one comparable to that of the warders. The fact that both their
standards of living were higher than that of the vast majority of
their countrymen was irrelevant and had little bearing on their
trading. While admitting that the warders were well paid by current
standards and were better off than the vast majority of nationals,
they still saw their own financial situation as comparable to that
of the convicts whom they had to oversee. A policeman in the town
was not in the same position as he ate in his own lines and did not
compare his food with government's ration issues to persons whom he
considered to be wrongdoers and his inferiors. The warder would not
deny that this was prison property but he saw himself relatively de-
prived in some particular spheres and the convicts in a position to
supply those needs. Similarly the convicts wanted many things which
the warders could provide without too much difficulty. The beginning
of such a trading relationship was so very easy to arrange as a con-
vict (23) suggested and said "a warder is on duty in the yard when
we are having some tea. I can ask him to join us; he will not refuse.
The same would apply to a piece of bread. Many prisoners carry on like
this; of course it is wrong but it is just the way of the world". Thus
it was that convicts had much property in their gift which was wanted
by the warders and the warders much that was equally wanted by the
convicts. If their standards of living were widely divergent it would
have been possible to expect an element of pure corruption with an
individual warder trading for personal benefit but here their equality
of interests prevented any such development. While senior staff
thought in terms of corruption among the convicts there were no refer-
ences in conversation to corrupt warders, but rather to warders who
were strict or lenient in terms of their overall relationship with them.
The prison authorities were concerned that there were warders involved in this smuggling and trading but recognised their relative impotence to do anything about it provided that it was kept within reasonable limits. They were unable to do anything to control or prevent it because they realised that to take effective action meant treating the warders to the same policy of searching as applied to the prisoners. If the warders were to exercise any control over the convicts it was obviously impossible to search them as a regular policy; however secretly it would have been carried out, the convicts would have found out almost at once in conversation with their own warders, and made common cause with them. The result would have been the warders and the convicts increasing their illegal activities in opposition to their senior officers, whereas in the existing situation although their position was sometimes ambivalent, they would have been very unlikely to increase the level of their illegalities for fear of damaging their overall position as government employees with many obvious fringe benefits.

Certainly occasional warders were detected in trafficking and were charged with this offence but these were isolated cases which would have had little overall effect on convict-warder relationships. A further restriction on such potential cases was that the authorities were unwilling to use convict informers to trap warders and afterwards use convicts as witnesses for the prosecution. So such cases depended on accidental factors such as an intercepted letter or a warder on a pre-duty inspection outside the prison gates being seen to carry something illegal. The prison authorities had to show that they trusted their junior staff.

While not denying the element of gain in such transactions, its basis must have been the initial association of warder and convict at the yard level they were together for long periods of almost unrelieved boredom. A convict (22) said "it is easy to get tobacco through the warders - certainly not difficult. They are strangers here. If I talk to a warder as much as six times we have got used to each other - we have a special relationship and if I ask him for something, he is not likely to refuse me".

Some prisoners who had relatives and friends locally could get
warders to go to them on the understanding that they got half of what the warder collected. Although these arrangements could be explained in economic terms, there were frequent references to this link as a purely commercial one.

Whatever the reason for a warder starting to trade with a prisoner the relationship would be utilised as long as both parties remained in that prison. Whenever such a warder tried to free himself by making a charge against the prisoner, he was so effectively compromised that the charge did not go in front of the officer in charge. A convict (24) described such an attempt and said "once I was stupid enough to give a warder my one remaining marihuana cigarette in return for extra food as I was particularly hungry that day. I suppose marihuana smoking had reduced my intelligence. He was a fellow smoker and he asked me for a smoke. While I was eating he went off to call the sergeant on duty saying that he had caught a prisoner with marihuana, and showed the cigarette which I had given him. It is always best in such a case to tell the truth and I said that I had given him the cigarette. It was not true that he had searched me because I still had some tobacco on me which I should not have had when the canteen boxes are still locked. I told the whole story to him". In another case the same convict said "I was charged with being in possession of marihuana by a particular warder. When the sergeant was brought to deal with the matter and he was a man of great experience, I told him the story. This warder has been a friend of mine for sometime and had occasionally brought me marihuana from outside". In both these cases the sergeant said that he himself would not take the cases in front of the officer in charge because they would expose the warder as much as the prisoner but that there was nothing to prevent the warder concerned from making a charge if he felt inclined and in both cases the matter was dropped. The sergeant in the first case said "the officer in charge will see that the convict's explanation was the truth as no convict in this or any other prison would give marihuana to a warder unless he had previously had some illicit relationship with him".

IV. Prisoners reactions against authority

In their attitudes to authority and what the convicts considered to be its illegalities depended on a number of interrelated factors
The social climate of the prison in relation to the country as a whole and its other prisons, the number of convicts who felt aggrieved at any one time and the existence of convicts who were prepared to initiate protest or to take advantage of protests once they had been indicated by others as well as the recognition by such leaders that they must consider success in relation to their own position as convicts and not in any anticipation of pushing their original objectives further than the minimum satisfaction of their demands.

The convicts were aware of the general climate of the country towards themselves and prison administration which they did not relate to the prison rules and orders. No convict ever mentioned that it was his right to have this or that and further no educated convict appeared to quote those regulations in support of his claims or resentments about prison inefficiency. While the whole tenor of prison life seemed to show that warders and convicts wished to reach a reasonable balance of mutually acceptable behaviour, there was still the stereotype of some convicts opposing authority which ought to have been shirked. A convict said "some prisoners have arrived from the central prison. They are very tough people. They don't care about a warder, they won't stand any abuse. They would not like to see a convict being slapped* by a warder. I think they are going to bring a lot of trouble to this prison. They told me yesterday that you prisoners who have been staying here are fools; why do you let warders slap a convict. They say that they opposed the new looking up rule for Sundays when it was enforced at the other prison; tear gas was used on them but the Commissioner came and the rule was never enforced again. They said they were waiting to organise themselves".

There was no reason to suppose that this was an entirely true story but it did possibly show that a group of prisoners who were transferred attempted to maintain their solidarity in their receiving prison. Although this convict talked in particularly admiring terms

*Slap here does not have its normal English meaning. Here it refers to any warder touching a prisoner - it does not mean nor is it likely to refer here to a blow, more likely a push to hurry on.
of this belligerency, such convicts were not popular. Convicts in
general and particularly those involved in smuggling and trading, did
not want the even tenor of their lives upset as any serious distur-
bance in the prison generally or to themselves in particular, upset
their networks. Most convicts were not deeply concerned over loss of
remission but a period in the punishment cells disrupted their arrange-
ments although the restrictions over food and the isolation may in
temselves have meant nothing to them. A convict (32) said "if you
are sent to the punishment cells, your channel for trafficking will be
destroyed and will have to be changed. The cook with whom I have an
arrangement for extra food, won't be able to supply me there. The
warders with whom I have established relationships won't be the ones
on duty in the punishment cells. When I am released from the punish
ment cells, then I will have to start all over again".

On one occasion when an opportunity arose for making complaints
to a visiting senior officer, they were directed first at the doctor
who was alleged to have been giving almost all sick persons "medicine
and duty", secondly that on returning from a sick parade they were
still required to complete their daily work tasks, thirdly the poor
quality of the food, fourthly that they were being manhandled and
slapped without reason and lastly that the canteen issues for a month
were not issued until half way through the following month. In a
sense these were complaints, not against the prison administration or
to gain special privileges but to making the prison more efficient by
the same standards as those used by the prison administration itself.
If sick prisoners were expected to complete their work tasks, it was
inefficient and unnecessary because no prisoner was going to pretend
to be sick when it meant that he would lose his daily payment. Com-
plaints about the quality of the food also referred to more efficient
administration since the convicts knew that there was no policy to
buy and issue poor food and that in this situation the contractor
was cheating the prison authorities. The complaint about slapping
was related to the fact that it was unjustified not that it was wrong
in itself, and lastly the delay in issuing canteen purchases would
have resulted in the power of the work payments to control the con-
viets behaviour being reduced. There appeared to be a general
acceptance of the current pattern of behaviour and to resent any activities which went too far in these terms. Recidivists who had served in past years when there was some manhandling of prisoners, never referred to it as illegal but accepted it as the current pattern of behaviour to be expected. They had no abstract ideas of what were their rights as human beings. A convict (28) who had made an accusation against a senior officer that he had been slapped, evinced no surprise when it was ruled that he had made a false accusation although it was probably agreed that the event had occurred, he said "where in the prison it is like a large family. Our elders cannot be blamed for hitting those younger than themselves. The warders have been signed on by the Prison Commissioner and us convicts are also in the hands of the Commissioner. Supposing a prisoner was hit by a warder and died, whom do you think would be told first - the Commissioner as in any large family".

While it could be said that there was always a possibility of violence within the prison community, it was probable that it was no more than might have occurred in a comparable group of men outside. From time to time prison officers were assaulted and homosexuals fought but such cases had identifiable causes or could be attributed to a mentally disturbed person who had not been accepted as such by either the court's or prison's doctor. The prison did not have an atmosphere of suppressed violence and the occasional assaults were sufficiently isolated to be unusual.

Among the senior staff there did not appear to be an ideology of reacting to those occasional outbreaks with equivalent violence and it had already been suggested that they were more worried about the warders' possible escalation of violence than the precipitating events themselves. A senior officer (7) commented on the absence of a violent atmosphere and said "the prisoners have the same respect now for the rules against violence as the warders have. If discipline is too strong in the prison, the warders would soon have a totally different approach, saying to themselves 'we are the people who matter now'.'

Although the prison authorities saw the convicts largely as an undifferentiated mass hostile to both them and to society, the latter
did not see themselves as having any such unity. A senior officer (7) commented that this prison was unusual in this respect and said "in other prisons the bad man can count on a lot of automatic support from his own tribe at least, but not here. They are never sure of themselves and can count on very little support so that no one is too strong". They had no binding ideology and only rarely acted in concert; their objectives in prison were so different that it was impossible for more than a very limited number to act in concert for minor objectives, for example smuggling or momentary hostility to a particular warden. A particular convict's misfortunes would never have united even a small group but poor food would have enabled a temporary leader to organise a protest. A convict (27) said "we heard that the Commissioner was coming on a visit to this prison. A convict who had been acting as a schoolmaster, told us that we were too silent when the food is bad with sour flour and gravel in the beans. He suggested that we all refuse to eat lunch on the day of the Commissioner's visit and we agreed. He was able to visit other groups since he was a schoolmaster and get their agreement as well". Finally in the absence of any engrossing political ideology which would have led an individual convict to seek power in protest and in acts of self-abnegation, any convict initiating protest was probably thinking in terms of self-advancement. Even at the beginning of the research, an African convict population being controlled by British senior prison officers was the cause of neither comment nor protest even though the country outside was fast approaching independence.

This self-advancement may have been a momentary opportunity for prominence or a play for an intermediary position which allowed the intelligent convict to get his own back in a more sophisticated manner than was allowable under the everyday circumstances of the prison regulations. In a situation when allegations that convicts had been struck by senior officers were made to a visiting senior officer a convict (25) talked about his actions after he had stated in public that he had been struck said "we were taken to the office and found the doctor ready there to inspect us as if a man who had been hit in January could still carry the marks in April. When my turn came I refused to take off my shirt as I said that no marks could possibly
be visible any longer, and he wrote on my record that I had refused to be inspected. Then I was called to see the Commissioner and said moreover that I was slapped by the officer in charge now standing beside him when I was found in the lavatory and was thought to be smoking when I should have been working. I was upset at being hit without reason. However much this story had been inflated by the speaker, the theme was certainly there of an alert mind taking advantage of an opportunity to embarrass the prison administration without any possibility of personally benefiting.

Similarly a meeting with the Commissioner of Prisons in which he had asked for complaints to be voiced, allowed convicts to seek momentary prominence in front of a large number of fellow convicts who gave possible protection from subsequent victimisation.

There were also secondary motives for initiating protest which made it irrelevant whether there was any improvement in the conditions complained about. It seemed that convicts who felt themselves oppressed, sought prominence in protest so that they could be classed as ring-leaders and transferred to another prison. A convict (25) said "the convicts who initiate collective protests are planning to be moved to another prison because in this prison the food is bad, men get man-handled and the canteen issues are delayed. They do not mind to where they are sent or that they should be separated from their friends."

Senior prison officers recognised that the prison rules in themselves represented adequate protection for them since they could not be found at fault if they had been followed. Such a bureaucratic system was particularly valuable for combating accusations against the staff since such accusations were likely to be made on the spur of the moment, while the paper system made constant observations about the running of the prison which a convict could not refute at a later date when he had a worthwhile opportunity to complain.

A seriously aggrieved convict might have complained to a senior officer serving in the prison but this was not generally likely to occur since the convicts felt that nothing would be done since they were subordinated to those same officers. Nevertheless there were regular complaints and the fact that they had not been so as shown by the register of applications to see the officer in charge was taken as
evidence that there was nothing to complain about at that time.

When however a more senior official came on a visit of inspection some convicts saw this as an opportunity to raise such matters either because they still felt aggrieved on a particular issue or because they felt generally aggrieved and wished to embarrass such officers. Such complaints had to be dealt with in the official manner laid down for them and a decision reached in accordance with the evidence disclosed. In a sense it was a closed enquiry since only the official bureaucratic evidence was utilised and factors of probability were not allowed any official and open recognition.

In such an incident twenty-two convicts were stated to have complained to the Commissioner that they had been slapped or manhandled on a variety of occasions during the six months or so previous to his visit. Each was medically inspected for marks of a beating of which they had in fact not complained and on nothing being found, the Commissioner announced in public that the convicts had made false accusations.

The cleverer convicts realised that this was a process which had to be gone through if any change was to be effected and that the authorities would have had to react in a way which minimized any loss of status rather than the authority of those involved. A convict (29) discussed this incident and said "do you really think that it is likely that the Commissioner would take any official action against his men for such acts even if he knew that they had in fact occurred. In truth we complained about events which had occurred and it is not correct to say that our complaints were not listened to because since that day I have yet to see a convict being manhandled, nor has there been bad food again. The Commissioner could not do other than this or it would have shown disrespect for the officer in charge".

The prison authorities emergency plans were based on assumptions that the prisoners extreme reactions to the prison would be either escape or mutiny. When prisoners reacted by passive resistance and made no attempt to escalate the situation, the authorities were usually impotent to control them except by threatening to or resorting to violence. This relative impotence was well illustrated by a convict's (30) description of such an incident. He said "by prior agree-
ment at mid-day when we came off work, we went and sat down in the middle of the compound, quite quietly. We were asked what we wanted and one of us said that we wanted to see the Commissioner and then we could move. The Chief Warder went off to report and the Officer in charge said that we should go away and we would see the Commissioner at two o'clock. But someone then said that we would not move or eat until the Commissioner came. He went back again to report and the Officer in charge came and told us to move and take our food as usual in our yards until the Commissioner's arrival at two o'clock.

We just stayed silent and he then threatened to use force. There was an immediate hostile reaction to this with us telling him to use force and some others shouted personal abuse. He then told the Chief Warder to sound the alarm and all the staff turned up in the clothes they were wearing when the alarm went off. The workshop officer came in a vest, I don't know whether he had been eating or sleeping. The one convict said that if any convict got up to go, we ourselves would beat him up. The Officer again said he would use force and we told him to go ahead. Then he had the gates of the yards opened and the warders edged us all into the yards; we did not hit them and they did not hit us.

In this case the officer in charge probably recognised that the convicts were trying to provoke him into acting in a way which would have had little effect on the convicts but would have had repercussions on his administration since the Commissioner was about to pay the prison a formal visit. He was also undoubtedly aware of the danger of unleashing violent action on the convicts without being able to adequately control the warders. Other senior officers had referred to this as a very real danger in a situation which allowed the warders to use force, or the matter getting out of hand. Here he was able to control the situation relatively easily by recognising that the convicts were very unlikely to have been violent unless provoked.

V. Prisoners' attitudes towards the staff

The low tension level in the prison accounted for the absence of any generalised hostility towards the warders and senior officers. The design of the prison with the majority of the prisoners in large multiple wards with lavatories attached meant that they had a large
measure of self-government in their personal lives for the whole day except the morning work period. While they were dependent on the prison staff once they left their cells, there was none of the ultra-dependency related to excreting caused by the absence of lavatories in cells and their inadequate numbers throughout the prison which was found provoking elsewhere (33).

Nevertheless despite this absence of observable tension, it existed not only because the convicts were in a prison but because they were relatively unprotected against malice. A convict (42) wrote "it is always remembered by prisoners that the warders are people making their life hard for them and they are the people who can get their sentences increased on no account. It always happens that when a warder dislikes a certain prisoner, he will find a means of seeing that he has trapped him and find the way of charging him. If the warder finds it is difficult to get you into the trap, he will first come and drop the marijuana into the pocket or bed of the prisoner without his knowledge". Some also considered that the senior staff favoured educated convicts and the warders the uneducated. A convict (44) said "the officers take to educated persons more than to the illiterate; they think that he has some knowledge of controlling himself. He is not thought to be totally bad. The warders tend to have a bias towards the illiterate. Of course the educated convict is more likely to be found in semi-clerical jobs and it is there that there are educated warders so that there is no clash there".

The warder himself appeared to have little difficulty in handling the convicts in his charge as a wide range of social pressures already described forced him into accommodation with his charges. The senior staff had no little contact with individual prisoners that their behaviours were rarely regarded as provocative and if it was so regarded, there was little that the prisoner could physically do about it since the officers were rarely isolated when they were in the body of the prison.

So it was perhaps not surprising that unless they had specific reasons to feel otherwise, their attitudes to senior staff were generally favourable. A convict (52) wrote "every prison staff holds different ideas about prisoners. He can classify prisoners in different
groups according to the way he feels about them. It is a pity that
the senior staff who are rarely with the prisoners, are the ones who
have good feelings about the prisoners. Although sometimes circum-
stances force the senior staff to be harsh to prisoners, they are con-
siderate and pity the prisoners. The officers do not take prisoners
as the worst people but as the less unfortunate ones. They hold a de-
gree of respect to prisoners who respect them, although not respect
one could value much if he was a good citizen, but it helps the pri-
soners to feel flattered. The senior staff is a responsible group.
The officers know that always mistakes are done by a human being and
one day he might do an offence and he undoubtedly will row in the
same boat. I think this is why senior staff treat prisoners kindly."

It was possible that the middle grade in the prison staff hier-
archy, the Chief Warders, had pivotal roles because they acted not so
much according to the rules, but according to intuition. Above them
the prison officers might have been considered administrative ciphers
and below them partially obedient satellites. It was in this grade
that the ability to handle men was crucially important and it was sig-
nificant that one of the two Chief Warders was seriously assaulted during
this period and the senior staff and prisoners commented on this attack,
and suggested that he had provoked it by picking on one particular pri-
soner too often and too publically. The remaining serious assault was
on a senior officer who had done much the same thing in going further
than he was required according to prison disciplinary requirements.

Although some of the less perspective prisoners considered that
the staff did exactly what they wanted without any sort of formal or
informal control, others recognised that the staff were controlled in
their relationships with the prisoners. A convict (34) said that "a
warder cannot come from his house with the intention of doing something
new in the prison when he comes on duty. If he wants to do such and
such a thing, he has to report to those who are a little above him in
rank. The average warder is nervous of doing something without autho-

rity because he knows that if he breaks the prison rules, he will end
up in prison". This convict had recognised the important fact that
the disciplinary tone of the prison was set by the senior officers and
that a warder would not break the rules unless he could be certain that
there was some tacit approval for his dereliction or he had the formal approval of his senior in rank.

Many prisoners commented on the difference in warder behaviour between now and in the past when they felt that there was a considerable amount of personal violence on prisoners which indeed they accepted as a normal part of prison life. During the period of research no personal violence of any sort was seen by the researcher and no more than complaints about being pushed brought up by the prisoners in interviews as having happened to them or their fellows. This was a remarkable tribute to the effectiveness of the Commissioner of Prisons' order that each member of the prison service should sign an undertaking that he knew that personal violence to prisoners was strictly prohibited and that any person who did so would find himself on a criminal charge of assault. Although this action was probably taken as a result of the Hola incident in which prisoners were beaten by warders under provocation but without proper disciplinary control as a result of which some died, no prisoner mentioned this circular nor did they comment that discipline was a more difficult problem than in the past or that there was any tendency to feel that personal violence to warders was likely or on the increase. Within this general policy of forbidding any personal violence to prisoners except when covered by law, most prisoners accepted that there were variations in which the latter rather than the spirit was observed, particularly when behaviour was initiated or at least tolerated by a senior officer. A convict (35) said "no one is beaten here but there is this slapping or rather shoving of prisoners. It is going on more than before. One officer does it and then the warders are following them. That is the way it gets started. In the time of the previous officer in charge not a single warder would do it".

The senior officer referred to here was the one assaulted later in the year, and thus this convict recognised that the tone of the prison at any particular time was set by the officer in charge. While the tone may have been set from above in their reactions against the prison system, it was the actions of individual officers which were important and the degree to which their innovations or changes coincided with the prisoners' concepts of local legality. An officer's
popularity or unpopularity was important as the convicts' willingness to co-operate with him was essential for the proper running of the prison. A prisoner (43) described a Chief Warden who was generally disliked particularly because he constantly attacked the prisoners' pride and wrote "this man does his work just as he wishes using force and harshness all the time. He is so harsh that he upsets everyone. Even if we are criminals, his contempt for his fellow human beings is dangerous".

There was no doubt that the most abrasive factor in this prison was the use of sarcastic and harsh words by prison staff in situations which did not justify such action. As a convict (74) wrote "many of the industrial instructors' work would be of value to the prisoners, but they are not listened to by the convicts because of the scorn with which they speak to them and because they treat them as if they were slaves." When unpopularity tended towards active dislike of such an individual, a convict or convicts may have decided to act against him either directly or indirectly through some collective action which was bound to be enquired into and thus enable them to voice their particular complaints against the officer under cover of the other matter. The same convict described an incident of direct action and said "he knew that this officer was going to be on duty in the morning so he waited naked for the unlock. When that officer came into the room he made a long speech about the Commissioner of Prisons owing him money and the rent on the cells being owed to him, finally the officer had gone further to steal his goat. He then got hold of the officer, threw him down and fell on him. It took six warders to separate them". Convict opinion in this case was that this was a planned assault and that the convict concerned was not mad, although no one in his cell knew in advance what he was going to do.

Whether or not there were specific grievances which caused the prison authorities for example to move warders and convicts out of the prison kitchen or whether it was due to some administrative requirements, it was usually assumed by the convicts that the authorities had made a particularly deliberate move. When the kitchen corporal moved from the kitchen to the rope making section, he was replaced by "another corporal who is a very strict man who said that no one should
give anything to a friend no matter who he is. This was done because the convicts had complained that a lot of meat was being taken by the warders and they wanted to appoint their own independent people to go and see about it" (40).

Although this may have been the true reason for this change as far as the prisoners were concerned it was a rumour and that played an important part in the prison in the absence of any collective channels of communication between the prison administration and the convicts. Although the prison was equipped with a loud speaker system allowing the broadcasting of music and news programmes and the names of convicts required in the administrative block, it was not used for wider administrative announcements.

There was some communication when tension rose in the prison as a senior officer (7) explained and said "this convict in the kitchens I could call for him if there was trouble and he would sort it out or rather want to. I told him that I was in charge and I wanted to know what it was. A very useful man. The Commissioner came round and found out that he had quite a record. I am not interested in his record, only in his behaviour here where he behaved extremely well. He was ordered to be transferred just because of the system". This approach was confirmed by the convicts (41) who said "where there is trouble the officer in charge calls in a few well-known prisoners and asks them to help to quieten down the trouble".

Possibly this feeling that the prison authorities always acted with deliberation was increased by their overall experience and lack of understanding of the prison's bureaucratic structure and more by the occasional acts of animosity made by warders to particular convicts. Some warders for reasons of personal animosity or because they may not have understood that a balance had to be maintained between authority's power and the willingness of the convicts to obey, varied the daily routine and upset the balance which was essential for the reasonable running of the prison and the needs of the convicts. A convict (36) described an incident involving unilateral action by two warders and the convicts' counteraction and said "those of us who sleep in small cells have a urine bucket there for night use. The cell doors are usually opened early in the morning so we can get rid of these smelly
buckets as soon as possible before morning food arrives. Today these warders refused to open the doors until the food had come to the yard alleging that we would steal it. Usually there is more than enough porridge for us but trouble breeds trouble and some porridge got stolen and they had to send for extra rations! The warders then called us a bad lot and kept us locked in until mid-day food came round and locked us up again afterwards. So I decided to bring the matter to a head by abusing the warders through the spy hole saying that they hadn't brains enough to read and that they couldn't penalise me any more as I was already serving a long sentence. They called the officer on duty who happened to be an Indian so I started talking about the nation being one and that as they were all wearing uniform it didn't seem right that he should cause us poor African convicts extra trouble. So I pointed to the prison rules which are posted on the yard walls w hich showed that we shouldn't be locked up like this. The prisoner here was able to get the yard returned to normal routine by getting the matter referred to an officer senior to the warders while at the same time showed his ascendancy over them by organised theft. He had probably provoked some retaliatory action later by these warders but it would have to have been strictly within the prison rules as if the warders did something irregular it would come to the notice of their superiors that this was their second attempt to get their own back on some particular convicts and the senior staff did not like such obvious sinnosities to build up.

The long-term convict who gave no trouble to the staff could count on their sympathy if he was caught in some minor offence which allowed the staff to avoid charging him. All personal possessions were supposed to be kept in the cell canteen boxes and only to be opened after working hours so it was a prison offence to be found during working hours with cigarettes and lighting apparatus. A convict described (39) an incident in which he appealed to the humanity of the Chief Warder and said "I was not involved in the matter which he was trying to investigate and that it was unfair for him to ask me to inform to get back the tinder box which he had found I was carrying. If he took it away and I was asleep in a single cell he was depriving me of my few pleasures as I had a long sentence. He told me to take
my tinder box as it was my lucky day but that I wasn’t to get caught with it again during working hours. On the part of the staff this was not only a reasonable human action but commonsense as the long-term convict lived with them for years just as they had to live with him. For short-term convicts this relationship was unimportant and they could be dealt with without any long-term considerations, in fact they could be used as scape-goats for both prisoners and warder staff. But to disturb a long-term prisoner on a more or less formal point of prison discipline, was courting serious trouble as such a prisoner may have lost privileges and as the prison penalties bore down on him, became even more resentful and troublesome. In this state he was a constant strain on the staff and required special observation and duty and the making of reports with requests and explanations of the staff’s punitive actions. Certainly the maxim of the senior staff to a prisoner with many years to serve would have been to leave well alone if he did not draw attention to himself.

The prisoners were very aware of the hierarchy of rank in the prison administration to which was subordinated their appreciation of particular officers’ characteristics as personalities. The warders did not necessarily ally themselves on the side of the gazetted staff and were sometimes liable to criticize some aspects of their administration in the hearing of convicts particularly when the convicts themselves were openly critical. The medical staff were often criticized because they were able to make decisions controlling the disciplinary staff allowing special diets, the wearing of shoes and the giving of light and excused duties but more because the ground on which those benefits were allowed was not discernible by the convicts. Also as the warder staff used the same medical facilities as the convicts, dissatisfaction was liable to find joint expression. A convict (37) said “the Sergeant who was near the medical attendance queue, saw that we were dissatisfied and said that we ought to stick together and complain. The visiting doctors are always changing and the dresser sells our medicine outside, even the senior officers are pleased when you convicts are not cured of your ills. Don’t forget as well that he was thin and he is fat now”. It was possible that here the Sergeant himself was dissatisfied as well as making a play for popularity. Both the
Officers in charge during the period of research had commented on the continuous string of complaints about the medical staff and facilities, for which investigation had failed to find any real grounds.

This lack of support for the administration's orders was more marked when the new arrangements broke established routine which had been to the advantage of both warders and prisoners. A convict (38) said "the new senior officer ordered that both warders and prisoners should work in the afternoons instead of stopping at mid-day which had been laid down by the doctor on account of the heat. Many warders were most upset by this order which broke established routine. Because of this people started to have bad thoughts and the consequences would mean much trouble. The warders haven't the strength to trouble the prisoners so much; one said that if he had to work in the afternoon, he wouldn't shoot at any prisoner trying to escape. A prisoner hearing this sort of talk is bound to know he has an opportunity to make use of it."

In their relationship with staff, the convicts occasionally recognized a prison officer of outstanding human qualities. One senior officer was universally well thought of by the convicts (45) and a convict (46) said "everyone speaks well of him. He had time for people - he treated them as human beings. His kindness put more people on the straight path. He would listen and find out why. He would help them". This officer was a straightforward disciplinarian but he was able to keep this role separate from the humanitarian role of just listening sympathetically to whichever convict wished to explain his problems and sought advice.

While this may have been an extreme case several senior officers were well thought of because they kept to the rules and did not say or do anything which would further damage the self-esteem of the convicts. Patient and kindly men deeply cynical of the effectiveness of the work which they were doing but unprepared to turn this cynicism into unnecessary animosity towards the convicts.

Some warders also came within this classification and a convict (47) wrote about such a warder "it is not the habit of that gentleman to scorn prisoners or to praise their custodians. He was made angry by any quarrelling or laziness at work. He was in charge of the farm
and never just told us what to do in the fields as so many warders used to do, but worked along side the prisoners. No convict disliked the way he was managing them, and all made an effort whatever the weather."

Another convict (48) said "the ways of that warden pleases everyone. He listens to the prisoners' problems when they are explained to him. He sees them as human beings just as himself and if he has to forbid someone to do something, his words are true and without scorn.

The ability of prisoners and prison officers to get on with each other has been taken as an indication of the relative stability of their relationships (49) and while it existed in this prison it did not seem to extend to anything approaching formalism, joking relationships. As between officers and prisoners it occurred only in the context of a rite of passage covering transfers to another prison or the discharge of a convict at the end of his sentence and then there were humorous and ribald public remarks.

Prisoners themselves suggested that the formal joking relationships seen in traditional societies and their parallels in expatriate European communities (50) were absent, and if there was such a relationship it was either because both had known each other outside and were in a similar way internal expatriates away from home, or they had known each other inside the prison for a long time. There was very little humorous public and private banter, taunting and bonhomie and this was accounted for by the convicts stressing the hierarchical position of the warden and the importance of his dignity and responsibilities in this context. A convict (51) wrote "outside the prison they are able to laugh together but not in the prison, he is not able to laugh with anyone as he is at his work and he is taking care that it should not be upset and if he is intimate in this way with any convict, he ends up being compromised and passing contraband".

There were also other functional restrictions on the possibilities of joking relationships related to language. It could have been anticipated that prison officers above the warden grades particularly those who were middle-aged, would have been able to joke in this way in a parallel to the joking which occurred between alternate generations. However the ability to joke in this way depended on a shared language
and this was rarely available. Similarly the joking relationships between clans and tribes may not have occurred because it could not serve the same functional utility as outside and a possible equivalent of this in a rivalry between wards or ward-blocks was not possible because of the impermanence of the prisoners in any particular part of the prison as well as in the prison itself.

The closest relationships between warders and prisoners occurred in either the workshops where certain long-term prisoners worked but performed useful and interesting work or in the prison offices where some prisoners acted as subordinate clerks. In the former case there was a general recognition that some of the instructor staff were nicer than the warders and this was an intensification of this feeling. It was not only that the work was interesting in itself but its scarcity was an antidote to boredom since few could receive this training or use the specialist skills in the small prison workshop and its usefulness forced an attitude of accommodation to the staff. Such convicts could also work in the afternoons on goods which they could sell and have the money credited to them and the ability to do such work must have depended on the friendliness of the staff. Such trust had to be reciprocal.

However such relationships did not become paradoxical because the hierarchical structure appeared to be too strongly advantageous to the warders for them to surrender their positions by fraternising with the prisoners while on a particular work project.

Perhaps such fraternisation occurred in the stores where the goods and shelves made for a much higher possibility of secrecy, but in the offices the role relationships were possibly too uncertain for such groups to form (53).

Although convicts had many functionally important jobs in the prison administrative structure, it could not be said that they ran the prison, only that they were essential if it was to be run as more or less efficiently. Certainly there were role reversals in which certain prisoners administered other prisoners and others who were personally useful to particular officers or to whom prison officers had to be subservient if they wanted to get what they wanted. The role of the decent and helpful prisoner in assisting the senior staff has
already been shown and numerous examples could be given of prisoners acting in a way to benefit the staff rather than themselves such as publically protecting an officer from violence or doing repair work on an officer's car in the afternoon after normal working hours. At the warder level prisoners in the workshops could do work for warders either officially such as making metal trunks or unofficially in repairing primus stoves and such work would only be done if the warder was prepared to reverse his normal dominant role.

However these were private role reversals and there were no public and permanent ones such as prisoners acting as cooks, accountants and waiters in the prison or in officers houses or messes. Because of incidents in other prisons and in other East African countries which involved murder, assault and peculation such employment for prisoners was prohibited.
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I. The basis of sexual deprivation

The sexual behaviour of convicts in prison was related to the deprivation of heterosexual relationships in general and to the types of relationship of which they had been deprived. Certainly the majority of the prisoners had had heterosexual relationships up to the time of their imprisonment, and this deprivation should have been one of the most if not the most serious problem which they had to face.

The number of exceptions to this were probably much lower than in a comparable European prison (1). While homosexuals were present in the prison, it was not the result of consistent police action or of the need to deal with a serious problem of homosexuality in the country's towns and traditional communities. Only four persons convicted for homosexual offences were present in the prison during this study (27).

The prison also did not contain large numbers of social derelicts for whom heterosexual relationships would not in any case have been available in the outside world. This was because they were either ignored by the town authorities or dealt with in special campaigns which resulted in their repatriation to their homes at the government's expense or passed to charitable institutions or societies for residential care or intermittent support. Also the absence of cold weather made it unnecessary for such people to seek shelter in prison for the winter as no one would have suffered from sleeping out in the tropics.

It is important therefore to explain their outside heterosexual relationships against which to assess their prison behaviour since they appeared to be in four classifications. Firstly men from traditional or at least stable urban industrial communities or homes who had had a married life both stable and acceptable to the standards of the community in which they lived. The former would mainly include men who were convicted for traditional offences - cattle theft and game-poaching while the latter would be white-collar offenders convicted of embezzlement or theft by servant from a company, co-operative or government department.

There was a difference also in this classification between the
former who would have been related to his wife in a traditional manner which would not have included much emotional interplay and involved widely separated functional roles in which the closest relationship would have been for sexual intercourse. If they were newly married, their wives would be far more emotionally attached to their own families by whom they would probably be cared for during their husband's imprisonment, than to their husbands. Similarly the men would have been emotionally centred on their own families without there being any sexual considerations. It seemed therefore that sex and personally particularised emotion in such traditionally centred convicts may have been entirely separate.

With the married white-collar convict there may have been some higher degree of coincidence of emotion and marriage depending on the extent to which he had been able to separate himself from traditional patterns of living and reciprocity. This may have occurred in the few cases which involved large salaries and living in the town. Convicts in this category however did not seem to have been deeply involved with a particular woman and most of their prison correspondence was directed towards their own families.

The second category contained convicts from the local Moslem-urban-estate environment in which instability of marriage was a recognisable and constant feature of social life. While most hoped for some permanence in their sexual relationships common-law unions predominated since it was generally felt that this made the partners more attentive to each other and less subservient to the obligations of Islamic family law. In this environment there was usually a graduated scale of relationships starting with casual intercourse through one of increasing regularity to that of the common-law and finally to the legal wife. Such convicts would have been inured to the practice of initial instability on the basis of a possible future ideal permanence. Since there were few social sanctions available to keep the couple's relationship intact, it usually did not survive the man's imprisonment and there was little assumption by the convicts themselves that indeed it would. They came to prison anticipating the possibility of separation, and that release would not have entailed any resumption of that particular relationship (2).
The third classification contained the majority of convicts and included all those whose way of life was either intrinsically unstable because of their criminal avocations in the urban-industrial milieu or who worked on estates and factories as migratory labourers. While there may have been psychosocial differences between these two groups of men, in practice they avoided permanent relationships with women and their contacts were mostly with prostitutes. The former by the unstable nature of their lives and the second by contracting to work on estates and away from their homes for long periods since they were considered to be socially inferior to the people living in the communities surrounding the estate, unable to marry without leaving work and returning home to the same social and economic pressures which had pushed them out to work in the first place.

While the former may not have had any comparable experience of sexual deprivation the migrants would have found in a short sentence of imprisonment many parallels to their own lives, certainly during the first months of a work contract, on an estate living in a work camp in which there would have been no unmarried women since their own earnings were needed to set themselves up in their estate quarters, they would not have been sufficiently well-off to use prostitutes.

The last category contained the small numbers of young and immature men who were emotionally in late adolescence and had not yet been integrated into the heterosexual relationships of their own societies. These would have expected and hoped for some emotional attachments and the transfer to the status of convict, would not have altered their incipient status which would thus have been diverted to homosexual relationships.

In other respects also they were different to the western convict in the manner in which their sexual drives were not prevented from becoming at least partially quiescent by the stimulus of sex in advertisements. It seemed that Africans did not respond to the western initiated erotics which was present in almost every newspaper and magazine so those who did deviate from this norm were influenced either by reason of psychological change or prolonged association with western education overseas. This conclusion was in fact logical when the majority of the prisoners were totally, or partially illiterate and had
no comprehension of erotically representational pictures.

A senior officer (4) said that "in all my service, I have never found anything pornographic — little or nothing, possibly one case. Not even among Indian prisoners". Some pictures of women were cut out of newspapers and magazines and the occasional cell had a cigarette card or advertisement pasted on the back of the door where it could not be seen when the door was pushed back on the average inspection. The ones seen were head and shoulder pictures and were put up for decorative purposes, as they made a splash of colour. There was certainly nothing secretive. The only thing approaching the pornographic seen in the prison was a Playboy nude on the wall of the Steward's office, onto which small pieces of cloth had been stuck as clothing. It was stated that this had been done by a prisoner who had been doing clerical work there. A convict (29) described adjustments which did involve erotica and said "you stay for a month and then in the second month you dream of sleeping with a woman, so you masturbate. Pictures of women in magazines doesn't make things worse for me. Some prisoners I have seen taking very special care of magazines which show these women's costumes, they don't seem to be either educated or uneducated. You can see one convict keeping a special picture for so long as six or seven months. They cut them out of magazines. Possibly one out of a hundred prisoners do this. I have never seen any written books in the prison written about sex." It seemed that sexual activity was either homosexual or auto-erotic with possibly an accent on the former rather than the latter in terms of frequency. The majority of convicts forgot about heterosexual relationships. Certainly only a very small minority were involved in imaginative sexual activities through pictures and none at all through written erotica. Whether it was because of frequent white-washing or not but no graffiti on lavatory walls was seen. Kinsky (28) gave a point of view which may have been even more applicable in this prison when he wrote "for the more poorly educated portion of the population, however, there is a minimum of erotic fantasy, and 91.5% of all those committed to penal institutions never go beyond high school in their education. In consequence these prison males do not illustrate sublimation, for they have little or no aroused sexual energy which needs dissipation". There was thus
little pornographic or erotic compensation for the loss of heterosexual relationship.

A further point must be that as the prisoners as a group were illiterate, their usual perceptions were confined to the events and concepts which moved before them - the realities of their everyday life. They found great difficulty in understanding pictorial or written ideas - the abstract rather than the concrete. This became very apparent in teaching prisoners when they found it almost impossible to consider an abstract situation unless they could relate it to their own experience or if it could be acted out in front of them as a physical event. It was possible also that pornographic literature and erotic pictures were not used or thought of because their heterosexual activities were essentially unimaginative - direct physical contacts with very little finesses (9). Kinsey (28) reached much the same conclusion for American prisoners and wrote "a few of these men are nervously disturbed as a result of their lack of outlet; but most of them live comfortably enough, apparently because there is little erotic arousal which needs to be relieved by orgasm. The men in such institutions regularly insist that there is very little if any arousal from conversation, printed pictures, descriptions in literature or anything short of actual contact with a sexual partner. The academically trained are too prone to interpret such situations in terms of their own highly conditioned responses".

While most convicts attributed homosexuality in the prison to their enforced separation from any contact with women, there were references to mental illness. A convict (40) said "a person has a 'wife' in prison because he is mentally sick. Even outside there are dozens of batchelors and maidens and they don't have homosexual partners because they haven't wives. He is mentally sick somewhere". These homosexual relationships involved an intensity of emotion which was the principal factor in the violent incidents reported. A convict (41) said "I don't know the extent to which other convicts trust each other. My trust for Mohammed exceeds the trust which I would have for my own full brother. He won't get anything extra without sharing it with me. We plan our canteen purchases together for our mutual use. If he gets some marihuana I will get my share and the same applies for tea and
and meat. If someone tries to come and make friends with Mohamed without my agreement, he is liable to get seriously beaten up as he is someone special to me”.

Only in homosexual seductions can the use of marihuana be described as socially undesirable. The same convict said "if you encourage someone to smoke marihuana, he takes delight in whatever you say when you call him 'your brother'. You get an opportunity to change him into a woman as he gets drunk from the smoking and you can do what you like without him being aware of what is going on”.

Also in the absence of highly personalised relationships with women and the difficulties of unaccompanied women travelling long distances to visit convicted relatives, husbands and lovers, the majority of prison visitors were men. In addition association with women in an illiterate society could not be maintained or stimulated by letters which in Europe frequently contained sexual references. There were no reports of letters with an erotic content having been seen by prison officers while censoring convicts' mail.

During the study many convicts were asked to write diaries or essays about their lives in any way they liked and on any topic. Although fantasy was shown in many ways relative to their own lives and capabilities, none wrote anything in any way connected with personal sexual matters. A few did in fact discuss such personal sexual problems relative to their present situation but again in terms quite without any fantasy element present in their own personal self-evaluations, and mostly connected with the inevitability of their own homosexual involvement.

Despite these essential differences it was still possible to describe their sexual behaviour in terms of Clemmer's three levels of adjustment (3) as normal, quasi-normal and abnormal but in relation to the East African social circumstances from which the convicts came.

II. Normal adjustment

The normal adjustment of those who had had stable heterosexual relationships outside was to allow their sexual drives to become as quiescent as possible. This did not take the form of any deliberate policy of trying to physically exhaust themselves or to take any
conscious form but to be a development of the anticipated and usual breaks in any traditional modern marriage. Many traditional societies particularly those based on cattle, have strong monosexual elements in their lives - age grades, cattle guarding duties, military service and delayed marriage with which such convicts would have already become accustomed. The fact that such men in prison tended to associate together as much as possible for social and linguistic reasons without any suggestion from their fellow convicts that they were being temporarily homosexual, suggested that their prison sentences may have been taken as a monosexual period comparable to those in their traditional lives and as such not to have been the cause of any sexual deprivation. Their own social upbringing had taught them self-control.

The other type of convict with a more western type of marriage may have been better able to adjust to prison life, because his higher literacy made him useful to almost everyone, prison officers, warders and convicts, if he should have chosen to make himself available to them. He thus could in theory compensate for the loss of his wife by a comparatively high status in the prison community at least equal if not much superior to that which he would have enjoyed outside.

Those in the urban-Islamic and criminal-migratory worker categories may also have been able to compensate for the loss of their heterosexual relationships which may have been entirely physical, by over involvement in convict affairs. In their own social relationships outside these heterosexual ones, they would have been used not only to working very largely if not entirely in male company but they would have become used just as traditional men, to exercising their wits in this male company when they wanted to succeed. In all three categories the typical action group will have been men alone and mixed consultations even on family affairs may well have been relatively rare. Thus in the prison he had a comparable monosexual association in which he could use the same manipulative talents if he wanted to do so. A convict (5) wrote that "any man who has done a year in the prison without any homosexual activity will never indulge in it because he has found other ways of satisfying his wants such as getting good food or marijuana or he had got into good relationships with the warders; he has no need of anything extra".
However there was in all these categories except the immature, an active revulsion for homosexuality which may also have acted as compensation for their own heterosexual deprivation. A prisoner (6) wrote about passive homosexuality that "in prison, one of the things which a prisoner is deprived of, and he finds it one of the most important things, is sexual. Most of the majority do persevere all this, but there are the idiots who are unable to forget all about women and the more their sexual desires arouse their minds, the more they think of other prisoners as women and they try or even they do commit sins in great secret". The same revulsion for active homosexuality was expressed by a convict (7) who wrote that "such a person has no purpose in front of his fellow human beings and God. Even those who are used primarily are subject to the same judgement. It is senseless activity and much disliked. The passive one cannot give birth - there is no profit in the act. Government should punish them heavily - the passive one should have his penis beaten since he wants to be a woman and be imprisoned for life since he does not want to marry and have children to support him in his old age". Another (8) wrote that "God made Adam and Eve as man and wife, certainly not a man to be the wife and so it is a sin against God's law".

Although no sexual action was found to be carried on with female visitors comparable to some reported in British prisons (10), cases were known in which occasional members of outside gangs with the connivance of warders and outside friends, were able to meet a local woman or prostitutes in the warders' lines or on the prison farm during work. A convict (29) described such arrangements and said "convicts on outside gangs get women in the lines by arrangement with the warders. You know most of the warders at the end of the month get prostitutes from the town. Arrange with a warder to go into his house in the lines. You have to be a friend of the warder and it would be necessary to give the prostitute five shillings. It is very rare. You find the convicts who are in the position to do such things are very few. Possibly twenty to twenty-five prisoners might be able to do this. You cannot get a local woman by yourself you must have the help of a warder.

Although this prison had a female wing outside the main prison and physically separated from it, female prisoners and wardresses used
the prison offices for all admissions, disciplinary and discharge purposes. Male and female prisoners were thus occasionally in the reception of ones together, but it did no seem that there was any contact at all between individuals in the two groups - they did not even speak to each other. No cases were known of attempted assinations between the male and female prisoners or even the passing of notes and messages through intermediaries. Against the quasi-normal prison background of constant petty manipulations, it seemed unusual that no convicts attempted to make contact with the female convicts - obvious and nearby focus for the heterosexual ambitions of the unusually talented. Although one prisoner reported an incident involving a female prisoner which had occurred in another prison, they said that no one would have attempted it here as there were too many things which could go wrong as the chain of contacts would be so long.

The fact that the great majority of prisoners adapted to their sexual deprivation without much difficulty was supported by the absence of references to sexual tensions being relieved by masturbation. This was also consistent with the fact that sex was not a constant theme of prison conversation and it can be concluded that if the deprivation of heterosexual relationships was a serious matter, it would at least have been a constant if not normal part of prison conversation.

III. Quasi-abnormal adjustment

The quasi-abnormal adjustment of the man with heterosexual drives who carried out homosexual activities without any transfer of ideas from the female for the duration of his sentence seemed to be the commonest form among long-term convicts. Even in discussing it with some of the individuals concerned, there was the reaction (11) of "what else could I do as I am in prison for so long? We have given up hope of getting out, we will die inside". They were both apologetic and ashamed of what they felt they had been forced to do by circumstances of their long imprisonment.

There was a difference between this type of man and those reported elsewhere (12) because of the design of the prison in which there were few prison cells and almost all convicts were in dormitories. There was less need for casual relationships to be utilised as the convicts
were thrown together all the time and had a relatively free opportunity to form permanent associations with homosexual partners.

It was only a minority of the long-term convicts who adopted this quasi-abnormal adjustment probably those who came from the unstable criminal class and who had undergone considerable prisonisation from repeated sentences. Men known to be in this class were all recidivists and had served sentences in this or nearby countries. It followed from this that they had all had experience of institutional homosexuality elsewhere probably from the time when they could have been included in the immature classification (13) and that had been led from its predominance among their own criminal associates, to have accepted it as an inevitable if not normal consequence of imprisonment.

It seemed therefore that the quasi-abnormal here was probably a transitional stage and that they moved quickly into abnormality in the sense of a semi-permanent homosexual relationship but one in which the ideational content would still be female.

IV. Abnormal adjustment

The prison contained a few prisoners who were constitutionally homosexual over and above those convicted for homosexual offences. They were usually either Arabs or Somalis whose culture had considerable tolerance for institutionalised rather than psychologically deviant homosexuality. Both these and those in the previous category who had taken to this abnormal adjustment because of their age and previous prison experience seemed to take on the active role and to compete for those in the immature classification as their passive partners.

While this situation may have appeared normal, there was considerable tolerance of such homosexual relationships in the surrounding Moslem society (14) where women did not perform romantic roles. Thus at least for some of the immature men there were roles in the outside world for them to copy, and for the remainder who had had no heterosexual relationships on which to look back, were also very socially insecure. Not only were they young and inexperienced but they had been thrust into an environment for which they could have had no prior experience, and therefore very unlikely to have been able to work the usual prison manipulations for their own advantage. The prison
staff were certainly aware of the problems of such young men but unless they were legally juveniles, they could not be transferred to a young prisoners institutions (26).

The immature men by taking on the passive role in a homosexual partnership may have been able to sell himself for substantially better living conditions while he was protected by his active partner (45). The two roles were clearly distinguished by the prison community. It was certain that a number of prisoners apart from the constitutionally homosexual took up active and passive homosexual roles for the duration of their imprisonment for both sexual, economic and social advantages.

The active homosexual was described by a convict (15) as "there are some who are very talkative to newly admitted convicts who look younger and quiet. They begin by providing part of their rations to such youngsters and thence a friendship might be founded which might result in a homosexual game". Another convict (16) states that "he uses much ingenuity to steal extra food or to make the necessary secret tradings with the cooks to get such extras. He eats this extra food with a certain young man whom he has established as his wife. The others who sleep in the same dormitory cell say that he tells the young man that he will have no troubles during his sentence while the older man is there. Another wrote that "he gives his food to the young man as a start to seducing him. If anyone else talks to this young man, he immediately asks what the other said, out of jealousy". One convict (11) who had spent over ten years in prison, and who had at one time been an active homosexual, estimated that only a small minority of the long-term convicts in the prison had not been involved in some such relationship and he even alleged that some of these men managed to form and maintain polygynous relationships with several passive men at the same time. None of the informants were able to write or describe the physical stereotype of the active homosexual.

The passive partner, however, had a stereotype which could have been described and a prisoner (16) wrote that such a person "doesn't like to work with his hands. He likes to sit and get his work task done by another. He likes to be clean, he doesn't like being dirty."
He doesn't like to talk to anyone else except the man who does his work for him. This man's body has changed to look like a woman. He likes very much sweet things and that other man brings him sugar from his monthly canteen purchase even though he could buy it from his own money. He is like a small child as even a woman makes an effort to work with her hands. These are his habits only in prison. All the time he uses his eyes to glance about like a woman and even his voice has gone high to sound like a woman. No convicts were seen who attempted to make themselves up or to dress their hair in a feminine style. The growing of at least one long nail was common among educated convicts and was a sign of status rather than homosexuality.

These men may have been inadequate from either the petty criminal or migratory labour classification who lacked the character to survive of themselves in the prison community. One prisoner (17) wrote that "vagrants after reaching prison are always kept by other prisoners as their wives". The same long-term recidivist (11) stated that "the passive men look coy when you stare at them. They offer themselves if you have anything to trade, even a cigarette. Some cannot do the work task which they have been given to do so cannot get any earnings and he looks for a man to help him, and others to get him extra food, marijuana or to have his clothes washed. There are many who find prison life hard and lighten it in this way and they seek a permanent relationship. One of them is in this block and on a Saturday afternoon, as many as ten people turn up in the block with presents - he is very greedy and he does it to get extra rations. He eats as many as six extra rations".

The passive homosexual was always in his teens or early twenties, and was considered to be identifiable by his stereotype of feminine inadequacy. Thus circumstances made homosexuals out of a proportion of those who practiced in the prison. A long-term convict (29) estimated the number of homosexuals in the prison and said "there are two in the cooks' block, three in C hall, and four or five Stage Fours. In D Hall at least four, but in E Hall which is filled with local men there might be ten or thirteen and these are not necessarily Arab just coastal people, any thirty in the whole prison".

It seemed that some convicts had a much higher sexual potential
to suppress if they were to do without any sexual activity while they were imprisoned and that others of a more passive nature found it very convenient to comply with this need when they materially benefitted from doing so. Some convicts (34) did not accept the argument that homosexual behaviour was inevitable in the long-term prisoners and said "one does not feel sick because he has not had a woman for ten years. It is a great trial but because you are denied of it, you might as well forget it. I think the ones who have gone in for it cannot say it is because they have been in prison for so long. I have seen people with a sentence of three months doing it. Whereas I have been here more than twelve months, I have never done anything like that".

An active homosexual convict (30) described how he found and kept his passive partner and said "a young man came to the prison and I became attached to him so that we worked side by side and I used to help him when his work fell short of the daily task. Now the corporal in the workshop was also a man of the same tribe and knew that I was an active homosexual. He called the lad and asked him if he had known me for some time as he was working and eating with me, warning him that I was a homosexual. The lad said he did not know that and broke off the conversation as I had always treated him as a brother and warned him about homosexuals in the prison. When he came back to our workplace, he told me what the corporal had said warning him not to be seduced by me. The lad said that he believed what the corporal had said as they were from the same tribe but I reminded him that I had already spoken to him about that very matter. Then asked him what was wrong if I used him as a woman since I was shut up in a prison and could not get a woman to use in the normal way. The lad then started to work out what would happen to him if he followed the corporal's advice because I was giving him extra food and doing a considerable part of his rope-making task for him - neither of which could the corporal help him with everyday. So he did nothing and we are still working and playing together".

In this incident both parties were very well aware that homosexuality was against their own moral codes but imprisonment alone produced a set of circumstances which overrode the normal controls of society.
The convict informant who told this story was ashamed of his acts but not of the circumstances which made it necessary and indeed at the end of the interview asked what else he could do when he had a further three years sentence in front of him. Not only was homosexuality morally wrong but some convicts thought that it had adverse physical effects. A convict (33) said that "the man who is turned into a woman by his companion for any length of time becomes a woman himself or at least impotent",

The long process of obtaining a homosexual partner was described by another prisoner (32) who said "I had been in the cell with this other young prisoner for some time. We used to eat together and he has used many of my things - smoking my marihuana and tobacco cigarettes, extra food and even a share of my own and I wanted to make an arrangement for him to be my 'woman'. I asked him if he was my friend and he agreed but I replied that I wasn't so sure as I had given him everything in my power without holding back even to doing a good part of his rope task. Don't you think that there is something that I might want in return for this help. He pretended not to understand what I wanted to which I replied that I wanted the special sort of prison friendship as there were no women in prison. If we help each other in this matter, I will continue to give you all that I have. He admitted that I had been generous with him but said he had never acted in the way I wanted since he was born although he had heard that men are used as women in some places. I said that I knew he had never done it before and neither had I had that I had only started to want such a thing because of being locked up in an all male prison, I wanted to try and that if it was satisfactory, I would want to carry on with it. It would only be a sign of friendship between us, never an act of disrespect I am the man as I am older than you". Since the homosexuals showed no observable tension over their activities even under conditions of some hostility and uncertainty, there may have been other factors. Most of the convicts had been imprisoned for acquisitive offences and such men had been found elsewhere (42) to accept homosexual experiences without noticeable upset.

It was the prison rule (4) that there should have been either one or three persons in a single cell, but this fact and the multiple wards
which could hold up to thirty, prisoners did not seem to have much effect on the incidence of homosexuality. Prisoners reported that couples lie together in these large dormitory cells although the light is on all night and there was a generalised use of the cell lavatory for such purposes during the night and day. Homosexual activities were certainly not prevented by multiple cells.

V. Attitudes to homosexuality

There was a very generalised dislike and loathing of homosexuality amongst almost all prisoners, even amongst those who had only become homosexuals during their imprisonment. Most of these prisoners were sufficiently near to their tribal origins to be bound by the concepts of customary law and no tribal system known in East Africa had a socially recognised place for the homosexual except perhaps the Arabs, Afro-Arabs, and Somali communities who had deviants even to the extent of public transvestites (18). Their revulsion may have been a physical one from an unnatural act, but it was socially based as well, and supported by customary law.

Prisoners probably found the practice of homosexuality unsettling and suggested (19) that "the man who has made arrangements with the young prisoners would be best sent to another prison because of quarrels they stir up in fighting over their boys". Another (20) wrote that "it is up to the government to take action against such people but nothing is done and they continue to be numerous in this prison". Another (21) counseled that "the young men should be put in a separate prison or at the very least made to sleep in separate cells".

In conversation about these passive partners, they were referred to as children yapoto before a liaison was established and as a wife bibi va vatu - the same phrase as would have been used for a legal wife obtained with bridewealth, rather than as a common-law wife mwanamke va kinyumba or prostitute hayara. It was difficult to discover the reasons behind convict reactions to homosexual behaviour, and jealousy apart, it probably depended on the degree to which the persons concerned were appearing to be better off than their fellows. A convict (35) described a reaction against suspect homosexuality and said "the prisoner who called the domestic gang in the morning does no
work for the rest of the day. Some convicts in B block went and complained to an officer that this chap who is a clerk is doing sodomy because in that block there is a young man who is known to have been doing it as a woman. Everytime they complained in order to remove him, this chap puts him back there. So they thought they must have some sort of relations. The officer went there and found this clerk sitting with the boy". It should be noted that the convicts complained to the staff and that it was not classed as informing although it was against another convict's interests.

While the prison authorities were both aware and nervous of homosexual problems, the convicts themselves if given the opportunity would play on this difficulty. If they were not to be manipulated the officer in charge could not afford to take such accusations on their face value. A convict (36) described such an incident and said he had been given a single cell as he wanted to study but had offered to give literacy classes. One day the officer on inspection came to his cell and found a Hasai there. This man stood up and said that the teacher had refused to teach him as he had refused to be seduced. The Chief Warder suggested that the elders in the yard should enquire into the matter but we couldn't decide whether it was true or not and the teacher lost his single cell as a result". In this case as it only seemed to involve these two individuals, the solution was to keep them apart although it seemed that the teacher-convict had been given the single cell as he had been irritating his companions in a general cell. The moving about of a troublesome convict who caused trouble to others or to himself, was probably the only solution for peace in the prison other than a transfer to another prison which would not be agreed to because of the expense unless he had a serious record of prison offences. So the troublemaker was kept on the move to avoid the building up of trouble between him and his yard associates. An example of a false homosexual accusation was given in this incident of which a convict (37) said "this youth in the ward had a sentence of imprisonment for buggery. Some in the ward did not like the convict in charge and had asked him to resign so that another person could be appointed but he refused. They then tutored this youth to say that he had been seduced by the in-charge. When this man heard of
this conspiracy, he slapped the youth who then complained about being seduced and hit. The Officer in charge said he could not be certain whether the first charge was true or not and he dismissed it but for the slap, he was punished.

Much of the little violence which did occur in the prison and which may not have been known to the authorities, occurred because of homosexual jealousy. A convict (11) described an assault in which one convict was assaulted so that his head was cut open, and said that "he had tried to take another man's friend and was hit from behind with a broom handle. The assaulter did not make any excuse just stated straight out that he was getting into a relationship with his wife". Another convict (16) wrote that "you have only to start talking to his friend for him to come up at once and start being aggressive". A convict (11) who had been an active homosexual because of his long sentence described the ambivalence of his feelings and the pressures which led him to violence. "I had a great friend who when he left prison, asked me to look after his wife which I agreed to do. A man called Hamisi shouted out loud in public one day that I was buggering this youth. I was ashamed in front of everyone, even those who did not know about such things were shocked at me. So I attacked this man and cut him up with a knife". Homosexual jealousy was a permanent potential source of violence in the prison and much of the dislike of homosexuality may have stemmed from the prisoners own dislike of violence which upset the overall regularity of their lives and their opportunities for manipulation.

VI. The prison administration and sex

The senior staff had a difficult problem on their hands which was not of their creation and which they could do little if anything to control. The alternatives of punishing, transferring or separating homosexuals were not real solutions under these prison conditions. Most staff tacitly agreed that there was no logical point in punishing them since it was the prison itself which had created the offence in the first place and would only do so when physical violence had occurred or when a young person was involved.

Transferring them was also accepted as no solution since they would have carried on their activities wherever they were sent and it
would create difficulties and animosities within the Prison Service since other prisons would reciprocate by transferring their homosexuals in retaliation. A senior officer (4) said that "you cannot do anything about it. Splitting up these partners can lay up a real store of trouble for yourself. If it has come to my notice officially, I have to split it up but I have never looked for it. One knows it's there but prefers to do nothing about it. Too complicated. Not too rife. To many, homosexuality is an absolute anathema. I have all the time for a murderer but I have no time for a homosexual. I hate them. It maybe a sickness which can be cured but to me it is the lowest of the low. We don't get much violence here because of it - I remember 2 or 3 cases in 14 years service".

The same convict (11) said that "the staff try and prevent serious trouble building up by moving homosexuals. Look at the way they have segregated the man who was beaten up, maybe it is because they don't want him to be hit again, but also he has been so active homosexually that they must keep him apart from fear of provocation. Similarly the passive homosexual in my block is moved from cell to cell every week so as to prevent relationships being formed or other people take action against him".

It was probable that the senior staff may have had no incentive or talent for disentangling the homosexual relationships in the prison on top of their other work, and that such movements were organised by perceptive Chief Warders. It was likely that the Officer in charge did not want the homosexuality in his prison to receive any more publicity than was necessary for maintaining a reasonable control over the prison. A convict (31) described an incident which involved a Chief Warder and said "Abashi had a young man whom he had turned into a woman with whom he had been living outside before they had been convicted together of stealing as the young man had been found wearing a stolen shirt. Ndevi spotted this relationship and wanted the young man for himself so wrote him a letter saying that he particularly liked the young man Kasungu and would give him anything he wanted if he would become his girl. This really surprised Kasungu who took the letter to the Chief Warder".

"Now Ndevi had already been charged four times with homosexual
offences so when the Chief Warder showed him the letter, he immediately admitted that he had written it. On being asked why he had done it, he said that he was serving a sentence of five years and no women while the prison was full of men alone. There is nothing secret about us using men as women, you know well enough that it goes on.

I am not going to deny the letter just because it has fallen into your hands; I wrote it to get Kazungu's services. Kazungu denied that he was a homosexual although the Chief Warder asked him why the letter had been written to him of all people in the prison. So he warned them both and sent them away". As this incident was described the Chief Warder knew that Abashi and Kazungu had been homosexual partners for sometime and hoped that by ignoring the letter in so far as not making it a charge under prison rules, Ndevu would be warned away and the existing relationship carried out without trouble since they had shared the same cell since their arrival.

Just as the staff would tolerate homosexuality provided that it was not too obvious, similarly the prisoners preferred that such relationships should be understated. A convict (36) described an incident in which the yard community sharply reacted against a parody of sexual activity in a homosexual context and said "one afternoon in our yard the men were dancing to a tune thumped out on the top of the canteen box, and two of them behaved disgracefully in front of us all by imitating sexual intercourse on the floor. The matter was taken in front of the yard elders and they were ordered to clean the lavatories for a week and to walk round the cell on their knees with a bucket of water on their heads twenty times."

In some cases active homosexuals were prepared to make a physical challenge for the possession of a 'woman'. In the case of Abashi and Ndevu in which the Chief Warder had declined to take any action on the complaint of the passive homosexual Kazungu that he was being interfered with, Ndevu attacked Abashi the same day and they were separated by other prisoners without any warders seeing the fight. Later in the evening Ndevu challenged Abashi to a formal fight which took place in the escapes compound at the back of the old kitchen where nothing could be seen by the warder on duty at the gate. The same convict continued "as soon as they got round the corner, Ndevu hit Abashi but
although Abashi knew much about fighting, he seemed to think that this sort of a fight was just plain stupid. So Abashi said that Ndenu was just picking a quarrel as they were both in prison, but Ndenu thumped him again and Abashi got really angry, bled his eye and tore his shirt and there was so much noise that the warder on duty came to see what was going on. The warder said he would charge them both in the morning while the prisoners wanted them to go on fighting or at least not report them for fighting. The effect of the fight was to successfully prevent any challenge to Abashi's ownership of the passive homosexual by the other man for the duration of their sentence.

In other cases the staff would act to head off a homosexual relationship which at least one of the parties was trying to develop. A convict (37) described the refusal by the Officer in charge of a request concerning his passive partner and said "I was surprised when my request was refused. The Chief Warder said that I was always making requests of a similar nature and the persons for whom he makes his requests are always small children. We do know what he wants with these young children. If you allow him his request it is just as if you were to permit him to marry".

The convict (22) who had knifed someone over homosexual jealousy said that "it was down in the charge sheet that we were fighting over our wife. This got us each the same sentence in the punishment cells and but for this, I would have got an increased prison sentence in court of grievous harm".

Homosexual relationships may have been tolerated by the staff so long as they were not made too obvious, much less any question of flaunting the situation in front of them. A convict (33) talked about making a gift of clothes to his 'woman' and said "If I go to the officer in charge and request that some of my civilian clothing should be given to this young man, I will be immediately refused on the grounds of homosexuality. The young man must go on request saying that before conviction I was in the same house as him for a time and when he went to the town, left some of his property in my care. By accident we are now in the same prison. I should explain that he was a short-term prisoner whereas I was long-term and he wanted to wear these clothes
VII. Attitudes to sexual offences and offenders

Sex offences as such formed a very small percentage of all crimes known to the police; the category was confined to unnatural offences and rape and defilement of women below the age of puberty. Against this small number, there was a strong feeling of animosity which did not lead to violence and the prisoners concerned stated that they were imprisoned for other, usually white-collar, offences. There were some rape offenders in the prison usually of young unmarried women but most of these cases came within a definition of statutory rape in that the girl was sexually mature. These men were regarded as offenders against custom rather than as breakers of a criminal law justifying a sentence of imprisonment as a sum in compensation for physical damage done would have satisfied custom, which included preventing a girl from completing her education because of pregnancy.

An educated convict (43) wrote "every tribe in East Africa has different customs. Raping a married woman is not usually taken as a very serious crime by the tribe but the husband of the woman would take it as an insult and he himself would take it very seriously. He sometimes hunts for the person to fight and sometimes kill him. But if the husband of the woman informs the members of the community about the raping of his wife, the raper will be fined; he will be asked to give one heifer or cow, lamp etc. and the matter is washed out".

To spinster and girls forcible intercourse is not regarded as rape at all because the methods applied by most of the East African tribes to win them is often force, therefore it is taken as a custom.

A convict (42) writes that "there is only one reason which I always think does not make African take rape to be a serious crime. That is because girls have no liberty to choose the right husbands as being done by civilised countries. Their parents force them to marry any man that they have recommended as the right husband for her. Force is not a new thing for them. I must conclude in stating that as in East Africa at this stage rape should be put in a list of minor crimes on ground that the big percentage of its population is still adopting force method on both marriages and winning them. Therefore the sen-
sentence punishable to a person committed rape in my opinion should be six months to one year imprisonment, or even less than that."

Another convict (44) wrote "the present judgement of this natural offence rape clearly shows the law, if not the makers, misunderstand the vital functions of organs of the body, and also lack of natural humanity in not knowing the longer you force man out of nature the higher the temper of nature becomes and the greater the danger. Such crimes are caused by natural forces and even if the girl is hurt, the offender should not be imprisoned". A more serious view was taken of raping girls who had not yet reached puberty some suggested that it approached a capital offence in severity. Most said that corporal punishment was the suitable punishment, and referred to the effect of rape on the families concerned rather than the girl.

It was more the case that they were ridiculed by the other convicts because they had not enough intelligence to get the woman to agree to interco rse without using force. A convict (24) wrote that "rape occurs when a man has been expensively courting a woman who keeps putting off sleeping with him because she has another lover or she is sick. Such a man deserves a heavy sentence such as 3 years for being too stupid to find another woman". This feeling of indifference to the raper or an adult woman seemed to be a very universal characteristic of prisoners (25). Since sex was not a constant topic of conversation it followed that the convicts were relatively indifferent to sex offenders who nevertheless felt sufficiently under a disadvantage, to hide their crimes.
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Chapter XII

Outside influences on the prison

In its relationships with the outside world and the influences of the outside world on the prison, it functioned to a very large extent in a social vacuum. While this was due in some part to the geographical isolation of the prison, its true cause was the disinterest of the public in prison matters either in terms of social service or vicarious interest in the press.

Much of the outside contacts in Western and American prisons were provided by those who wished to give their services in a charitable cause as prison visitors, teachers, entertainers and ministers of religion. Such people had to have their incomes assured so that they could perform these valuable free services in their spare time.

In a developing country such as this, free social service was not only the spare-time occupation of the professional or middle-class but was potentially confined to the non-African communities. During this period which covered independence, the number of Europeans who were committed to the country as theirs for life, was being substantially reduced by emigration and their replacements in commerce and industry were on short-term contracts, and thus they had no interest in performing such social services.

Arabs and Indians were not only subject to the political pressures of Africanisation and at least the subconscious consideration of the need to think about emigration, but may also have disliked the publicity of being involved with an almost totally African prison population in an increasingly African prison administration. Not only were fewer persons available for charitable work but the needs of prisoners were neither attractive to nor given priority in the considerations of those who might have been available. This shortage of volunteers was not due to any lack of interest on the part of the authorities who would have liked them to do such work.

Public opinion as an outside influence which the prison department had to consider was virtually non-existent. No outsiders were allowed to visit the prison unless they had a reason to do so which was covered by the Prison Rules and acceptable to the Officer in charge or the Commissioner of Prisons; there were for instance, no
conducted tours for students or social workers as a part of their training or general education.

In theory the department would have said that they had nothing to hide, but in practice there was an almost complete embargo on the passage of news in general or in particular to the public about prisons and prisoners on the lines of British practice. There was no conception that the prison had to be justified to the public if anything the moderation of the penal policy in recent years was against public opinion and was able to be carried on at least in part because of this news embargo. However in a developing country the reading of news was a newly acquired interest and in this group of literates there was little interest in prison affairs as a source of news.

It would have been quite wrong to suggest that this practice was primarily motivated to protect the department and its members from unjustified accusations. The prisoners also had the right to be protected from publicity while serving their sentences and the authorities also considered that guilt in one area of behaviour meant that they could not be trusted in others. Although this protection was absolute in newspaper publicity, nothing was done to protect him from publicity or rather to respect his privacy at certain times during his sentence. Prisoners working on the farm were in full sight of the road; those who assisted in outside building works were even more in public and those who were referred to the hospital in town, went in prison uniforms through the corridors. It did not seem that this ambivalent protection was caused by any deliberate intention to make these convicts feel shame and embarrassment.

The prison department maintained its statutory position of being answerable to the Minister of Home Affairs and fulfilled its publicity obligations by the production of an Annual Report which was very largely statistical. Although the general public showed little or no interest in penal policy and practice, the judiciary, the police and the lawyers were professionally involved and interested. No attempts were made to justify and explain the country's penal policies to these people, although logically this would seem to have been absolutely essential for the judiciary.

Another connection with the outside world which the prisoners
recognised was the celebration of political and religious holidays. The former particularly as Independence Day and its successors had been recognised by the remission of at least some part of every convicts' sentence; this provided the senior staff particularly with considerable over-work to alter the expected date of release for every prisoner and to release a substantial number of them at once.

The prison population was very appreciative of special festivities to celebrate outside occasions when either themselves or the staff had gone to the trouble of organising them. A convict (21) said "the celebrations which we had in the prison to mark the President's Day were excellent; almost everybody was happy. Even the warders came to watch because of the clever songs and dances. There was dancing, boxing and recitations. Some even dressed up so that they could indeed have been mistaken for women, we felt that we were free of the prison for at least that day. Nothing bad happened all day - not a single quarrel. The main organiser of the dancing and costuming was a convict who has not been here very long."

Nothing was heard to suggest that such generalised celebrations were made the occasion for particular illegal activities to be carried out under the cover of such temporary disorganisation when convicts were usually able to move about the prison with considerable freedom.

In comparison some prisoners (22) commented on the lack of festivities over Christmas and said "on this holiday we were just locked up. Looked up until mid-day food which came late at 2 p.m. and then locked up again by half past. On the day after it was just the same being locked up most of the day. Various priests came but we were not all allowed to go to Church. They were not happy on this holiday. Some said we were being troubled in the same way that Jesus was given trouble".

Although the staff realised well enough the significance of these holidays and the break which they brought in the monotonous lives of the prisoners, they were only partly free to make unusual arrangements. In the first place this medium security prison contained large numbers of long-term prisoners and they could not afford to take the risks involved in relaxing the rules and allowing general association. In the Independence celebrations the circumstances were different as the prisoners themselves put on an interesting show which the officers and
warder staff came to see with the result that the prison was not understaffed at that time to deal with any emergency. Secondly the wishes of the warders and officers staff to have as much time as possible off duty during official holidays must have priority over convict welfare. The prison was thus run on the minimum possible staff on Sundays and holidays so they did not have the staff to release prisoners from their cells except for short periods and in small numbers. This resulted in those occasions being ones in which the convicts felt even more cut off from outside life than they would have done on an ordinary day, the reality of being in prison was rubbed in.

The outside influences on the individual prisoner were designed to be the same as those available in Western and American prisons; letters, visits, newspapers and the wireless, but the situation here was different. For these links to have functioned fully the prisoners and their friends and relatives had to be literate, the prison conveniently situated, the newspapers and wireless provided in a dialect known to them. There were restricted visits and letters available to all convicts and a loud-speaker system allowed news broadcasts and other programmes for short periods. Newspapers and magazines were allowed to those who could get them posted to them and some were begged or borrowed from the warder staff. A convict said "there were no restrictions on journals coming in and you can have a subscription to a local paper for delivery every day, and it would only be opened to see if there is a smuggled letter inside". While the convicts may have seen letters and visits as at least some attempt for them to continue to keep in touch with their relatives which was permitted by the authorities, the prison officers saw them as restrictions related to punishment. A senior officer said "it is largely a question of punishment. If they were unlimited, it would be bringing him back to the privileges which he had as a free man. It contributes to the overall question of discipline; a deterrent - a little bit more of a whip-hand. A big proportion would not want more than their entitlement, letters and correspondence don't mean the same to them as to us".

Under these conditions it was doubtful whether the maintenance of
outside connections and their influences on the prisoners, was a serious factor in their lives except for the small number of highly educated ones. It was a much diminished factor in the lives of the partially educated and almost non-existent for the uneducated particularly those whose homes were far distant from the prison.

The difficulties of trying to keep up with current affairs in prison were described by one convict (9) who said "there are very few inside who were interested in politics. It is because they feel that politics has nothing to do with them; criminals just aren't interested. Even when the radio is on, many will not want to listen and make a lot of noise; they won't keep quiet so that the other can hear. It is none of their business who wins an election. If you argue with them about the noise, they say carry on listening, there is nothing worth listening to. They keep up their argument until the news broadcast is over". An uneducated convict (13) took the same view and said "convicts were not very interested in the news except for those with short sentences. However we were all upset by the death of President Kennedy; he was a good man who tried to help negroes to get their rights; he also brought maize here during the recent famine; he helped the world and he was a peace-lover". An educated convict (33) took a different attitude and said "day after day I grew pale, white and lean. There were no books in the prison to entertain my floating thoughts. There was no radio to bring news from outside, Newspapers were rarely seen. The prison was but a cave where for the first time I found myself cut off from the country's news."

However these last two categories may not have felt themselves cut off from outside influences in any special way just because they were in prison. Unless they were convicted near to their homes, it was possible that their relatives, may not even have known that they were in prison. Even if such persons wrote letters to their friends and relatives, the absence of any postal delivery service since houses did not have recognisable postal addresses meant that they were collected by nearby missions and administrative offices. These had boxes open to the public who searched through them for their letters if they happened to be passing and thought they might have had a letter waiting for them. There were usually dozens of long uncollencted letters in
these boxes with barely legible names and addresses. Thus the isola-
tion of such convicts may have been just another aspect of the simi-
larity between prison life and employment away from home. They could
not keep their relatives informed of their whereabouts and their rela-
tives did not expect to know where they were and indeed the families
of such workers may have known no more of the whereabouts of their
menfolk than the district in which they were working and at the most
the company or estate concerned.

This may in fact have had little deleterious affect on the convict
simply because they never expected to keep in touch with their
homes whenever they should leave for work elsewhere. This cutoffness
which was considered to be one of the worst aspects of Western and
American prison life, may have been seen as a normal part of their
travelling life. Migrants in 19th century America and Europe were not
able to keep their relatives informed nor did the British soldiers
in the Crimea and India, the British sailor on blockade duty during
the Napoleonic wars nor those who moved to England from the Scottish
highlands or Ireland during the Industrial Revolution. Once such
people left home they were isolated, remained so and accepted it as
inevitable.

The professional criminal for whom the Morris¹ formulated the
penalty box hypothesis did not occur in this prison, because firstly
the same restrictions on contact with the outside world applied to
them as to other semi-literate and illiterate convicts. Secondly
their criminality in this prison at least did not depend on maintaining
contact with a network of other professional criminals in the towns
and industrial areas, but was more likely to involve the traditional
crimes of poaching and cattle rustling which did not require the main-
tenance of contacts while the convict was away in prison.

The maintenance of outside contact was important for the educated
or those who considered themselves educated. In their letters, visits
and in the newspapers which they read, they saw the opportunities slip
by to which they aspired. During the independence period the educated
were almost all receiving rises in status. The whole group had a
high mobility upwards and was composed of such small numbers that they
were usually known to each other. Consequently these convicts heard
that others were getting on and that they were losing their relative status as one-time members of this elite. A convict (43) wrote "it is a great blow to one when he finds that he is a step behind his age group, and most of all behind those who used to be his classmates in school. This fact has poisoned my feelings towards my friends. I think after release I will find all my friends holding big responsible positions in their respective organisation. Hence they will take me as a spoilt man who can be good enough to dust their shoes". Another (31) said "if you have come once to prison you are known by all your friends. The best thing is to go to some other country and start a new life. Prison is a thing which pulls you like a magnet."

The worries caused by these outside contacts were worst for those with strong political affiliations outside, who had a very high self-definition of what they could achieve in the outside world and whose sentence was short enough to have involved little distortion of his ideas on his own career.

Besides letters and visits an additional means of contact was through the warders. The importance of tribe in this prison community has been noted, not only between the convicts but in the relationships between convicts and warders but that they may also have been known to each other outside. Many if not most criminals came from areas in which there was a maximum presence of government, the smaller towns, trading centres and industrial areas and since both police and criminals were in the same business, it was not surprising that associations occurred outside which could have been continued inside the prison. One convict (24) phrased such an association and said "I knew the warden who came on duty during the afternoon as we used to live near each other in the capital and I used to find a woman for him when he wanted one. I told him my trouble and he said that he would do what he could and that I needn't worry so much. Such warders would act as a channel for extra letters to and from the prisoner and if they went home on leave or escort duties, they could actually go and see their relatives.

Warders were also able to make contact with the relatives and friends of prisoners who lived locally since they visited the local town regularly, and similarly relatives made contact with them. A
convict (25) said "relatives of mine had made arrangements to send me money through a corporal with whom they had agreed that he should keep half".

I. Letters and visits

In a largely illiterate prison, the worries over letters were obviously confined to the literate who wanted to keep contact with their relatives and friends. A convict (24) said of the worries caused by letters "some days you will find yourself very happy; you will get good news from home for which you have waited for a very long time. Until it comes we have to be all alone from others all night as we are very worried". Since the literate were the most sensitive to their status the procedure for letter writing was disliked; a convict (15) said "letters are not very easily written for you cannot get any piece of paper unless your name is recorded in the register. They don't give you your entitlement, you have to ask for it. Then when you have finished writing your letter, it must be noted in your record."

Another convict (18) said "even if you use your full entitlement of letters - the regular number according to your stage which is usually one per month - it is useless as a method to keep in touch with family or friends. Others who have been inside for two years, don't bother to write any letters at all. It is possible to get more than your letter entitlement if you know someone in the welfare office but it is favouritism rather than tribalism". Another convict (17) commented "it is not easy to keep contact with your friends outside. They give you the opportunity of writing to one friend at one time. If you have six friends, it will mean six months to write to them all." Another (32) seemed disturbed enough by a family letter to consider trying to escape and said "yesterday I got a letter from home saying that everyone at home sent me their regards. On my part I would do what I can with God's help to go and see them."

Other than for the educated group letters were not really a means of communicating ideas but a status symbol; the pleasure and excitement lay in the act of receiving a letter rather than in its contents. The writers of letters coming in were almost entirely men which reflected not only that education was very largely a male prerogative but that
men, particularly brothers, were the pivots round which families revolved rather than wives.

To the educated, letters or their absence appeared to increase rather than diminish anxieties and a convict (19) said "I have not heard from my family for four months; I am very worried. I have written four letters and had no reply. A discharged prisoner was asked to call at my mother's shop. I am not worried about my wife who is a school teacher; she may have gone off with another man - it is always happening - I do not blame her. But not to hear from my family, that is very worrying". Where as the anxiety of the American and European convict was almost entirely over women with whom there had been a sexual relationship, this aspect did not occur with these African convicts to anything like the same degree.

It did seem that the regulations for the writing and receiving of letters were based on the need to prevent the overloading of the officers censoring the letters, which would not have occurred anyway with the prisons containing such a high proportion of illiterates or semi-illiterates, to enforce equality in the provision of privileges to the convicts and to reduce the costs of postage spent on the convicts.

The circumstances of personal visits did not make for the successful maintenance of family contacts. Visitors and prisoners stood in stalls in which there was a glass partition over which the sounds of the conversation carried. A convict (26) said "the visiting place makes me feel sick as it is built like a cold storage plant. It shows no respect for the public who come to visit," and another (6) "the glass in front made it very difficult for me to hear properly. I got very angry. I know this is done so that things cannot be passed through to us but perhaps it is also done so that we have to talk very loudly and the warder there is thus able to hear all we say". Another (31) said "you see people in clean clothes and you start thinking of what you will do to get out of this place, and wear those clean clothes". While it may not have been the intention of prison policy to penalise such personal contacts, the effect of the design of these arrangements had been to do just this. The routine work of the prison had to continue and the length of visits restricted partially on this account.
and also to penalise the convict, although the result was to penalise the visitor as well who may have travelled some distance at relatively great expense to make the visit.

Every afternoon the prison compound had a few people waiting under the trees to see a prisoner; they applied at the gate-house office window for a visitor’s pass which admitted them through the main gate to the visiting cubicles in the administrative block which could be approached by the prisoners without passing out of the main prison compound. The warder who made out the visitors’ passes for most of this period, had a pleasant and open manner in speaking to the visitors which must have gone somewhere to reducing their embarrassment. These visitors were predominantly male and while there may have been some attempt to screen such visitors almost anyone with a legitimate reason for seeing a convict was able to do so provided that he was entitled to a visit at that time. A convict (17) said “visits are just as restricted as letters. The time you are allocated for talking and seeing your visitor is fifteen minutes. At times there happens to be somebody with more understanding you may be allowed more time or to talk in one of the offices. You are also refused to talk in your own dialect and your visitor might not know Swahili as you must talk a language which the warder on duty can understand. The warder on duty might say your time is finished, despite the fact that he doesn’t have any watch”. However visitors did bring gifts of fruit and tobacco which were allowed to be passed to the prisoner which may have gone much towards cancelling the administrative difficulties and made them more important personally to those prisoners visited.

Without commenting on these administrative difficulties some convicts were against visits altogether because of their effect on both the prisoner and the visitor. The same convict said “some like visits, some do not. They say that it increases their worries. When you see your people from home, they get very much worried when they see you dressed in these awkward clothes. They tend to worry very much. They think that you are being very much tortured or yourself is being very much disturbed. Some try to avoid having visits by writing and asking them not to take the trouble of coming over to see them. If I am visited I couldn’t become comfortable on that particular
day or some days after". Others took a reverse view (20) and said
'I get a visit once a month from one or another of my relatives. I
like it as it lightens my heart. I am more likely to be worried about
them and how they are getting on than to be upset by seeing them".

II. Religious activities and attitudes

The law (1) provides for the Minister of Home Affairs to appoint
ministers or priests of any religious faith to be prison ministers
for whom the Commissioner of Prisons shall frame standing orders and
who may receive reimbursement or remuneration for their services.
The prison rules (2) state that each prisoner on admission must state
his religious denomination, and that ministers of religions shall be
permitted to visit prisoners, and that the officer in charge shall
make arrangements for the holding of religious services and the
religious instruction of the prisoners.

The attitudes of prisoners and staff showed wide variations. A
senior officer (3) said "religion in the prison is an additional in-
terest. It is escapism of a sort. They let off steam and they are
happy when they do it. Life in the prison is very monotonous and the
Sunday service is a diversion for them. The opportunity to visit his
friends and to trade has nothing to do with it as he can do this any
time he wants", but a recidivist convict (4) said "the religious
sessions on Sundays are a great opportunity for unrestricted trading
and talking.

Another convict (5) said "many take to religion because they are
in trouble and on their release they forget all about it". This was
illustrated by the saying of actual prisoners that (6) "I pray to
God to let me out soon to prison" and (7) "therefore I will pray God
very hard to help me after finishing my sentence not to do anything
which can lead me to prison" and conversely "it is pretentious non-
sense to become Christianised; it is something to do inside, pretend-
ing to be good".

Others referred to the inadequacy of the religious activities
provided (8) and said "the Roman Catholic Priests can only manage to
get here once every four or five weeks. I have never seen a Church
of England parson or any other minister. I thought this was a most
serious failing of the churches. The prison could only ask ministers of the denominations represented in the local town to attend the prison when they could and most of these managed to visit once a month. However several of the established denominations had no local full-time ministers such as the Church of Scotland and the Seventh Day Adventists so consequently they were not visited. Perhaps more important than this were the members of separatist churches which in this country probably outnumbered those in established churches, and their members also received no visits.

At the beginning of this period the prison had a full-time chaplain appointed and paid by the Prison Department. He wore a military type uniform as other senior prison officers with a Roman collar. He was transferred after a few months and the prison remained without a full-time chaplain for the remainder of the period. A prisoner (9) commented on religious activities in general and said "they don't give other help besides the services. We talk to them but what can you talk about with a padre unless you are a practising Christian, I attend the services. We have a preacher who comes every Sunday and the Anglican Bishop comes once a month. I don't go to the official prison Chaplain with my personal problems because what can he do. The Chaplain who we had here, I used to talk to him but he never seemed interested. He used only the Gospel, any other problems he said 'that's not my line. I cannot help you in anything so please don't tell me' he is expecting me to be saved".

The visiting ministers had a restricted role since they were only visitors to the prison for services and little time for personal contact with prisoners. Also with the existence of a Welfare Officer to care for the personal temporal problems of the prisoners, the Chaplain was not in an easy position for acting as an intermediary between prisoners and the prison authorities. Their role then appeared to be evangelical in circumstances as much removed from personal contact as possible. A convict (10) said "we get some padres in the prison. They don't give real help despite the services. They come inside and we talk to them but what can you talk to the padres unless you are a Christian. Whenever he comes I always talk and he asks me how I am and such things like that. I don't speak to him about a personal
problem because I never thought he could do anything”. Although there may appear to have been a conflict of roles between the chaplain and the welfare officer, the former’s attitude was the same even when there was no welfare officer stationed in the prison. The Protestant observance was certainly evangelical in character which allowed some prisoners to carry on as a small independent worshipping group after the transfer of the prison chaplain.

Attempts were made to have Moslem services provided by a visiting preacher but this was not successful as Islam in East Africa did not have functionaries who were paid and maintained to carry out independent charitable acts apart from conducting the religious observances of their own community. Some Moslems carried out at least some of their obligatory daily prayers but the mid-day Friday prayers were not possible because this was a normal prison working day. However some Moslems did achieve some solidarity by observing the formalities of the Holy Month of Ramadhan for whom the prison authorities made special arrangements to have their main meal of the day after sunset as they did not eat or drink water during daylight.

While clearly some prisoners were inclined to be religious because of their prisonisation, religion in general was an aspect of specifically prison behaviour (11) and served as a link with the outside world for only a small number.

III. Anxiety over friends and relatives

While anxiety over friends and relatives was more easily recognisable among the educated, it did exist among the illiterate despite their resigned acceptance of their separation. This anxiety was concerned with wives, relatives and friends. While they did not see wives as important as relatives if they were asked to grade their relative status, there were examples of deep attachment to them and extreme anxiety. A convict (23) said “I get on very well with my wife and love her very much and I don’t like it here in the prison, where I am not able to see her and she is left alone and far away”. Another (27) virtually illiterate convict wrote out this poem of anxiety in capital letters............

*We got on so well for a long time, my love
Your face cannot reach me now - your heart is far away*
I am encircled by the whole system of punishment and prison
Many who loved me tried to help but they all failed
Don't forget the strength of our love which was yours
Try yourself to pray to release me from my suffering
I do not know for how long you have not prayed with incense
I cannot get used to being in prison
I had a nightmare that you saw me in my grave
Seeing your body and hearing your voice increased my despair
If only we were together again and I was lying on your breasts
My body trembles with fever and I see no medicine or helper
My love for you perhaps will cool my body
Week after week goes bye and I still have fever
I know we quarrelled and perhaps this is its punishment
My love start building our home for when I return.

While another (34) said "I was reading a book of a quiet lover,
so in the book I saw the thing it has already happened with me. So
I went in for a dream of my lover and all those days I have passed with
her in very good time when I had a lot of money. So in prison you
simply remember of past time and spoil your mood".

Others were anxious as to whether their wives or girl-friends
would wait for them to be released. A convict (29) said "a married
man really worries during his imprisonment as his family suffers much.
A harlot does not suffer the same consequences". Another (28) said
"misfortunes never come singly. Some prisoners had only been married
just a few days before their arrest and they are doubtful whether
their wives would dare to wait till the last day of the long sentences.
Those who had married just prior to their arrest sometimes they are
told by their parents that your wife has gone. If not that, he would
be told that your wife has got a new-born. Such a man can think too
much of his wife, how it happened for her to bear a child. One whose
wife is gone; she goes with someone else or she goes alone to the
town and she becomes a harlot. He becomes very sad to hear all this".

In this respect the fifteen minute visit allowed to new admissions
to the prison could have been a traumatic experience, a convict (30)
said "when I had finished three days of my sentence my girl friend
visited me and asked me when we were going to get married. I had
answered that it would be time enough to think about that when I get
release. She asked me how long was my sentence going to be and I told
her straight out that I was in for three years. At once her whole
attitude changed and she said that she wanted my permission to look
for another man. I had to agree because there was nothing else which
I could do as I couldn't prevent her doing whatever she liked."
Another convict (32) spoke on the same theme "the woman wanted to know where was the rest of his money as she was left with a small baby on her hands while he was in prison. So he tells - do you see this baby I got last month. So he thinks it to be true but you know I have got no money to keep this child for his food and clothes. By the time you come out he will be going to school. If you don't help me I will go and leave this child with your mother and tell her it is your child. But a sensible man can make out from it; he can tell her to go and get stuffed and take her child with her, she can't ever get one cent from him. Love has spoiled so many young boys here as they were not worried about anything else but their girl friends. This is my principle give money for only the time you fuck and don't go to one particular woman".

While a prisoner may have been anxious about his family, he may have been satisfied to leave them unaware of what had happened to him and if he was a long-term prisoner resent the officer in charge's legitimate concern for him to be visited by his relatives. Educated convicts were very sensitive to their position and one (35) commented on such attempts to help them and said "the government also wants to show our parents that we are very bad here in prison, and sometimes government is writing letters to them to come and see their children in prison".

Many had formal responsibilities for their families which they were not able to fulfil while they were in prison, and responsibilities in comparison which may have been heavier than for a western convict. A convict (36) said "I married and have two wives and seven children. I lived with them and paid the school fees for all the children which I cannot do now. Government should start a scheme to help the families of long-term convicts who had great trouble to get clothes and food. Another (37) made the same point and said "while I am in prison, it would be reasonable for government to educate my brothers who are still young and my own children if I should have some. They should help my father and mother as I would have done if I had been at home".

While these anxieties seemed to be centred more on the educational chances which their children may have been losing by not having
their school fees paid, it was likely that to miss the traditional rites of passage of his family was far more upsetting. A convict (31) said "in the jail he can't even marry or see his brothers getting married. Sometimes he can hear bad news that somebody from his family is dead and he can't even see the face of the dead man. He is unlucky because he can't even reach a dead man's funeral. He can't even see his own mother for the last time of her being in the world".

IV. Anxiety over the Future

The anxieties over the future after their release were in two categories. Those prisoners who had come directly from traditional backgrounds had anxieties largely confined to their friends and relatives since on their release they would be reabsorbed with little difficulty into the agricultural or cattle-keeping communities from which they came before their arrest; they were self-employed. The remainder who had left their traditional backgrounds and had been arrested after sometime in an urban, industrial or agricultural estate area, were anxious not only about their friends and relatives but about their own personal position on their release. A convict (39) said "the social side will be even worse than working life. Firstly I will be isolated from all our community functions and celebrations, I won't be invited; not only me but my wife and kids also have to suffer. Mainly I shall have to suffer to get employment; wherever I will join for service they will inform my employers that I was a thief and that I am not a reliable man to be trusted; so naturally my job will come to an end".

For both categories release was likely to be a traumatic experience, however much they tried to disguise its consequences. A convict (38) said "when I leave prison, it will seem to me that I have been born again". Another (40) said "clouds of doubt which start ebbing in my mind leaving me as a confused man. I do not know how I will have to adjust myself to meet my future life in an independent country hence I will choose to be a hermit for sometime. It is only one question which always goes on echoing in my mind; that is whether all my friends will trust me anymore".

Many of the educated and semi-educated convicts had become so isolated from the outside world that they were unable to evaluate
their chances on release on any basis of reality. They also seemed to have little idea of the special penalties which must be experienced by ex-convicts in search of work. Admittedly there were no bureaucratic biases which would have given away his status such as the blank periods in his insurance cards in Britain, but he still had no record of continuous employment and past employers to whom he could refer. Such optimism seemed illogical but it would have been difficult for convicts to have been better informed of their post-release chances. Their main centre for information and gossip was convict to convict conversation and the reaction of most prison officers to departing convicts was one of some optimism since they would not have wanted to be too discouraging. It was common, if not general for convicts to say that they expected to get employment at the end of their prison sentence. A convict (41) said "when I leave here I expect that if government or a company gives me work, I will be able to carry on with that work. I do not know whether they will give me any work - I haven't asked anyone". Another convict (42) said "I will find a small job. I will try my best. I can start working as a free agent only, I am quite capable. I don't think they will reduce my salaries. You see up to now I have never failed in any sort of thing, whatever I try, I succeed. In any career. Suppose I decide to work as a mechanic I can start working as one, I don't need a lot of coaching. You see I have got good grasping of things. My own desire is to start my own business a sort of independent type - I don't like to be employed".

Others were not optimistic about their chances of employment and saw an inevitable return to crime. A convict (52) said "if I do not get a job, I shall try and see any of my parents if they can help in living. If not I shall use my brain in order to get money in living, by using it, is to get the thing I want by stealing. I cannot get a job in an office or a labourer in any of the companies because everywhere I will go there is a sign of no vacancy, as I know there are so many people in town are jobless and better educated than me. What do you think I will do. If it does happen to you what will you do".

While some convicts had suggested that the educated prisoner suffered more by being sent to prison than the uneducated, others stated that the possibility of reform as a result of the sentence, was
related to their previous employment and the jobs which they had lost in consequence. A convict (53) said "those who are frightened away from a further offence has been an employee of a certain company or a government department particularly if he has been doing that job for two years. The sentence teaches him that he has not only lost his job but he has been confiscated from his people and his property. He has been confiscated from all his things for the first time, from social life so to speak. He has been confiscated from most of the things in life for a human being. Having experienced a lot of trouble in a place where he had been exiled then some of them decide never to commit any crime again."

However this opinion ignored the realities of life for the discharged convict. For the average ex-prisoner of little or no education there were only the interpersonal difficulties of reabsorption into his family and the taking up of his agricultural or pastoral life from where he left off on arrest. Release in fact meant freedom to resume the same type of life that he had before, admittedly with the same tensions and temptations but with comparatively few additional difficulties assuming that he had not served an exceptionally long sentence. The educated and employed ex-convict faced a very different situation. He had lost his job at a time when the schools and universities both in East Africa and overseas were returning large numbers of persons into society as job-seekers where there were very obviously jobs to be filled. In the late 1950's an educated man was not common if no longer rare, but by the early sixties the circumstances given above combined with the trade recession following independence and the continued expansion of the population had meant that the educated ex-convict would have been exceptionally lucky if he got a job equivalent to his previous employment.

However the insulated nature of prison life, combined with a growing end of sentence euphoria meant that such convicts faced release with considerable optimism. The same convict said "it depends on the circumstances but particularly I am hoping to get even a better job than the former one I had. It depends on the merits of somebody but as for me I am almost certain that I will definitely get a better job than the one I had. I will take any job that suits me I am convinced"
Perhaps in their attitudes to getting future employment they saw the prison as just another branch of the government by whom they had been employed and that it should have been up to the government to look after them. A convict (41) said "perhaps it would be best if I wrote down my problem as an application to the authorities that they should look out for some work for me in advance if that is possible". Another convict (44) said "when a man is released from gaol he is left to go at large without any food or any idea how he could start life afresh. In my opinion no convict should be released until a position has been found for him where he should go and work. Although there is the present Discharged Prisoners Aid Association which deals with this matter, it is not at all very effective. This work should be made the entire responsibility of the Prison Department which should be a part of their duty to apply for jobs for convicted persons. They should in the first instance recommend government departments to employ ex-convicts to set a good example to the private enterprises".

It was probable that this difficulty of the prisoners being too dependent at least in their imaginations was that the prison provided too much in some areas and then failed to follow through to protect them outside. Certainly the standard of living in the prison was above that which the majority experienced outside so that quite a number must have left prison with higher consumption needs than they had when they were arrested; in fact this might in some cases have been seen as an incentive to continue crime. A senior officer (3) recognised this very clearly and said "we see the physical conditions as a punishment, but for many the conditions are better than they would have had outside", and this was bound to have had considerable effect on the ability of the discharged prisoner to adjust to his own independence.

Despite the opinions of some convicts that they were discharged without assistance, the prison service attempted to provide considerable help for them. Every prison had a Discharge Board (45) which interviewed every long-term prisoner within three months of their date of discharge. They may have recommended that those with over four years in prison who had been notably zealous and skillful in a prison industry should receive a grant of eighty shillings towards the pur-
chase of tools. He was provided (46) with free transport to the dis-
trict in which he normally lived. Provision was also made (47) for
him to have rations for his journey or a subsistence allowance if the
period was to be more than a day and to have (48) second-hand clothing
issued to him if his own were found to be unsuitable or insufficient.
The day before they were released, these prisoners got their own
clothes back out of the store so that they could be washed and made
presentable. These standing orders (49) were emphatic that "it is the
duty of all prison officers to do their utmost to ensure that prisoners
on release, are in a position to lead an honest life, stating that
much could be done by personal influence with the prisoner during his
incarceration, and on release every effort should be made to find him
suitable employment, or if returning to his own home, to give assistance
in the way of food or otherwise for the journey, and that the release
of prisoners without visible means of support was bound to lead to a
high percentage of recidivists. The prison department had also institu-
ted a new scheme to help long-term convicts adjust in some way to their
impending release. When they British Services left a nearby forces
wireless station, it was turned into a camp where such convicts spent
the last months of their sentences under nominal supervision and open
prison conditions.

If these rules were to be followed adequately it would have
placed an enormous additional burden on the senior prison officers con-
cerned which they would never have had the time to even partially ful-
fil. A voluntary worker (50) who had served on the Discharge Board
for seven years said "it was hopelessly overloaded; 96 came up on the
last board for discharge and reception. The Secretary is an African
who hasn't yet learned that potential employers have to be kept in
touch with and that getting them jobs is a question of contacts not
letters.

While prisoners may have complained in general of the prison
staff's lack of interest which was obviously not true, at least some
had a clear idea of the difficulties facing the prison administration.
A prisoner (51) said "even if the Discharged Prisoners Aid say that they
help these ex-prisoners, it's all a lot of nonsense really. For every-
one whom they are able to help, there are ten others who equally need
that help, and these are still badly off.
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Chapter XIII

Crime and Punishment

I. Views on the causes of crime

In their explanations of their own criminality, these prisoners' statements of their own and other people's actions suggested that they, just as British convicts (38) supported a theory of environmental determinism; they had not chosen to be criminals but their actions were either psychologically predetermined or that they in certain circumstances, had no alternative but to act criminally or to be treated as criminals by society.

While their statements were often quite explicit on these factors they had had no contact in the vast majority of cases with professional or volunteer social workers who might have suggested to them either directly or indirectly, the reasons for their own criminality; they did not produce explanations which might have been the half understood remnants of sophisticated theories. The dangers of this to the concentration and functional ability of the professional staff member working on rehabilitation needs to be stressed (40) and the benefits which accrued to this prison by their absence. They rationalised their own behaviour but only in terms of their own particular circumstances and social background. A convict (39) wrote "in any prison there are so many types of prisoners. Those who have committed their crimes because of their ignorance, those who have been caught in crime by accident, others who had created habits of committing crimes and those who had taken to the committing of crimes as their careers".

It would have been simple for numbers of these convicts to have suggested that they were not criminals and that they had been caught doing acts which had always been traditionally sanctioned. Their absence may have been due more to the fact that they were less articulate and thus less likely to be contacted during this work or that they may have been from the tribal communities living on the northern boundaries of the country and thus less likely to be represented in prison since their crimes would not have been reported to the police. Crimes which might have come within this category would have been the stealing of cattle from neighbouring tribes to make up their own herds.
or the killing of game animals for food, clothing, medicine and magico-religious reasons. The same convict wrote "some of them stole cattle because of poverty most of them wanted to prove to their villagers that they were warriors".

Numbers of prisoners could have been put in this category but for the fact that they had committed these crimes by traditional methods for money. To these crimes the prisoners were overwhelmingly opposed and allowed no factor of traditionalism to mitigate their antagonism. They were not pushed into crime by poverty and a convict (41) wrote "to my own opinion I see and am not satisfied that it is a very serious offence to be committed by anyone. It now brings some poverty to a person whose cattle has been stolen. Let us say a man owning 17 heads of cattle and his family are used to drinking milk, they can suffer a great deal after all their cattle had been stolen, and can even cause either suicide or poverty to the family concerned".

In general they were equally unsympathetic to poaching offenders who were no more than hunting in areas which were traditionally their own. A convict (42) said "though game offences might seem to be a very minor offence, it is a big one. It is one of the drawbacks of the prosperity of our country because it hinders the growth of tourism. A man who commits any game offence should be termed as an enemy of the country".

It seemed strange that little reference was made to crime and criminality in relation to rapid social change. When they referred to ignorance it seemed to be a person's inability to understand what was going on, rather than to the increasing complexity of the legal system and the enormous expansion in the quantity of legislation. This was particularly striking in the absence of references to accused men being overruled in courts by the court officials in their concern for correct procedure; the constant clash between traditional and western methods of law (53). No convicts seemed to suggest that they were victims of any system, colonialist, nationalist or industrial, and more surprising none stated that their convictions had been due to tribal bias; this last absence added weight to the suggestion that these criminals considered that they had a closer relationship with the police as an occupational group than they ever had with tribal
associations in the same milieu.

Perhaps in this respect their only comments referred to convictions for which there were no alleged criminal acts quoted in the charges. This showed in their attitudes to the imprisonment of vagrants who were convicted on the grounds that they had no visible means of support rather than because they had committed even a very small offence. A convict (48) wrote "it is not a very serious offence but sometimes leads to thefts. There are very many people who come to seek for an employment in towns probably because they are fed up with the difficulties at home in connection with the shortage of money".

While poverty was often given as a reason for crime, it was only regarded as a justification when the person stole for food but if he stole in order to improve his standard of living, it was not regarded as a valid excuse. A convict (51) commented "his stay in the town made him to be in great need of money and also he claims that he became very poor. So he thought of stealing for he had no job. To my suggestion this man was not stealing to do anything with the money, but wanted money for enjoyment. No one can afford to live in the town without money and moreover if such a person is give a labour job he won't do it". When poverty was given as a reason for crime, it seemed to be based on religious rather than political opinions. A convict (67) said "it is impossible for a man to continue to live in a state of poverty as we do when our fellows are very well off. Did God create the poor and my friend the merchant".

Some did not appear to think that their criminality had to be explained by reasons. A convict (55) said "I am in prison because I was found in with money which was not mine. Secondly I had a lot of marihuana in my possession as I am a heavy smoker, and thirdly I had bought stolen cattle. This is all as to why I am in prison". Another convict (20) said "I was imprisoned justly all right. I stole that bicycle in the charge. Never mind about the reason, I did it and that's enough explanation". While some attributed their criminality to bad companions, surprisingly few suggested that they were the victims of the badness of society from which they were unable to break free. A convict (68) said "he is only 26 years old but a bad society
A large number attributed the criminal act for which they were convicted to circumstances beyond their control rather than to suggest that they were in fact innocent. A convict (46) wrote a series of notes on the causes of the crimes for which his cell associates had been convicted: "I made a journey from my usual place to drink beer where we drank too much that I could not realise what was going on. I was taken somewhere by that person who had bought me beer and called a girl whom we asked to go with us. His sister and mother called the police who arrested me. I knew nothing through that night which was going on even to the charge I could not now what kind it was. I could not escape to being ruled the victim of such an offence, rape which I did unknowingly and had not even an aim of it".

Of another he wrote "I fought with somebody but I did not cause any bodily harm I suggest because I saw no injuries. Afterwards this man went on his way and myself on my way. It is after a while I come to hear that he became sick and was sent to the hospital where later he died. Therefore I am certainly sure that my intention was not to kill but I was just defending myself to being beaten by this man".

Another incident was described by a convict (57) who wrote "as the evening celebration was over, he was drunk, and as he stepped outside the house saw two gentlemen playing sexual intercourses with his wife. As a consequence he took a spear and stabbed his step-son. The spear aimed at another person caught his son. Anyway he had the intention to kill because he should not have thrown the spear". Others attributed their conviction to the enmity of others. The same convict wrote about another "there was an enmity between him and someone who also applied for the job he got. Six months later his opponent fell jealousy, arranged for someone to steal some cattle and alleged that this man had given them to him. The person was quite innocent, even the raiders themselves say so. They are now in the same prison but don't talk; they can possibly kill each other".

Another convict (47) wrote "I am not a thief since at my home there is plenty of land and my parents are healthy and not poor. The thing that sent me to the bad was to associate with bad characters."
When I was arrested for robbery, it was not my intention but that of my associates as I had no need of anything at home. Although ideas on good and bad luck frequently came into conversations in the lingua franca kiswahili, few convicts referred to it in connection with their own criminality or convictions. A convict (49) wrote "I can't state why I am in prison because on 9th December was unlucky day for me. Policemen suspected me to be a thief whereas I have never dreamed of taking anything which doesn't belong to me. Troubles are always with men and men are always troubled."

In a few cases there were the beginnings of suggestions that criminality was caused by the families of convicts. One man (55) wrote "A man grows up according to the way he was brought up" or more specifically in another case attributed their criminality to someone and said that they would not have been criminals but for someone influencing them to do evil or failing to influence them to do right. A convict (58) said "I am being blamed but I am not the right person to be blamed for my criminality. My grandmother-in-law and my father created the circumstances. My in-laws made my marriage fail and my father because he never put me on the right path".

Another cause of crime was the pressure of relatives to share in the earnings and benefits of their family members who were employed and had regular incomes. The higher the standard of living of that person, the greater the pressure from indigent relatives. A convict (66) said "that job too was brought to an end by some of my relatives. The way I was progressing started the relatives coming in. They were cunning and wanted to let me down by putting me into unavoidable liability. I could not disappoint them and gave them generous helps on their word of honour. The way I had started giving out money to help did not turn back and I had to face dual loss".

Some at least attributed their criminality, not so much to the way in which their parents brought them up but from their own failure to profit from their actions. A convict (69) said "one's father is like a second god and if I do not obey his instructions he will never be able to obey anyone and he will appear sad. This accounts for the fact that some men are thieves when their parents are rich; if they had obeyed their parents they certainly would not have become thieves,
got arrested and imprisoned". As the man's loyalties were usually centred on his agnostic family it was not surprising that a number of convicts blamed their criminality on the women with whom they associated. A convict (63) talked about some of his fellow prisoners, "one thing spoils a man that he goes with women when he is too young. He starts giving her presents and before he is the father of a child and when he has got no money, he starts robbing. Another man here serving a ten year sentence, saw somebody else with his woman so he simply killed her for he was blind in his love. Another here got five years for shop-breaking as he wanted to bring things for the woman he married".

There was also an almost complete absence of magical considerations in accounting for the causes of crime. No protective tattooing and only one reference to magico-religious protective medicines. A convict (54) said "on this journey I was arrested by bad luck because my protective charm had been lost and I did not know that it had gone". This was surprising in view of the fact that such protective and aggressive medicines has been reported (56) to be used by criminals and personally observed in connection with cattle theft and game preaching in Tanzania 1951-59.

In some cases however they did refer to criminality as being part of certain persons characters. A convict (52) said "he is a thief and his habits are just that, all the time. He does these crimes because his brain does not work properly. He steals things which are not really necessary for him". An illiterate convict (64) said "human beings are never the same; they are created different. Human beings were naturally created with the potentiality of sinning, and anyone can commit a criminal offence". Another convict (53) talked about himself and said "some convicts leaving the prison say that they will not steal again because of imprisonment or corporal punishment. Others say that they will continue to steal as it is their work. Thieving is indeed my work and I say this serving a five year sentence. It is is written that a man shall be a breaker of laws, he is such a man. Even if you cut off his hand, he will steal again when he gets better".

Although the question of guilt did not seem to be an issue over which convicts were unduly worried, their classification as criminals
often gave rise to considerable argument and had relevance to their attitudes on the causes of crime. A convict who from his conversation was by his own admission guilty of car theft and robbery and serving a long sentence said "Anyway I am not a criminal because I did not do any big crime. Also I don't do these criminal things all the time. When I run short of money I do it otherwise I don't do it. I say that I am not a criminal because it makes me feel a little bit better - not much. I am not convinced that I am a criminal but when I am in business they say that I am a criminal because of my record". Another (44) who was in prison for arson committed in order to get insurance money said "I don't think that I am a criminal. I am just an apprentice - just a learner. You see had I been an expert criminal I don't think that I would ever get caught. I was charged on seventy-nine counts as while I was on the run from the police, I was obtaining money by false cheques and that sort of thing. It was a regular crime but not a big crime. Once I had done the arson I had to live". Another (45) wrote "when one wants to use the word criminal mistakenly, he can call me a criminal but in actual fact I am not. The word criminal to any uneducated man can mean any person who has committed a crime, but to the educated can mean a person whose whole life has spent and lived on crime committing and other minor crookery". This inability to face reality seemed to result from the self-supporting nature of the prison community; prisoners who were guilty of crimes in which the degree of criminality could be the subject of endless argument simply because the individual convict very rarely came in personal contact with an outside individual who could have argued out this issue with him. An individual reorganisation of self-perception seemed essential if any professional criminal was to be able to survive outside without reverting to crime.

These explanations rationalised their own behaviour but it was difficult to use an hypothesis of immaturity to explain their views. They were certainly ego-centred in that they, thought largely of themselves rather than of their families but this would have been a Western evaluation neglecting the importance of classificatory kinship in their social lives. An intense personal involvement with other individuals in a nuclear family may have been very rare in the society outside, so
its absence in these prisoners could hardly be given as socially deviant behaviour. Perhaps even the reverse that this absence of involvement with individuals, may have accounted at least in part for the apparent balance of most of these men.

The hypothesis of immaturity must depend in part on some concept of a uniform society with some discernable norms from which criminals deviated. However this society itself was in a state of flux and the country had gone through many of the changes in a few decades which in the Western world took centuries; in the sense that the society itself was in a state of flux, it could also have been classed as immature.

While they were egocentric, the hypothesis of immaturity failed to provide evidence that these men were adolescent whatever their ages. The societies from which they came provided many examples of tolerated and controlled adolescent explosiveness, but this was not a feature of their own criminal experience or of their behaviour in the prison. No one provided case histories of their own activities or showed in interviews serious signs of emotional stress which could have been connected with their criminal actions.

Possibly they were as a group invincibly optimistic and if this had been a British Prison it could have been classed as a sign of immaturity because common sense would have suggested that their hopes would not happen. In this country however there had been so many changes in which individuals had been precipitated to the top in politics, business, the civil service and industrial relations, that these men had some right in accepting optimism as the key to their own futures. With a natural ideology of optimistic progress perhaps these criminals only reflected at least a part of these hopes and to admit that they were inefficient as men and as criminals would be more than they could stomach as individuals and as creatures of their time.

Although they inflated both their hopes and successes and interpreted these events optimistically, it did not appear that it was related to a general gambling attitude to life. Gambling went on in the prison and in life outside but it was not a national or even a tribal obsession such as occurred in Burma where it accounted for much criminality.
Few prisoners admitted that they were directly to blame for being in prison or that they were morally at fault; this would have involved them in accepting preconceptions of what they would have felt in a Western-European judicial context. The country's judicial system appeared very largely to reverse their traditional concepts of private and public delicts. Interpersonal violence in the courts was made into public delict and offences which scandalised the community and the family became private delicts under legal conditions which made it difficult to get redress. Thus these men were almost always convicted and sentenced under government legislation which did not coincide with the moral obligations taught by their parents.

II. Attitudes to punishment

Most prisoners were doubtful whether prison sentences reformed the criminal despite the fact that they knew this was the avowed intention of the whole system. A convict (1) said "to the best of my knowledge there is little reformation in prison. It probably affects only first offenders. Some people in this category who deeply feel the torture of prison, rehabilitate themselves because they have at least been taught a lesson and they feel it. To repeat the offense would mean they suffer the same torture. But for the habitual offenders they come and go in and out of prison but it doesn't rehabilitate them at all. They are never reformed; and in fact their situation has been aggravated by being imprisoned with other criminals".

The class of short-term prisoners was unlikely to be heavily influenced by the experience which may either have been towards the fear of further imprisonment or towards resentment at being imprisoned at all. A convict (2) said "prison is a process for increasing theft. This is because many people in this place have been imprisoned for offences which can hardly be called criminal. Take a man who has not got his tax ticket, he gets imprisoned. Here in the prison he begins to hear for the first time the conversation of thieves. What they did and how they work. The newcomer thinks to himself that I have been imprisoned without reason and this thief who is also imprisoned has at least got some return from his thefts so when I get out I will do that sort of work".

Although some convicts felt that the prison was a school for
criminals because of the associates of the proto-criminal with the professional and by this means was recruited into permanent criminality, others felt that the prison sentence refreshed their professional criminal knowledge. The same convict (1) explained and said "there are a number who came out more efficient criminals. This is because people with same crimes are put in the same place; to my knowledge I think it increases their knowledge of repeating the same crime. They associate with people who have committed the same crime from whom they try to acquire some new techniques. In fact they come more specialised to a certain extent". In addition the fact that some convicts wanted to increase their criminal knowledge meant that others could take advantage of them. A convict (3) described the role ascribed to him by rumour and its advantages and said "he came to me saying that he had heard I was a forger of notes. I could see an opening for myself here so that I said that I did but that I could not work here as there was no proper equipment. He wants to be taught by me and will play his along". Another convict (19) gave a different attitude to this and said "in prison we have more time for talking than for work; most people get ideas here. If I was a forger I would speak about what I had done to show my cleverness. Then someone else would cap me and call me a 'bloody fool' for doing it so inefficiently and thus I would improve my technique. Even if I am caught, the job will have been done better than it was done previously. This applies to all sorts of crimes".

The theory that prison was a school of crime had always been dismissed by many police officers on the grounds that the least efficient criminals were caught and that they were unlikely to be able to teach others techniques which were not already widely known rather than unknown to the police. A convict (4) said "In prison I have learnt a number of criminal techniques which I did not know before. For example if you haven't got a switch for the ignition, to cross the wires at the back of the dashboard; to avoid leaving fingerprints by rubbing smooth surfaces with a cloth which you have touched and to find out as much as possible about police patrols and their timings and to remember that the police are usually at their slowest round about 3 p.m."
If it could have been taken that this man was a minor criminal, the results of this sentence of imprisonment seemed to have been to make him a more efficient one. Indeed nothing new had been passed onto him but he now understood about fingerprints, how to steal a car and the best time to find the police doing. He may not have been capable of any new avenue of criminality but he would now have been much more difficult to catch if he really did intend to take up crime as a serious part-time or even full-time activity. Also the passing on of such information would have given him a new set of expert values which he would want to learn while appreciating the older criminals from whom he had learnt such techniques. These techniques may not have seemed very important but they represented a significant stage in his absorption into the criminal community.

Some prisoners however did not belong incipiently to this criminal community and were in gaol because they succumbed to bad companions or a single temptation and to them it is sort of constant criminal conversation was without interest. A convict (5) said that "all I heard talk about crime but I wasn't listening". In that context it was perhaps necessary to restate that for many convicts, imprisonment meant an immediate rise in both the quantity and quality of the standard of living. A convict (65) said "I am not very wrong when I say that some people get better living in prison than outside. They get free food, free clothing and so many other things which they cannot afford to get outside. This is one point which makes some people to be imprisoned now and then".

In considering deterrents, legal punishment was often only considered as one of the social penalties suffered by criminals and very subsidiary to them. In East Africa police action for a multiplicity of reasons connected with inadequate communications, finance and education and a complicated alien legal system (6) had often been ineffective in catching thieves and getting them convicted. Getting complaints to the police quickly was difficult when there were few telephones and much stolen property was of little value and quite unidentifiable if not found with the thief immediately after the offence. The public then tended to take the law into its own hands by dealing directly with any suspected thieves, quite illegally and very viciously.
Deterrence then under these conditions had very little to do with legal actions and the thief had to avoid local rather than police reactions. An imprisoned thief (7) said "I was caught carrying stolen property in the company of my fellow thief who had already served two sentences. Sure enough I was well beaten up by the people who had caught me and had to go to the Chief but I knew about this risk beforehand. I knew that thieves found with stolen property were always beaten, some so severely that they died (8) of the beating". This convict knew that he was more likely to have been caught by neighbours than by the police and that he would get a severe beating without doubt before being handed to the police for sentence, but it did not act as a deterrent.

In so far as deterrence could be said to act on imprisoned men in this prison, it was not because of the rigour of prison life but because of the wasted time. Most of these men had a conception of social progress; that in order to gain status, they must do certain things and that although money may have been very necessary to gain these ends which indeed might be gained by stealing, time was a more important factor; time lost could never be regained. A convict (5) said "I suppose that whether I return or not is up to me and if I really listen to what has been told to me in prison and look around me at the recidivists, I will see that crime wastes the time in my life. This seems so obvious to me now that if I come again to prison, government can really say that I chose it myself". Another convict (19) said "the time I am wasting I don't think is worth wasting because it is my young age I am wasting here."

This aspect of lost time was also considered in the punishment for murder when a convict (10) said that "a murderer should neither be hanged or given a life sentence because both destroy a lifetime - it would be better to release him under supervision and he can be called back to prison at any time or on any excuse if he is thought to be misbehaving". Although convicts generally asserted that they were not going to return to prison after they had been released, they did not attribute this resolve to the hardness of prison life. A same convict on being asked whether he found prison life hard said "Prison is quite easy; the only trouble as far as things are concerned
is that there is a little bit of mental torture, and that one has to face".

In their understanding, of punishment convicts distinguished very clearly between the fear of the punishment and the possibility of it acting as a deterrent even for those who had seen, heard or experienced corporal or capital punishment. A convict (11) talked about capital punishment and said "of course everyone is frightened of being hanged for murder but when the thoughts of killing someone start collecting in your head and when you do the deed, there is no restraining you because of this fear of being hanged". This same convict who had been in an execution prison said "even someone who has been present at an execution and heard the condemned man crying, will not be deterred from murder. No man rationally wants to kill but bitter or sudden anger takes no account of this. It depends on the temperament of the individual concerned not on the deterrent - one sort of man will kill and another will stifle his desire to kill. These are my views and I have heard executions happen". Another (12) said "hanging does not deter anyone because this crime is committed when he really beyond control. He kills with a reason so deterrence fails".

Convicts were also critical of the system for capital punishment and said that whatever the judicial reasons, it was no longer humane system as it gave unnecessary suffering to the prisoner. A convict (13) said "these days the law process is very slow and the man on a capital charge has to wait up to nine months on remand before the case and then is sentenced to death. What point can there be to have him in prison so long and then hang him. The case should be heard immediately and the death sentence carried out at once". The same convict later was critical of hanging and said that "in another prison we could hear the condemned man shouting goodbye - this went on once for over half an hour. Then afterwards prisoners had to clean up the gallows room. If there is to be a hanging it should happen well away from an occupied prison and he should be killed without any advance notice except to the killers". Others (12) were critical of capital punishment on other grounds and said that "I don't think it is quite human. The man has already murdered one individual and now by hanging him you are making another one - it is reducing the population of the
world. Making our population low, if he wasn't hanged he could work and help build the country along, bringing up the children and so on. Population is property. Hanging is a sort of formality and as far as I know, it does not do any good to anyone whether to government or the public." A few gave some consideration to the deterrent aspects and said (14) that "in capital cases government gives publicity enough in the papers to the fact that a sentence of death has been given. Why does not government then have a public hanging. Unless hundreds of people are made to witness the event who is going to be sure that it has in fact happened. Public killing is in our African tradition."

Much the same argument was used about corporal punishment that it was frightening in itself but did not deter. A convict (15) said that "anyone who says that corporal punishment deters criminals is lying. I have known many who have been beaten even as often as seven times and yet they go on with their criminal activities". The same convict pointed out the connection between the viciousness of the punishment and said that "corporal punishment or imprisonment gets heavier the more convictions you get, presumably on the theory that it will force you to leave off crime. A criminal may not think of the punishment until he is caught in the act. He sees a witness of his new crime and remembering the punishment, becomes vicious at this memory in order to prevent himself being caught. Heavy punishments may make heavier crimes."

While the prisoners were generally critical of imprisonment and capital punishment, they seemed to feel that corporal punishment was the most effective means of deterring people. A convict (15) said "corporal punishment is very good. It should be given to most of the people. Because it teaches and it is a punishment which every person fears. The man who has been beaten fears that he can commit another crime but he has in mind the previous punishment. I would rather have two years imprisonment than corporal punishment. It is not so much the pain but the scars which are left so that you can never wash in public again. It is not good to beat someone like a cow or a dog but these strokes make a person have the feeling of the punishment to his body. Prison itself cannot have the same effect as it is just felt in the mind; his heart always directs him to do whatever crime
he can do as imprisonment never does affect his skin at all". Another convict (24) with a large number of convicts commented "to me corporal punishment would have been a deterrent if I had had it after my first conviction. The Germans used it and they didn't have many prisons". Another convict (15) took a more extreme view of its badness and said that "it is better to get a sentence of life imprisonment than corporal punishment because it makes a man impotent. Even though you are beaten on the buttocks and not in front, it is from the back that a man's sexual strength comes. If you get as much as three lots of corporal punishment, you will end up being like a woman. I would personally rather have ten years than corporal punishment".

Nevertheless this argument ignored the important fact that the man who had such punishment became the centre of attention in the prison. A convict (17) said "when he comes back from punishment everyone is sympathetic, his hands are shaken and they commiserate over his suffering". But no one reported that he had seen a convict boast that he was strong enough in mind and body to withstand this punishment. Another (13) said "serious steps should be taken against housebreakers. The maximum sentence should be fourteen years and five strokes every month".

Others took the opposite view that corporal punishment was soon over and better than imprisonment. A convict (12) said "it does no good. Even if you give them 36 strokes it does not change them. Even if they give me 50 strokes and give me release today, I will accept it. You see strokes are nothing. I would have accepted straight away".

Probably a minority of convicts (18) questioned whether capital or indeed any other form of punishment would deter and said that "killing murderers will not frighten more than anything else because killing has been going on for a very long time. It certainly won't deter because at the time of murdering someone, the murderer does not think that he will hang. He might even reason that if he is to hang it would be a case of he will die just as I am to die, that is fate".

The same convict saw no difference between punishment for murder or any other offence in that it should have been only in terms of compensation and said "it seems that by killing a murderer, government
is making the murderer pay for the murder. But for me if my son has been murdered, there is nothing at all and I am not even told by government that the murderer is being hanged because of killing my son or rather in payment for this murder. Government just does not explain to us why they hang murderers. It is difficult for us to say whether we are in favour of capital punishment or not because we do not know why government does it. We accept it as government does it as governments are wont to behave.

In considering their sentences many convicts appeared to think in terms of compensation - the value of the property stolen and the length of the sentence in relation to this; in fact that any sentence was not punishment but compensation. A convict (20) said "in comparison to my offence of stealing a bicycle, a year's imprisonment is a long period - a very long time - a bicycle has a low value. If I had been the sentencing judge in my own case I would have given two or three months as the equivalent of this value. Another convict (4) said that "there is no difference between central government and tribal law in penalising theft but it is in the penalties that we see a big difference which doesn't help to stop crime. We fine for an offence; a crime against us and compensation for us and the matter ends with money. If we send a case of theft or assault to the police, the offender gets sent to the prison or fined and the loser gets nothing. It does not stop crime and we get nothing." From these comments by criminals it did not seem that their objections to their sentences were a form of commiseration for themselves but rather a general dislike of abstract justice. They, just as much as the sufferers from their activities, wanted to see it dealt with by compensation in which the issues were assessable to their understanding. Even consideration of murder cases suggested that they saw murder and capital punishment in the same terms. A convict (21) said "it is useless to hang a murderer and even more senseless when the murderer is a young person because he should be required to make compensation to the murdered person's family. If they want to hang people, they should hang the old".

Others went further than the idea of compensation and stated that punishment isolated from the social circumstances of the criminal was
wrong. A convict (22) said "they should not punish me, they should give a penalty. To give them compulsory work or to give them to government for limited time each day and the rest of the time he has to earn for himself and maintain his family. If they sentence me my dependents really suffer, nothing is earned for them".

While the convicts may have questioned many aspects of punishment in the abstract, when their attitudes were related to specific crimes they tended to revert to harsher rather than lighter penalties. An extreme example of this was the uneducated convict (60) who said "killing with planning in advance is much worse than killing in anger. Imprisonment just wastes time, it would be better for him to lose an eye and an arm and many would be more frightened of this than any length of sentence. Pickpockets too should have their left arms cut off".

Another (60) said "it happens that some public think policemen are bad people when maintaining peace and order, and kill them. Had I been the judge over a man who has committed such a crime I should let him be killed in the same way he killed this policeman". Another (61) said "any proved case of robbery with violence must be considered with great care that the offender must not escape landing into prison for a good twenty years at the best. Nothing less than life imprisonment is adequate for such a brute".

These heavy penalties were not confined to the educated convict giving opinions on offences which were not white collar ones. An uneducated convict (62) said "cattle thieves should get between 3 and 4 years imprisonment and on top of that up to twelve strokes. The same sentence for a person who drives dangerously when drunk, but only nine months for servants who steal and a year or more for a government servant who peculates".

There was however a general feeling that heavy sentences deterred not only the criminal who was wasting his life but the general public who were thus warned away from crime. This at least was the basis of the physical punishments which they advocated although they did not consider how the social invisibility of the long-term convict could deter those with whom he was no longer in contact.

While commenting on the basic unpleasantness of prison life for
every type of convict confined, there were some convicts who sug-
gested that prison could never be a place to avoid unless it was closely
related to very hard work. A convict said "they don’t have discipline.
Way they have is worrying the prisoners for the first two days. But
to worry me, they think I am worried; suppose they cut my hair. That
makes nothing. It is not discipline. But suppose I am told to dig a
hole from here to there and if I don’t finish it no food. Because I
want to get something to eat I will finish and by finishing it I will
get tired. And by getting tired I will not have these idle times.
Double work will stop you thinking crimes. Some convicts will refuse
to work because they are in different categories. People on a passing
charge like vagrants and the dangerous criminals like a murderer sen-
tenced to life imprisonment - tell them to do a job and they will re-
fuse. Because he is sentenced for life he doesn’t care. So it’s
bad to put a man who is sentenced for life together with a two to four
year sentence prisoner. When they say they want to punish a man who
is here for forgery, he will say why is that other man sitting idle,
I will refuse too. So the whole trouble begins. But suppose you have
put forgers in their own place, let them get their share of what they
did and let the lifer stay where he should, let those criminals in-
stead of segregating them to a single cell, put them in one prison
and nothing else but those. You will see them change”.

Some convicts suggested that the difficulties resulting from a
much heavier work load on the convicts would be welcomed at least
passively by them and not resisted as it made the time pass more
quickly. They had guessed that it would result in trouble from the
warders who would possibly have to work longer hours and be prevented
from having their present relatively easy going relationships with
the convicts and be subjected to constant supervision. The same con-
vict described the consequences of this inability to closely super-
vise the warders and said "for example you find a warder is told by
an officer that no one leaves this gate. As soon as the officer is
gone a convict will come and say let me go out there and he is let
through. Then comes another prisoner. He is a friend; the warder
tells him all right go and come back quickly before the officer is
here. Another prisoner comes and asks and is refused on the grounds
that the officer said no one was to pass. The prisoner says why am I refused and the other one passes and a big quarrel starts. So after the quarrel, the warden will give up.

Many recognised that an efficient system of separating the different types of criminals and providing appropriate treatment, would have had better effects than the existing prison system which could not effectively separate the prisoners who were only graded according to their number of convictions and the length of their sentences. The same convict said "those who are mentally sick should be separated and kept in a different place. Every category should stay in their own category with their own officer who is qualified for their job. It is not cheaper to have prisons like this in which people are put and forgotten about; this sort of prison costs more because one man having been here for two years, goes out and comes back. He only goes out for holidays. There should be a prison for those who steal because they are sick and those who are classified sick should go there and not allowed to leave until the doctors are satisfied that he wouldn't steal again. Prisons should not be used for those who steal because they have not got anything to eat and they are poor, they should be given jobs, or land in settlement schemes, and made to work. They get their food and they wouldn't steal again. Those people who steal for fun should be put in a hard prison where they will be punished by work and a big discipline, and no one will dare to steal again."

In their attitude to the prison as a place where they were reformed through industrial training while they were being punished by imprisonment, most convicts were well aware that useful training was only available to a limited few. A convict (25) said "I learn nothing inside this prison which might be useful to me outside. Only carpentry would be good to know and I won't be taught. My sentence is not long enough. I am therefore frightened by being in prison."

Since the majority of the prisoners could not receive any adequate industrial training, they had to profit from the prison regime as such or return to their outside lives unchanged or with reduced inability to lead a crimeless existence there. Some senior officers realised the fact that the prison could not train the convicts to be better prepared for an outside life and stressed the value in itself of a
regular regime of obedience. The latter was already a prominent gesture of African domestic life and probably there was less need to fear its absence than in the western world; obedience was a known and recognised value by both parents and children. A convict (26) said "I am being given a proper knowledge of obedience in just the same way as a child at home is taught by making it painful to disobey. What will happen when you are disobedient to something give in advance. The knowledge that if you disobey, what happens afterwards is your own personal responsibility". This line of thought was extremely common in East African adults and children - that there was a particular virtue in obedience as such - elders and government required it and citizens and children practised it. This convict made no reference to the badness of what he had done or that he hoped of his own volition to be good in the future. He had been taught to obey again in his opinion just as he had been taught as a child and has forgotten.

The value of a regular regime presupposed certain institutional ways of acting which were almost entirely absent. A regular regime was a time system and the majority of Africans saw time in its social context rather than as an entity in itself. It was probable that most traditional people saw the passage of time in relation to the social necessities surrounding it and in the absence of clocks and watches on every wrist and in every house certainly had not the means to conform to such schedules in their daily lives. Thus the prison regime was not only an abstraction from the system of life that the prisoner could be expected to follow on his release, but was an extreme form of the industrial way of life of which he had probably already had some adverse experience. His earnings related to his ability to do time-work, the disinterest of employers in his difficulties in their African context and their disregard for age and other forms of traditional status.

There was thus little of the "disculturation" or "untraining" in the sense suggested for western long-term prisoners (27) except for the small minority who had become effectively westernised prior to their imprisonment, since they were the ones who complained of their status loss and the futility of much of the prison work. For the majority the prison regime with its insistence on time, remained an ex-
perience totally alien to their outside lives and which they could not repeat because they had no watches and lived by the sun. This was not to deny that they usually benefited psychologically from this regularity in the sense that livestock benefited from adequate feeding, clean stalls and the attention of a veterinary surgeon.

Since it was unlikely that anyone could be released from imprisonment without some effects, it was very probable that the chances of the average convict being further implicated in criminality, may well have been increased because they had been forcefully desculteralised in terms of the semi-intact traditional life from which they had come. Even if such a convict followed the prison regime in the manner theoretically hoped for by its creators, there was its sheer inapplicability to their lives outside. The majority would never have to seriously consider again the possibility of forced association with other tribes, living by the clock or having to obey hierarchical superiors not allowed for in their own societies.

Some prisoners discussed the purpose of prisons and concluded from the number of recidivists that they did not reform, so they looked further for the purposes behind the obviously elaborate edifice of the Prison Department. An educated convict (28) said "It was designed to reform convicts but probably also to a certain extent it was designed to create employment for some people. Without the prisons, all the people in the prison department will be wandering the country doing nothing". This may have been a depressing conclusion on the well-meant efforts of this prison administration to reform their convicts, when recidivism was not a serious problem for law enforcement agencies. Criminality for the vast majority of convicts in this country just as in any other countries, seemed to disappear as far as prisons and the courts were concerned by middle-age. Convicts accepted that youth and early adulthood was the time for crime and that later there was less incentive. A convict (29) said "I have completely decided that I would devote my life to keeping free from crime. After going out I would not commit a single crime. Even a small crime I won't do. I am getting to the middle-age now because I think I should settle some way or the other".

This experience could not therefore be described as "untraining"
but as "disculturation" towards the societies from which they had come and usually returned, while at the opposite extreme being inade-
quately "acculturised" to urban-industrial society. They may have been forced to enter this environment because they have become un-
willng to return to their own homes because of their prison associa-
tions.

III. Attitudes to law-enforcement agencies

It was a very noticeable feature of these convicts' attitudes to their criminal lives that they had very little antagonism to either the police or to the courts. It was not only remarkable that no convict produced attitudes which might have been described as approaching a pathological hatred of authority but that there should have been so little hostility in a country where the law enforcement system was based on western rather than traditional principles.

It was not only the reasonableness of these convicts which was remarkable but their rational approach to matters which involved their own convictions. A convict (30) said "the magistrates are all right; they are middle-aged and it is their job to punish. The police have to get convictions when they catch us thieves so they twist the evidence that is their job". Another (31) said "the police told me that it was best to admit the offence, it helps the magistrate. I pleaded guilty to fighting the man who was asleep with my girl but I was sentenced for robbery with violence. So ran out into the street with no clothes on. I am not angry with the police or the courts. It is my fault that I am in prison. Just bad luck", and finally another (32) said "I am not guilty of the offence with which I was charged but I was not framed by the police - they made a mistake, a natural mistake on the evidence".

Thus complaints against the police were very few and never against their duty to catch criminals rather than to prevent crime. A convict (33) said "why should I be angry with the police when only I committed the crime. I don't think government is bad or that I should blame anyone for my present predicament. After all if there was no govern-
ment to control us, I would have been loaded down with stolen property". Some complaints were against the police for trying to incapacitate a
known thief for as long as possible when a convict (33) said "they
did not tell the truth about me as they wanted me to get a long sen-
tence. They told the court that I was the principal bicycle thief
in the town and that they had been waiting to catch me red-handed.
Further that it would be best if I got a deterrent sentence because I
was always giving trouble to government. Indeed I told you that I am
a thief but they do not know all which I told you - they are going
beyond the evidence".

While these convicts never felt themselves to be a part of the
legal system, a surprising number as remarked before considered them-
selves to be potential policemen after their release from prison.
Recidivists and convicts out on license were always apt to be picked
up by the police for questioning if there was some possibility that
they had committed further offences; such questioning might have been
in the form of asking these men for help and getting their co-operation.
Others, particularly petty criminals who moved backwards and forwards
over the boundary of legality particularly in the towns, were able to
provide the police with information and were paid small amounts for
this service. Both these types could have considered themselves
police auxiliaries. However many felt that they should become full-
time policemen on their release, and the local representative of the
Discharged Prisoners Aid Association spoke of having to convince many
prisoners coming up before the Discharge Board that they could not
join the police.

Another aspect of this inter-relationship was the reciprocal
friendship rather than dislike which existed between individual
policemen and the convict with whose conviction he had been connected.
A convict (34) on a sick visit to the town hospital said "I spotted
this policeman from my local police station and called out to him so
he came over for a chat. I knew him very well as he had tried to get
me to confess to the charges against me and had even brought over
some tea for me from his own house. I said I was getting on all
right in prison but for some health trouble. He saw that I had a
long time still to serve and agreed that I had never given any trouble
to him much less trying to escape. He put his hand in his pocket and
gave me three shillings telling me to get on with my sentence without
giving any trouble. He remembered that I had pleaded guilty in court and remarked that because of that they had helped me. I asked for cigarettes and he gave me a packet."

The police appreciated criminals who pleaded guilty in court once they had been caught as this gave them more time to deal with other crimes instead of having their time wasted by hanging about the courts waiting to give evidence. This policeman may well have been thinking of the future when such a personal relationship would repay him in getting casual suggestions about where to investigate other crimes.

In other incidents policemen had bought food for prisoners who had been kept waiting although there was little possibility of the money being repaid and the prisoners classified such people as good policemen who do their duty to catch criminals but did not go beyond that necessity into the area of personal animosity. That this was a personal arrangement between the individuals concerned was shown by the fact that a policeman who was willing enough to help a convict whom he knew, was very reluctant to have much or indeed anything to do with the convict's family whom he felt would abuse him if he went anywhere near them.

There were also examples of genuine concern for the prisoners. The same convict who had been favourably dealt with by a policeman whom he had met after he had been sentenced explained his action by saying "he did not help me because he was embarrassed at having been responsible for my imprisonment. He was just doing an act of mercy because he saw my label on my uniform that I had a long time still to serve. I don't think that he was trying to get anything out of me, because what have I got in prison that a policeman could possibly want".

While there were few complaints about police action, many complained about the nature of their sentences rather than over their guilt. A convict (35) said "I am guilty of receiving stolen goods. I don't hear of anyone complaining that they have been falsely convicted. I ought to have been fined for my offence instead I got a year's prison". Another (36) said "I was sentenced on two charges but I only committed one crime which they split in two. I should have
got six months and I would have had no complaints but I got three years".

Perhaps in their attitudes they evaluated their sentences in comparison to those of other prisoners rather than with reference to their own criminality. The following comments referred to the sentences given to European prisoners known to them but this may have been due to the rarity of Europeans in this prison which would have made their sentences widely known than to the racial biases of the magistrate concerned which may of course have existed. He said (32) "I got 18 months for a second conviction and a European with previous convictions also in for forgery got 6 months".

A high proportion of convicts could have been expected to protest their innocence to their fellow prisoners and the prison administration and particularly to outsiders visiting the prison. However it was necessary to distinguish between conventionalised protestations of innocence and a genuine conviction of their own innocence. The researcher conducted an experiment in group therapy for any prisoners who cared to volunteer to attend. Some twenty-five came to the meetings in which the only rules were that each person should either admit that he had been correctly convicted or defend his innocence himself in front of his fellow convicts. Only two chose to defend themselves by describing the events which led to their convictions. The group interrogated them with care and skill and in both cases concluded that they were not innocent. The reactions of these two men was chagrin that their fellow convicts should have used the same standards of evidence as the police involved in their cases as they had assumed that they would have assessed them by specially partial standards. This group therefore provided little evidence of innocence.

While few appeared to accept punishment as justice for their crimes, the majority acknowledged that it was right that they should have been punished by society for crimes which they had committed. Protestations of innocence were usually related to their innocence of particular crimes with which they had been charged, and not that they were innocent of any comparable crimes which they might have been charged with, if the police had got the evidence. A convict (32) said "I would say that between 10 and 15% in the prison now have been
wrongly convicted - not guilty of the crime with which they were charged, they might nevertheless have been criminals. After these have been taken away perhaps 5% are purely innocent. I suspect that this is because the magistrates and the police are very close together; they work almost as one whereas they now they shouldn't work as one. Most magistrates take what the prosecutor says as being the truth and they almost always take what the accused says as being untruth. Perhaps 25% of the cases represented here are inside on evidence which the police have fabricated. They have been framed. I admit that the man may have done one shop-breaking but not the one for which he is convicted. Conviction for being a rogue and a vagabond is justice enough as it protects society, but it is unfair".

Despite the small numbers who may have been incorrectly convicted and a larger number who complained about particular aspects of their cases, there were noticeably few who disliked the legal system as such. The more shrewdly intelligent saw a legal system which they could manipulate to their advantage, while a far larger number understood that there were many elements in it from which they might well have profited in their actual cases.

There were three legal systems operating in East Africa of which two could penalise an accused and send him to prison. The first contained the courts of the Resident Magistrates, and the Judges with specific legal training who dealt with judicial matters solely in terms of statutory law.

The second system involved local tribunals or African courts presided over by magistrates who had some legal training in government institutions but who could not be classified as members of the legal profession; they sat in the immediate locality of the cases origins and were usually assisted by local assessors. This system covered certain statutory laws relating to taxation, licensing, agriculture, health and law and order. It also dealt with customary law cases involving land, marriage, adultery, inheritance and debt in which the community created and defined what they considered to be their law; as this did not depend on written definitions or rulings, there were differences according to both time and place between similar cases within the jurisdiction of a single court. Thus the
magistrate might have changed from a written record in one type of case to a largely verbal trial and decision in a customary dispute. Lastly there was the system of law which operated entirely within traditional limits in which the government's legal system had no formal interest.

Recidivists and professional criminals were almost invariably in favour of having their trial before statutory law magistrates and this research within the criminal community did not produce a single complaint against the judicial system as such. Even illiterate criminals had a shrewd knowledge of the statutory law and were emphatic that they would prefer to be tried by it, especially when the evidence against them was mainly verbal; they appreciated the niceties of the Evidence Act and the provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code which restricted the actions of the prosecution to rather narrow limits. If there was hostility to the magistrates in some cases it may well have been attributable to the court procedure (50) rather than to the legal system. A magistrate who was forced to follow the appropriate procedure was bound to be seen as unsympathetic. A convict (71) said "the magistrate however was not in the mood to hear the defendant's plea". The only criticism of the legal system as such was that some convicts commented that the crime was the fact about which governments should be concerned and that guilty intention should not be examined by the court because it couldn't be proved much less whether a person showed remorse after the crime or not. A convict (37) said "when I hit you, I did not want to kill you but you died. I wanted to hit you so that you would be frightened of me. According to the law I am guilty of murder and must hang, even though the moment you had died, I saw the enormity of my crime". They stated that the bias inherent in being tried by the second system in the locality of the crime or where the criminal lived was ruled out.

In the circumstances outlined, a criminal might admit to previous conviction so that the police would take a more serious view of his crime and not consider sending it for trial to a local court. Many of the appeals presented by criminals were based on this assumption that the law itself would find a loophole in the evidence and not that the evidence would be presented in any new way. Even within the
first system, the experienced criminal litigant had considerable room for manoeuvre as he was acutely aware of the differences in sentences given by magistrates serving the courts in a particular town. He could get out of a court presided over by a magistrate known to give heavy sentences by declaring that it was not fair that he should be tried there as he had been up before that magistrate on a previous charge; he would not have to prove this statement to get his case transferred to another court.

Most criminals appreciated that justice and the legal system were not the same thing, but that the latter in the courts with professionals sitting on the bench, were the nearest approach to justice that the government would ever be likely to institutionalize. Far from increasing their sense of justice, the availability of lawyers who could be hired by those who had money, gave them a feeling of injustice. The magistrate might have been biased but within certain understood limits, lawyers gave certain accused advantages not available to others, not in the sense of establishing innocence but in getting away with a crime through a legal trust. A convict (73) said "many people are sentenced because they haven't money to hard. An advocate would have explained away my crime. Because I had no money, the government was able to override me". Another (71) said "poor as he was he had no chance to employ the lawyers who demand exorbitant fees."

Both the police and the public were aware that the first system required higher standards in the presentation of evidence, even apart from their acceptance of the specialized procedure required and the need to have given a well defined charge against the accused. Thus any prosecuting agency would try to bring its cases into the court system most likely to bring success as in a case of grievous bodily harm in which there was no expert medical witnesses available so that the charge was altered to 'harm' and the case transferred to a local tribunal. The police also tended to transfer to these courts cases in which the evidence was marginal hoping to get a conviction which would not be obtainable in the statutory courts of the first system, or generally for cases of less importance which would not, under the day to day circumstances of their work, justify the time and expense of producing the evidence in the necessary form for the higher courts.
The criminal himself was also aware of the maximum powers held by the magistrates in the lower courts and the advantages which might come to him by pleading guilty there with the agreement of the police. The criminal with a long record of previous convictions and aware that the case against him was based on exhibits rather than verbal evidence would try to be heard in these courts.

Thus the intelligent criminal saw a legal system which on some occasions he could possibly manipulate and one in which there was always a chance of its rigidity acting rather to his advantage than the reverse. As regards the police, he saw them as a permanent feature of contemporary social life preoccupied with matters in which he was himself involved; they had in fact a shared interest in the same business.
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"All too frequently the lingo and point of view of the professional becomes the property of the articulate champions of the most aggressive and corrupting inmate forces in prison. Like some strange human hothouse, the prison has a way of developing a species of flowery "Bleeding hearts" which put forth especially sticky and luxurious blossoms to ensnare the new professional. It is almost as if the inmate social system recognizes the special social value of these articulate inmates and puts them forth as a kind of burnt offering with which the professional can make penitential sacrifices on his personal altar of social conscience. The inmate social system throws a diversionary human screen of institutional "problem cases" around the professional staff member, eating up his time and misdirecting his efforts away from his proper target, the system itself."

The writer during his ten years as a lost class Magistrate, was frequently struck by the difficulties of the accused in pleading "guilty" or "not guilty" as required by the Criminal Procedure Code, when they wished to make longer explanatory statements. This often resulted in the accused at an early stage in his trial being told to shut up and wait for his correct opportunity to speak if he wished in his own defence.
(58) Informant MY 8/122 English
(59) Informant MS 23 Trans.
(60) Informant SM 4/64/17A English
(61) Informant JW 1/64 English
(62) Informant JH 8/64/17 Trans.
(63) Informant JL C/1/20 English
(64) Informant JH W/3/14 Trans.
(65) Informant JL C/1/20 English
(66) Informant MF C/1/8 English
(67) Informant MW W6/2 Trans.
(68) Informant J 1/37 Trans.
(69) Informant JK G/5/35 Trans.
(70) Informant MS 33 Trans.
(71) Informant JD C/1/13 English
The health of the prison

This prison could not be automatically associated with ill-health, and the visitor did not have to make allowances for overcrowding, out of date buildings and deplorably depressing weather. The architecture of this new prison provided ideal conditions for the maintenance of good health; the new buildings had fewer cracks and crevices in which parasites could hide. It was light, airy and open and supplied with plentiful running water. The large cells may at times have been overcrowded but not under conditions which could automatically have been said to encourage the spread of infection.

The prison authorities paid constant attention to the health of the prisoners particularly the spread of infectious disease - the smell of disinfectant was common and washing down frequent in every cell block. Their second preoccupation was the prevention of malnutrition in the convicts and each convict was weighed every month and the weights recorded as a check on their general condition with any consistent drop in weight being investigated.

The doctor in the prison seemed to have been more related to his position as a hinge in certain bureaucratic procedures than in his purely medical functions to cope with ill-health and as such to be at the centre of a high proportion of all the complaints made by the prisoners both publically and privately. A senior officer (1) said "if a prisoner wants anything extra to his prison entitlement, he has to go to the doctor; in almost every case he is the deciding authority for boots, diet change, extra milk or egg and a transfer from the hot climate. The medical officer is the only authority to recommend. He is the butt of every malicious back-biting complaint; such as he only can give drugs to his fellow Asians from whose families he received payments, with only aspirins going to Africans. The African hospital assistant was also subject to this same treatment, as the doctor only comes three times per week or in an emergency, he has become the administrator of this authority and the butt of their malice". A recidivist (20) with experience of several prisons disbelieved those complaints of bribery and corruption and said "I don't think that there is any bribing of the Medical Staff to get special
benefits; it might happen but I am doubtful. Talking to them nicely is the only tribe they can accept."

The Medical Staff were not so involved in the affairs of the convicts that they could have been classified as the "purifiers" (2). The medical inspection of the new admissions was only one of the procedures to which the prisoners were subjected. The other routines were not controlled by the Medical Staff such as the checking of food which was carried out regularly by the supervisory staff and recorded in the Chief Officer's daily journal, although the doctor's formal certificate was required for food to be condemned.

While it may have been quite clear in the western context that the doctor possessed special knowledge beyond the access and comprehension of the disciplinary and training staff, this was not clear here; there was little mystique about the doctor's role and he and his subordinates were certainly not invulnerable to criticism. When the prison doctor was a European there may have been some mystique attached to the position but when the doctor was an Asian with a high proportion of the day to day work being carried out by an African hospital assistant this was certainly absent. Whatever the reason, most convicts would have seen the African hospital assistant as one of themselves in the image of a traditional magico-religious specialist whose expert knowledge was within their own potential range of acquisition. They would have expected him to make his medical judgements in their social setting, and when he made them on medical grounds alone, they were wont to attribute this to his social malevolence.

Added to these difficulties on which the doctor's role was not clearly defined in practice, he was required to carry out duties which had legal consequences and for which he was legally responsible. It was laid on him to diagnose illness and from that decision suspended a whole series of consequences which could turn back and involve him in disciplinary procedures. The senior prison staff were rarely faced by such dilemmas with uncertain outcomes since they would solve most situations by administrative action and force if need be, in which they would receive the superior's support in an enquiry. A misdiagnosis and a dead convict was not in their class of problem. This was a major difficulty for the Medical Staff because of the overt and
covert benefits which could occur to the convict by assuming the role of a sick person. The doctor or his representative had to diagnose illness in the convicts who came to him complaining of sickness while at the same time being particularly conscious of possible malingering.

The Medical Officer was responsible for the health of all prisoners in his charge and he authorised forcible treatment "as he may consider necessary to safe guard or restore the health of the prisoner or to prevent the spread of disease". He was also required to examine every prisoner on admission, before being sent to harder work, before and during corporal punishment, before discharge and on transfer. He shall also see every prisoner once a month and keep observation on the mental health of all prisoners serving sentences of three years and more (4), as well as other obligatory duties laid down in Standing Orders. At the very least this was a serious and heavy work load for the doctor of a prison with an average population of a thousand.

Possibly as a consequence of this health was a negative concept; if not ill, the convicts were assumed to be well (2). The authorities through the doctor concentrated on the physical health of the convicts which was probably better than in a comparable body of men outside, if the absence of any weight loss was any indication of good physical health.

Mental health was largely ignored in practice although it was theoretically required by the rules for the doctor to report on the mental condition of certain prisoners. This was seen to consist largely of observation of the prisoner in his cell and a possible interview of doubtful diagnostic utility. It was not only that there were no qualified staff available for this work in this prison but the necessary concepts for its evaluation had not yet been greatly developed in the country as a whole. Violence from mental upset was recognised because of its obvious physical symptoms, but in a prison community of different languages and cultural backgrounds, personality and character disorders were difficult to accept and recognise.

The doctor and senior staff probably recognised in theory the relevance of mental disorder in their required rehabilitive work but
gave it diminished importance in their priorities of work. In this respect the doctor just as much as the senior staff were the victims of their legal responsibilities within the required bureaucratic framework. This was not accepted by the convicts and some recognised clearly that mental disease played an important part in the practice of crime and that punishment would have had little effect on whether such individuals would or would not commit further crimes. A convict (5) talked of these differences and said "for the ordinary man once you finish your sentence, you know what you have learned. So when you go out, you forget everybody because they don't respect you. You start working your own way to get to win those friends back. After you have done that there is no question why, unless you are sick to go and steal again. But if you are sick, you don't see the people who do not respect you. You ignore them as they ignore you. So you don't feel shameful or anything, and you go out and start stealing again because you are still sick".

This prison did not appear to receive any appreciable numbers of psychotics and mental defectives. Only in capital cases was some serious attempt made to assess mental health in order to advise the prosecution and defence as to whether a plea of diminished responsibility could be presented and accepted. Elsewhere mental factors were ignored as far as possible but contact with a large sample of these convicts did not suggest an predominance of mental problems.

I. Medical facilities

The prison had no permanent medical officer for the majority of this period and he visited the prison three times every week from the neighbouring town. The day to day work was carried out by a resident hospital dresser who referred cases to the doctor. This staff dealt with the daily sick parade, their legal obligations and medical emergencies which included the observation and care for civil lunatics committed to its care by the courts. A convict (6) described the medical facilities as he saw them, and said "on Monday the doctor sees the lunatics, capital remand and urgent cases; on Wednesday he sees people for diet changes, the lunatics and the capital remands and on Friday special applications for clothing and shoes."
For all these applications the hospital assistant must put you on the list or you will not be able to see the doctor, and he also does the medical examination on admission. The doctor very rarely checks the food. There are lice and bed bugs inside although there is a usual routine of spraying but it doesn't help. Another (20) said "the arrangements are not very good. It comes from considering prisoners useless. The prison is clean but there might be verminous prisoners. The prisoners on admission are not medically examined; the hospital assistant just asks them if they are ill - only a sort of inspection; he is too proud of himself."

The prison contained an Infirmary but the seriously ill and those requiring specialised treatment were transferred to the town hospital under escort, which was disliked by the senior staff because of staff shortages. These visits to the town hospital were prized by the convicts because of the opportunities for trafficking and contacts with friends rather than for escape. These valuable opportunities would relieve boredom and to make contact with the outside world and to arrange drops for contraband. A convict (6) attending the main hospital who met an acquaintance in the queue outside the doctors said "he knew where I lived so I asked him to go to my house and to tell them that I am coming again to see the specialist this coming Friday". So that on the arranged day a friend would appear in the queue and pass to the convict some contraband which he would have usually succeeded in getting past the gate guard at the prison.

Convicts attending sick parade were given medicine and duty; excused duty for which they stayed in their cells, sent to the Infirmary or referred to the town hospital. There were no special quarters or cells for the mental patients who were usually housed in the punishment cells which were in a separate block away from the main cell group.

Prisoners attending sick parade and details recorded in the Medical Officer's Day Book for the first ten days of October, November and December averaged 5.2, 9.8, and 14.7 persons per day which represented a daily sick rate of 0.5, 0.9, and 1.4%. This was certainly a very low rate of reporting, substantially lower than that reported for two British prisons (7). There were no formal medical
and administrative restrictions on the availability of treatment. Any prisoner could go on every daily sick parade if he wished or report sick at any time through the warder on duty in his cell block or apply for special treatment for teeth or eyes. A convict (8) said "others go on sick parade because they are sick, others because they do not want to work, others for the fun of it. There is nothing to stop me going sick every day. Many go sick every day; they do not get into trouble. There are some who think they are sick - he doesn't know whether he is indeed sick or not. Today 40 went sick, 10 were malingerers and 2 or 3 who genuinely think they are sick but are not". Another (20) commented "there are some who are mentally sick in thinking that they are ill as they collect medicine tablets but never take them".

Apart from the occasional lunatic legally defined as such whom the prison had to house which it did with considerable reluctance as the senior officers were very conscious of the inadequacy of their facilities both to house and observe such people, it was not possible to enumerate the mentally sick. A senior officer (1) said "for lunatics it is a pitiable state of affairs. We have no trained staff. We have to put them in the small cells as there is nowhere else for them to be put". No one knew or had even attempted to guess, but very few had been convicted of crimes which would presuppose some mental trouble. No suicides or attempted suicides were reported during the period of the research. Smashing up cell furniture or any form of eruptive violence of a prisoner within his cell was apparently unknown if only because the cells contained no furniture except for that occupied by the special stage convicts. Although many factors were present in this prison (11) which might have led to institutional neurosis, no convicts were seen who could have been diagnosed in this category. The loss of personal friends, possessions and personal events, and the loss of prospects outside the prison were all strongly present but the idleness was relative rather than enforced and the dormitory cell atmosphere not hostile to personal relationship.

The prison only acted on the assumption that a particular convict was mentally ill when he behaved in a way which disturbed the other men, and when they could not avoid reacting. Such matters were dealt with
off the cuff by the senior officers rather than by the doctor. A disturbed convict would be isolated or moved from job to job; it was social handling rather than medical treatment. The same convict said "the doctor has certified one convict as mad because he was always quarrelling, walking about naked, being obscene. There are others who are mad but nothing is done about them — picking quarrels — they have just kept on moving him. Others do nothing unless told — they just stand and wait. The prison authorities don't care. It is we who complain and get the quarrellers moved. The Chief Warder will put him in the small cells and when they become overcrowded, he will be moved to the segregation block. They shut their eyes — they know they exist".

While this appeared to be a deplorable state of affairs, the Officer in charge sometimes used considerable sagacity in manipulating the mentally disturbed so that they caused less trouble. An aggressive psychopath who had caused periodic trouble and who had been sent to the punishment cells for these disturbances was told that he was now in charge of the lunatics to look after them under the direction of the warder staff; a position which had no formal existence and which could not have been given to a convict under the existing prison rules. This man (9) was interviewed and said "I am in charge of all the lunatics under observation I look after them. They cannot complain about what I do as they are mad and the warders won't believe them". The Officer in charge said that from the time of this appointment he had given no further trouble. Nevertheless probably only the paranoid was recognised by the prison authorities, not as a mentally disturbed person but as a trouble-maker if not because they thought he was instigating others to make trouble, then because of the possibility of attacks on them which occurred occasionally. Certainly such men who appeared to have violent outbursts were a cause of great anxiety. However there were no cases in which the warders reacted violently against such persons and punished them illegally by "punch-ups" on their way to the punishment cells.

The Prison Rules and Standing Orders did not distinguish between types of health and the prison authorities had an equal obligation to treat both physical and mental illness but these Standing Orders showed
clearly that in fact they only aimed to hold the disturbed until they could be handed over to specialist institutions. They had to hold the mentally disturbed simply because there were no other institutions available which could take custody and assume security responsibility. This was explicitly recognised by the order (19) which stated that a mental hospital could legally refuse to accept a lunatic if there was neither sufficient or suitable accommodation available.

That the mentally disturbed were not more of a problem since a small number undoubtedly existed, was due not only to the ingenious manipulations of the senior staff, but to the low level of tension in the prison as a whole. The design of the prison and the climate with its open yards and lighter disciplinary regime, certainly allowed the solitary to keep away from the others if he wanted to be alone or be avoided by the others. Nevertheless it should be recognised that the prison authorities reactions to mental disorder and offences against discipline in the prison, although distinguished in law, were very much the same in practice as far as the prisoners involved were concerned and both went to the punishment cells. So it would not have been surprising if the warders reacted in the same way in regarding mental disorder as a cause for punishment rather than treatment.

II. Health and the convict

Despite the obviously low daily average rate of prisoners reporting sick, many prisoners did appear to be very preoccupied with health. The absence of sickness could be explained in part by the low average age of the prison population and the very low numbers of middle-aged prisoners and also to their healthy life with light work, open air and reasonable institutional food; they were not cramped up in out of date cells and there was no problem over exercise.

In American and British prisons the sick parade had been an opportunity for manipulating privileges, traffickng and communicating with those from other cell blocks. Here it was certainly not necessary to go on the sick parade in order to get favourable opportunities for communicating or traffickng which were relatively easy in many other directions. Prisoners going sick lost their daily pay if they
were absent from work for more than four hours but not if they should be sent to hospital except for an incapacity of their own creation (12) which at least seemed contrary to the normal understanding of social justice. There was this economic pressure to be either ill or to take medicine and return to work.

Although there was a low sickness rate, the Medical Staff had to be and were, constantly on their guard against malingerers. The prison doctor was in a much more difficult position than the welfare officer, who could not suffer any administrative consequences from being helpful as he followed up prisoners' problems and the decisions on them were made elsewhere; he did not even have to test whether the request was reasonable and indeed by passing on every issue with sympathy he could gain the prisoners' confidence without weakening his official relationship to his superiors. The prison doctor had to make decisions which the prison authorities must obey and this difficult position made them acutely aware that any prisoner may have tried to get his favourable decision on an entirely bogus health application. The consequences of making a wrong decision would have been very serious resulting in unfavourable publicity and detailed administrative enquiries. He was inclined therefore to admit prisoners' self interpretations of their illnesses but was restrained by the feeling that he was being taken advantage of all the time. For most doctors in outside practice the malingerer was a rare individual and did not have to be considered except in relation to insurance claims and work exemption certificates. In the prison every convict in the sick parade was potentially a malingerer looking for a change of prison, variation in diet, different clothing or a trip to the town hospital.

While the convicts had commented on the amount of activity which went on in the prison, even the most perceptive suffered from the monotony of the routine and this may well have been as the basis of much malingering. Although attending sick parade meant the loss of the day's earnings which was a necessary control of prisoners going sick for no health reason, it was often used regardless of this financial loss to relieve boredom or to attempt to get a transfer. A convict (13) said "last month I pretended that I was sick with a bad chest so I was sent to the town hospital where they took a series of
x-ray pictures. I was looking for a means of getting transferred to another prison for getting relief from this place. The pictures showed nothing so as I said they took a series and even when the doctor said that there was nothing wrong with me, I continued to complain. The last time I went I cut my tongue with a razor blade and said that I was coughing blood which I demonstrated to the doctor who kept on explaining that I was not ill and that the x-rays showed nothing. I continued to argue so I was given a daily dose of cod- lover oil. I had my own bottle which I haven't yet finished. So this month I complained about blindness at night saying that I could not see even when the lights were on, and I have been going sick about my eyes, on and off since then sometimes getting medicine and sometimes not. I did not ask to go to the main hospital in town but they sent me to the eye specialist this week who gave me a very thorough examination as well as some stinging medicine.

This convict was preoccupied with his own personal need to get a transfer and he was pursuing this end with considerable patience and ingenuity such as his description of trying to get to the lavatory at night and tripping over his cell mates and getting cursed was most convincing. In order to go sick so often he was of course losing the majority of his possible monthly canteen earnings but he got in return something definite to do and of course the diversions of new conversation and the possibilities of new opportunities which he could develop to his own advantage. The loss of canteen earnings could have been balanced out by any intelligent convict wishing to deal in illicit trade.

There were also others who were prepared to act the symptoms of mental illness to get personal advantages. A convict (15) said "there are also prisoners here who make themselves mad and are taken to mental hospitals; they are only cunning fellows. What he is after is to have letters and more food than the others and to have greater freedom of movement in the prison because the warders would fear to provoke him".

This constant difficulty over malingering must have eroded any doctor's conception of himself as a helper of the sick and comforter of the afflicted. It was not surprising then that convicts had a
generally unfavourable opinion of the prison doctor regardless of the individual's capabilities or personality. A convict (14) said "the doctor does not help. I think he thinks that we don't deserve. Most of all they don't understand why a prisoner who is here for doing a bad thing should be treated. They don't look on medical treatment as the convicts' entitlement as of course they are thinking of malingerers. They don't feel why, they don't see it. They feel that he can be left to die by his own". Another (16) said "the arrangements are not good here because they don't pay attention to you unless you are seriously ill. They don't mind if you are slightly ill. They regard us all as liars so it is difficult to get treatment".

If the prisoner had to see the doctor to get anything extra to his prison entitlement, it was surprising that so few in fact went on sick parade. Special privileges had to be assessed in relation to the overall position of each type of prisoner in this prison. Numbers of prisoners had a rise in their standard of living by coming to prison and they would have seen no particular advantages in trying to get more by getting involved in further prison procedures. It was suggested that in fact only the convicts with some education and a relatively high standard of living outside, who had status problems applied for these privileges. Most would not have bothered and indeed some of the educated ones (20) who said "I got my shoes without making an application to the hospital assistant and seeing the doctor. I just got them by a private arrangement with the warder in charge of the stores".

There was considerable complaining about the inadequacy of the medical treatment given in the prison and the persistance of complaints from some prisoners that would at least have suggested that they may have been hypochondriasis. A medical analysis (17) of 1190 consecutive diagnoses listed for each patient attending sick parade recorded in the Medical Officer's Day Book, showed that some 3.4% related to symptoms of possible psychosomatic origin such as abdominal pain, headache, chest pain and lumbago, apart from diagnoses related to infectious, parasitic and contagious symptoms. While no reference could be given to comparable figures, it did seem that this may have been a significantly high figure and that it did relate more to the educated and
high status convicts for whom their prison sentences were in fact times of great strain.

As a result of the restrictions which they saw on the distribution and availability of medicines, some tried different sources and systems. A convict (18) said "only a few people are allowed to go sick from every gang. Many prisoners spend their own goods to buy medicine from outside to use inside. They don't get enough medical treatment. I agree that plenty of medicine is given out but it is very difficult to see the actual doctor". At least one herbalist was practising in the prison during this period whom a convict described "that old man provided medicine for quite a number of other convicts in the prison outside workers bring in the plants and roots which he instructs them to collect for payment which he in his turn gets from the men who consult him such as sugar or whatever else he wants. He is just carrying on with his outside profession while he is serving his sentence". These complaints were confined in effect to the recognition of illness rather than its actual treatment once the convict was diagnosed as being really ill. A convict (20) said "if you are seriously ill the treatment is adequate but to those with minor ailments it is not so good".

Another possible explanation of these complaints might have been that hygiene was taught in the primary school syllabus of all three East African countries and for that reason alone any convict who had been at school at all might well have been more conscious of hygiene and its connection with disease. Also among the more literate and vocal convicts hygiene and status would have been closely connected and they would have concentrated on this in relation to their own difficulties as prisoners.

Fear of malingerers may well have led to some lack of sympathy, but it seemed that the medical staff may have seen in the importuning of some prisoners particularly the more literate ones, a challenge to their authority and professionalism. A convict (16) said "the medical staff at the prison are more or less like warders. You are not allowed to talk English to anyone like them and if you do they reply in Swahili. You are just the same as any other prisoner". Another (8) said "I had a 101° temperature in the evening and got six tablets."
The hospital assistant asked me where I worked, I said in the stores but I cannot go to work today. He said it was not my business to tell him what I should be given and just for that I would be put on medicine and duty, but I just went back to my cell as I was feeling very ill."
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Prisoners essays

These are essays written with the encouragement of the researcher on topics of the convicts own choice. Those written in English have been transcribed without alterations to the grammar, while the remainder have been translated from Swahili into English.

1. The prisoners reformation

It all starts very simple - a man does a thing which to his mind he thinks it all well worked and it will work to his own plans. Later he discovers it won't work at all. Something, somewhere have gone wrong and he finds or understands for the first time what he have been doing is against one of the many laws of the Country which have been laid with many do's and don'ts. He finds himself in the strong hands of the law keeper. He is in other words arrested.

For the first time he does not know how to plead when charged before the Court where penalty is to be passed upon him for what he did which seemed to him well worked and planned. However he pleads either on Police advice or his own mind. The Court after all finds him guilty of an offence. He is convicted, sentenced and sent to where many other unlucky people like him have landed and wander their worries and live a care free life. They feel at home, while the new admission is full of fear and worried thinking the next few days will look like.

After usual formalities he is thrown in the one of the Halls where some have spent 4 or 5 years either consecutively or in intervals having been in and out after the completion of sentences and coming back after doing another Crime. The first words they tell the unhappy new admission is do not worry two years is nothing. Some of them so they say, have already finished 4 years and they have 2 years more to do. They further inform him that here we are always happy despite lack of some luxuries. They tell him all sorts of funny stories, why Mr. X is in Jail, Why Mr. Z is wearing a blue uniform, Why I have a red ribbon on my shoulder, Why others are called Stars and others ordinary, which gang is best etc. In a course of two days his worries and fear are almost wiped away and he have now
joined them in the daily discussions of what actually happens inside a Criminal Jail.

These people who claims to know everything about Jail tells him many new things, teaches him how to behave in order not to go somewhere worse than Jail - the small jail inside the jail. But, they will not tell him what he should not do to keep the Prison Ordinance. They teach him what they do to break Prison Ordinance, and get away with it. In other words he is taught the law but he is not shown how to obey it. He is shown a hundred ways of how to break the law and get away with it. E.g. - They will tell him it is against Prison Rule to smoke. They will not tell him what to do in order not to break this rule but they will show him the means and ways of getting cigarettes which is against Prison Rule and they will teach him many ways how to keep it without being detected. He have no doubt started on the wrong path - always planning how to break the law which he knows and get away with it.

After knowing the Prison Law and how to break them and get away with it, he becomes like them all and as days pass he starts to be taught about the laws of the country. He will be taught this after giving his own story of why he is in Jail. They will teach him what he would have done to get away with it. No one will stand and tell him what he did was a bad thing and against the law. Instead they will tell him the precautions to take next time before going on a robbery mission. Now, will he ever repent or regret what he did? Will he become a law abiding Citizen while he have been rehearsing the ways to break the laws and get away with it after release? Will the 2 years sentence teach him how to obey the law or will he learn more about breaking the law? On his release day could the authority classify him as a reformed Criminal or the type which takes the cue to become a habitual Criminal? Are courts set to choose people who will enter the prison school? And lastly, do the Prison Department spend £1,000,000 per annum of the tax payers money to train expert Criminals?

When a judge passes a sentece he must have a good reason to do so. And I wish if who ever carries that sentence should take great care to see that the sentence have done a good course towards the:

There is no use whatsoever of sending people to jail if when released they are not reformed and instead, the sentence of two years have not in fact punished the person but it has turned him from bad to worse. This should be vice versa - that is when a man have done a bad thing he should be punished so that he should never do such a thing again and afterwards he will be a law abiding citizen - he have turned from bad to better.

In my opinion the sentence is supposed to do a good course both to the Country and to the convicted person. If it does not serve that purpose as it seems, then, somewhere the Government Machinery which carries that sentence is not in working condition. Therefore it is not saving the Country from the unhappy situation of having Criminals at large. I will allocate the blame to the Department which is entrusted with the task of carrying the sentence and punishment.

There are many ways which the Prison Department fails in its duty to the Public. Prison department thinks that its responsibility is only to keep a convicted person in a locked door, But it is very unfortunate to see that they fail in the very important duty of having a convicted person reformed. No one takes interest to know what happens behind the locked doors, and in fact they care less whether a particular convict have been released and come back again. They do not even try to see why that person have not reformed and hit by the previous sentence. They are happy to see people going and coming back rather than going and never come back again.

I have been working in a legal office for the last ten years. I have come across a good number of habitual criminals as they are our best clients. I always plead with them to do away with crimes and lead a honest life. The answer is always the same - if I do not commit crimes what will I do for a living? So next time I meet them, they have landed into another trouble. I remember one who came from prison after serving 3 years. He came to see his lawyer and to settle his long outstanding account. I pleaded with him not to turn to crimes again. He did swear that he will never have anything to do with the crimes. In the same afternoon a telephone rang in the office and I was shocked to hear the same man who was with me in the morning is in
Police Station and wants to see the lawyer. The offence this time being a very serious one - Robbery with violence. Within a week from when he left the Prison he was back there to the School of Crime to learn more how to do a robbery and this time it is a term of 7 years and six strokes. These proves that even after staying for 3 years he had not actually been reformed. He did not learn more in the first course and by the time he finishes 7 years sentence he will have learned more and next time when he pulls a robbery he will now use a mask.

So, as you and I can see it will go on every day, a man is released and he carries many new methods and plans of committing Crimes to the Country at large. He is bound to try them, he may sometimes do it and get away with it. There are ways which Government should do to stop this. Here below I give some ways which I think the Government have failed and which they should do to stop people from learning different types of Crimes and get them reformed.

There are many ways which Government can do to reform the Criminals. Here under I give some things and ways which according to my experience as a Prisoner, will if adopted prove very successful.

1. **Segregation**

When rotten potatoes are mixed with the good ones they will eventually spoil the whole stock. The same way, it happens when habitual Criminals are mixed with the first offenders of the second or third offenders they ruin them. It would be easy for Prison Department to segregate the convicts. First offenders should be kept in a separate prison with the second and third offenders. The habitual Criminals should be kept in one Prison and be classified according to various Types of Crimes.

2. **Treatment**

Where the first offenders are kept, they should be treated favourably. Second offenders treated fairly and third offenders treated a bit hard. Habitual Criminals should be treated cruel so that every first offender will never dare commit another crime hence he joins the cruel treatment.

The habitual Criminals should never be allowed time off. They should be subjected to a hard life in Prison rather than the present
arrangements of a life in a holiday camp.

3. Hard work in Prison

There is a saying - "idle mind is a devil's workshop". In prisons under the present arrangement, most of the times prisoners are idle. Even the time they are supposed to be working hard, they are never kept very busy to an extent which could make their mind work hard. It will help if they are kept very busy the whole day so that they have no chance of being idle. They should start work at 5.30 a.m. and retire at 7 p.m. with only one hour break at lunch time. From 7.00 p.m. to 8.30 they should be allowed to talk but at the end of 8.30 p.m. they should go to sleep. By this time they are tired and they will have no time for their ill thinking and useless discussions.

4. After-care

When a man is released from jail he is left to go at large without any food or any idea how he could start life afresh. In my opinion no convict should be released until a position have been found for him where he should go and work. Although there is the present organisation which deals with this matter it is not at all very effective. This work should be made the entire responsibility of the Prison Department which should be a part of their duty to apply for jobs for the convicted persons. They should in the first instance recommend the Government Departments to employ ex convicts to set a good example to the Private enterprises.

There should be all types of training to the Prisoners in the course of their duty while in the Prison to specialise them in all types of trades and occupations from a gardener to a Clerical, Printing, mechanical, Electrical jobs and in fact all sorts of works should be taught to prisoners according to their aptitudes in addition to the present opportunities of Tailoring, Carpenters, Masons etc.

2. Me and my family after conviction

I was born in October 10th 1932. My father came from Fort Hall District joined the army and when he was stationed at British Military Hospital near Kabete he met my mother, married and settled down at Kabete where I was born in Kiambu District. In year 1937 my father was attacked by asthma and could not work anymore. So the money which
he had saved, he gave to my mother who started a small shop which
business she still runs. Since then my father does nothing other
than drinking and staying at home.

My mother is a hardworking type always devoted to her children,
and her small vegetableshop which have maintained the whole family
which in addition to Mother and Daddy there are 8 sons and a grand-
mother to look after.

I was educate in a small village school and then went to Kabete
Secondary School. I then joined the then Jeanes School where I took
a two year Commercial Course. My second brother went to the Medical
Training School where for four years he was trained as a Hospital
Assistant. Just before he completed his course, Emergency had been
declared in the Country and he was detained. On completion of my
course, I was employed in a legal firm as a typist. I never used to
smoke or even drink and I never kept any body’s company. I was always
at home coaching my young brothers after office hours. I was a good
Christian.

My mother used to collect my salary from my employers which was
300/- per month. This was used to educate my other young brothers.
Then in year 1954 I was detained together with my brother. The third
brother went to a High School and then to Makerere where in year 1963
completed his B.Sc. All this time prior to my detention I was sup-
porting the entire family and was regarded with respect by all young
and old.

My life changed just on my release from detention. I had learned
to smoke and drink in detention camp, the habit I adopted even after
my release. This made my mother very annoyed and even if she used to
ask me to leave it, I went on secretly. I always remember her kind
words that drinking will land me into troubles. Then it happened as
she said, as in 1957 January I was convicted for 3 months. This only
made me worse rather than teaching me a lesson.

After my release I went back to my employment, and in year 1958
I married my wife. She was a school teacher, a girl I had known
through her childhood. She was just few yards from our home and she
was respected by all people. We had a wonderful Christian wedding
costing me some 6000/- apart from the dowry settlement which was
3000/-. This was the start of my downfall, because the events which followed were so bad that every one in the village no longer respected me.

However, my wife and my mother became so much acquainted that it was hard for any one to discover that she was not her real daughter. This annoyed me so much because she used to repeat the warnings which my mother used to give. With all fairness to her I would say my wife was a good comforter and at the same time a very jealous wife at a thing which she never used to show until after we had our first born - young Helly. Then she changed and started to show her jealousy. She used to follow me secretly at night when I go to meet girl friends. She would wait in darkness until she catches me with a girl then she will fight the girl. It went on like this then I made up my mind to buy a car in which case she could not follow me. After staying with a car for few months she was accustomed to it. When I go home at midnight she would only joke but she never took it serious then I was free. When I stayed like this for one year my love for her came back and I found that I really loved her than I thought more than I expected to love any woman. Then came my daughter, she was my image, sometimes I could not do for 10 hours without seeing young Helly. She was always happy with me it remained like that until my day of arrest.

To my wife my arrest was not a surprise. She was always expecting me to land into troubles due to my habit of drinking. She even used to say when I was late that she thought I have done an accident or being arrested.

When I was arrested I felt that it was all my fault although I was not actually guilty of the offence allegedly committed. One thing my wife knew was that I could never be a criminal. I was always honest in my dealings with every one. She expected my troubles from drinking and driving. After my arrest and convictions she used to visit me in jail every weekend. Then I was transferred to this prison where it is not possible for her to visit me.

My great worry is, will I see her again or will she get fed up and find another man? These question when I ask myself I cannot get the answer. First woman evil like flowers. They treat men as shades.
Which means when flowers have no shade they are bound to dry. When a woman cannot see her man she is bound to be tempted and of course who can blame her - it is natural. We should always allow some errors for the human nature.

I always think about home but for the past four months I have been very much troubled in mind. I have written four letters to my wife but she has decided to keep quite no reply. Then I have written to my mother again no reply and also to my brother without any reply.

If my mother and brother do not reply it matters little. But when my wife do not even write to say the children are in good health, it lead to a convict like me having sleepless nights. At the end to keep my heart settled I have to make some conclusions of my own as to why she does not write.

My judgements may be wrong or may be right. Suppose she met someone else and made love what could I do when I go home and find her in such a state? Will I be able to bear it? Suppose I assume that to be correct and decide to keep away from her. What will happen to our three children? I always feel that if this happens, I will only say a fair goodbye to her and perhaps could easily get another wife, but then comes another question will I get other children?

When I go on thinking about home and imagining how my wife might be, or where she might be or doing in sometimes, or what my children are doing on a Sunday morning I feel I can never from my own conclusions and therefore cannot find or solve the things in my own mind and feel the answer depends on the calendar - as I mark dates as gone, the nearer I am to get the answer.

3. What one could learn from prison

Committing an offence to one's own will looks as if he is enjoying its privileges. For instance, when someone steals, let us say about two thousand shillings, after enjoyment with it or before, he will be saying to himself: "Had I known that the Prison life would be tough on me, I could had not committed this offence".

When a wrong doer is caught by Police, he is brought for trial before the court, and when found guilty, he is then sentenced there and then. The government might think that by so sending this type of offender to Prison he would learn to become a good citizen. According
to my own experience in the Prison at least nobody becomes a good man when he has stepped into Prison.

The prison is a mixture of different offenders, and even from smallest to the worst. All these prisoners are put in one big place - Prison where, these prisoners, sometimes tell of their different stories as how each committed his offence and how one should be careful before he is caught by any Police, and by doing all this, a prisoner, who did not or was not a thief becomes to learn how to steal. Yet he was supposed by the Government to learn not to be a bad citizen.

Again let's imagine about a vagrant who never knew what stealing ways were, when he has heard of how some people become rich through stealing; such a man, after his being in the Prison, he deteriorates and becomes a bad man and starts stealing too.

When we come to some other prisoners behavior, an educated learns nothing from illiterate prisoners, and so is an illiterate one. Today, there are some Technical industries such as Carpentry, Painting, and etc. which are taught to prisoners and those who did not know anything before, could leave when are skilled carpenters and so on.

But this is not possible for a prisoner of less than three years' sentence to learn but only for more. As the Government really makes use of the Prisoners tools made by them they do not teach them properly. After this country gained her Independent Government, there had been brought some rules which says that, anybody from Prison, would be helped to find a job suitable for him according to his qualifications. This is done by a certain body called "Discharged Prisoners' Aid Association". This association meets every individual prisoner when he is due for his release, for at least to months in advance and asks him (prisoner) which kind of job he would like to do after his release. At this time, before this association, the prisoner can decide of what kind of work he could do or whether he might like doing some private trading business. The D.P.A.A. can assist such a prisoner to find a job quite easily and if he were a man who really does not like coming to Prison, he can concentrate on his work or business and becomes a truly good citizen.

Behaviour of Prisoners in Prison. After one has heard the end of his case before the court and the sentenced imposed on him he becomes
somehow sick and feels as though he were dreaming. He is forthwith
taken by the Prison Warders and handcuffed him, no matter whether he
was willing or not willing to escape and hang him to a Prison van
which is well built for security.

When they arrive at the Prison, the prisoner is taken one by one
until he reaches an office called "Duty Office" where he will find
some other warders and an officer called "Duty Officer" ready to re-
ceive any prisoner that may be brought in from any court. Here, he
will be ordered to sit down whether he likes it or not and should he
attempts to disobey any rules, he will be dragged to and fro until
he becomes to blame himself. In the office there are some white
clothes a pair of shorts and shirt will be issued to the prisoner,
and two blankets as well as a mat.

When all these have all been issued he is taken to the halls
where other Prisoners do live. When he arrives there, he is greeted
by jokes by other Prisoners and asked how the Public is like, some
ask even nonsensical questions, and others do beg for ciggarettes,
when he has been done all these he will be asked of what offence he
committed and for the period he is convicted. After all these, some
of his fellow Prisoners will ask not to mind but to be very careful
and obey the Prison rules so as to avoid losing some of the Remission
given by the Prison. Others, who have lost some of their remission
or those who are to, rude both to warders and their own fellow P:
isoners, might mislead him and tell him not to be polite to anybody.

Prisoners as a whole, are not bad people, but, some were wrongly
created by God. We may find one of them who is too greedy and in-
stead of asking for an addition of food, he fights and later banged
to the small cell for some days. Some do not do the same, but may
make some specific arrangements with the cooks and in their agreement,
they will be brought some extra food and later at the end of the month
they give some of their monthly earnings properties, such as sugar,
tobacco and others to the cooks concerned.

According to the experience I have already gathered from various
prisoners, i.e. different Prisons, there are three to four different
types of Prisoners' behaviours. There are some who do practise home
sexual in the Prison and are very talkative to newly admitted convicts
who look rather younger and quiet. They begin by means of providing their rations to such youngsters in order to please them and hence a friendship might be founded. Which might result a homo sexual game to be played or practised.

There are other Prisoners who never like talking too much but works rather hard to please any of his superior officer and should any of his fellow prisoner attempt to persuade him, he automatically disassociate with him.

Most of them do really talk of theft experiences, and how he had been enjoying with the money he stole before arrested. Some who stole even ten bob might bluff his friends that he stole ten thousand shillings. Most of the Prisoners are not highly educated although some claim to have possessed any B.A. degree.

In a big prison where longer sentences convicts stay, e.g. those convicts whose sentences do range from three and over years' imprisonment the behaviours of convicts are not so the same as those of shorter periods. One could find their behaviors to be either rather queer or good, this is because, in such a place, an organisation of strike is rather common and most of them are too obedient.

Most of the prisoners really do smoke tobacco as well as bhang in lieu of cigarettes. Some of bad prisoners like to fight against one another and when caught, they may pretend that they were playing or joking. This is just owing to the oppression one may find in the small cell, should he happen to be found guilty and banged in there for any of an offence he has committed.

Disadvantages of Remaining Offences. To my own view, a real socialist and a prominent citizen, who comes to Prison for the first time, finds the Prison life rather complicated and if he gets a chance of freedom can escape completely.

Going to a prison is really bad and disappointing too. When one come to Prison, whether he was a rich man or poor, clever or foolish, and even whether he had a remarkable designation, he is regarded as an ordinary fellow picked up from any street having nowhere to live or nothing to feed on and has committed a minor offence and banging into Prison. Actually the Prison is just nothing good but second to hell. We find a man with a good standard of education in the Prison being
treated in the same way as those who do not have any bit of education. The government nowadays does claim to be reforming the prisoners in order to be good people after their release, but this is not so.

When a prisoner is sent to jail an officer in charge of the prison cares not to talk to his prisoners. This is commonly among the whites. Such an officer, the prisoners fears him and all the time he would not like meeting him while he is still a prisoner or after his release from prison.

The prison is not a good place at all, when in there condemns himself because, once he is a prisoner, whether he was a trader or worker, he earns nothing in the prison except ten cents a day and should he fails to works, he earns nothing and this might even result a prolonging of the imprisonment days which might have been cut off as remission. This is a sheer waste of time and once you go away you have learned nothing at all.

Most of the new offenders who are convicted do not like to be recommitted to prison after they have been released and in most of their times condemn being in the prison. This is because once, a man is convicted he goes in the prison and all the times wasted is not paid for by anybody. Let us imagine the difference between a bachelor and a married man. These two people when convicted and stay together do not look alike in the way their times are wasted. A married man really loses plenty of time and during his stay in the prison his family suffer much while a bachelor does not suffer the same consequence.

At last, we do find that being a prisoner does the following damages to a honest person (i) Disgrading, (ii) Abuse ment b the Public (iii) Waste of time (iv) Separation from Family and friends (v) Prevention from all the free movement (vi) Starvation and stupidities and so forth.

Treatment of Prisoners by Warders. "Chonjo" this is the good morning that most of the warders say to every club and the prisoners get ready for anything, that might occur. This word means be "careful".

The prison a warder normally put or arrange all the prisoners in lines of five to make it easy for counting by any officer doing either look up or unlock. When they have done this, they order the prisoners to be in a line of Porridge (ujji) which is distributed by one prisoner
who is a cook. Should any of the Prisoners refuse or brings any disturbance at this time of the morning, he is dragged as a useless log to the small cell and locked there.

Most of the warders feel very pleased when a Prisoner is charged and put in small cell or added some days. A warden may approach any prisoner and the question which he asks him is "I say you why were you convicted"? He just asks this question simply to fool the Prisoners. When the Prisoner might declare to say his offence and explains the whole story to such a warden, he keeps quiet and goes a part from him (prisoner) and should the Prisoner make a slight mistake the likely word to use is the abuse by the offence he did.

We may find a Prisoner who was a clerk, let us say even in an ordinary office, when he comes to Prison, if he tells the warders that he was a clerk, he could never be believed. He might be told automatically that he was a clerk in a hall of thieves and this sort of treatment makes most of the Prisoners hate talking to warders. In a working gang, the warders do not regard prisoners as human beings but as dogs or horses. There may be a slight argument on experience of a certain kind of work to be done in the gang, if a prisoner suggests of an idea, he can be told to shut up and even he may be told that his ideas are as rotten as he is himself. In big Prisons, such as Kamili is where we find good warders who do not mistreat the Prisoners.

Some people say that, this is just because these warders are literate and are not simply warders but qualified artisans. In other remote Prisons where no other kind of carpentry or black-smith or some of the sorts regarding industry are practised, the prisoners do go to the labour gang by warders, there has commonly been some few arguments between a Prisoner and a warden regarding the experience of any academic qualifications, the Prisoner could not be listened to at all. But this is just because of hatreds which these people hate the Prisoners.

At least we may be satisfied if the Government would endeavour to recruit qualified warders rather than those who are illiterate, nobody would be expected to be a bad warden by any Prisoner. Long ago, during the colonial times, Prisoners were not regarded as real human beings and most of them died through hard beating by warders.
These type of warders some were expelled but most of them are still in the present government Service. These people are now good but still have the colonial hearts. This is that should any prisoner make a mistake, and such a warden has a little chance of beating or hitting the Prisoner, he can deliberately hit the Prisoner as a wild dog. This happens mostly in remote places such as District Prisons.

The public regard the prisoners as bad people but as far as I have learned this, the prisoners are not bad people, it is the uniform that makes them look rather shabby. In the labour gang, the warders like to shout at the Prisoners to work hard. This sometimes is not good, because, a warden may see a lady passing by and at this time is when he can make the prisoners ashamed by abusing them and telling them to work although none of them was malingering. If there is some work to be done by means of measuring a bit by bit of work to Prisoners, still even if the Prisoners have finished their measurements, the warders can hardly allow Prisoners to relax.

Nowadays prisoners hardly escape from Prison but still we find warders to be pretending to prevent them from doing so. But this is rather a sheer waste of time since we may find one warden looking after twenty or more prisoners. If one would want to escape I wonder how on earth he could prevent him from escaping.

The necessity for Prison in the Country. Long ago, before civilization came to exist, what was being done to wrong doers? Perhaps the best sociologists would tell. In Africa, there were very many different tribes, who differed from languages and culture. But still the question on what was being done to wrong doers stand. As far as my tribe --Traditionally customs are concerned, if any body had stolen his neighbour's property he could be killed either by spears and arrows or clubs, but this still was rather a rotten idea since if such a law could be regarded as a common law, nobody could learn to leave his own mistake to be a good citizen.

The prison was built by those who decided that all the wrong doers and evils should be collected and locked there against their wills and work hard and get less food. Those people are called Government. Had it been actually that there was no Prisons, the evil doers, especially murderers and robbers who use vigilance, would have
been in big numbers.

According to my own experience in the Prison, the present type of Prison with its present rules and condition of life, most of the criminals do not regard it as real Prison but either as theft or Robbery Training School. Those who have nowhere to live like committing offences purposely to be arrested and sent to jail where he will get free food free clothes free medical attention free blankets and etc. This is just in the Prison.

Let us now refer to those who kill their neighbours and still the Court may sentence such an offender to three years' imprisonment. When such a person comes to Prison, he gets everything free, and never works hard as anybody jailed for six months' imprisonment. Such a man can never learn to be a good citizen in completion of his sentence. The Prison could increase hard labour to those who do commit offences such as Robber, Theft, Murders and other serious offences in order to make them learn what the Prison is. But the present type of Prison is not teaching these offender any thing.

In other cases, where corporal punishment is awarded by Courts, the offenders really feel sorry for what they did by the time of getting the strokes. This could, I think, reduce the present criminal number if the Government could impose corporal punishment to every offender that is found guilty.

The existence of the present Prison condition need some improvements. This, I think, if the old hard labour is reformed, hardly no one could take heed of repeating their respective offences. If one could try to tour big prisons where we find those who like repeating offences simply to come to Prison and stay in there, pretending to be either lunatics or mad and get food, he would know that the present type of Prison rules and conditions need to be changed to the old condition where severe hard labour existed.

In 1948, I saw one of my relative go to Prison for a sentence of two years, when he came back, he was very thin and seemed to have changed his appearance and behaviour. He told us that, in the Prison, they were beaten like untrained oxen for wagons, and all the rules and conditions were next to any hell that a human being could have built. He told us that, should anybody attempt to re-convict him and
sent to prison for the second time, if he gets a suitable chance for escaping he could do so or otherwise commit a suicide in the prison rather than being in such a place.

But for the sake of the country security, this type of prison was rather better than the present type. Long ago, the population of the prison was low because of its old oppressive rules and conditions. Now, when all these had been revoked the population has increased and the criminal has also been in the same echo. Now there are so many robbers, house breakers, stock thefts and so on, which to me, should be replied by the old type of prison they cease their existence.

How Buuna Z became a Forger. This man is a Lahya by tribe. He was educated up to Cambridge School Certificate Level and passed his exams successfully in 1954. This lad after he had obtained his Division II Grade, he decided to go and look for a job in Nairobi.

When he came to Nairobi Buuna Z joined the East African Post and Telecommunication Department in the following year (1955) as an ordinary clerk at the Post Office counter. This department offered him a wealthy pay and promised him a good job in the near future and as a result of his good work, he got promotion and became an accounts Assistant this was after two years time.

In the third year this lad was promoted to the post of Accountant and sooner Buuna Z bought a saloon car. By five years' service, he began writing false Accounting by means of misappropriation of this department's cheques. He did this undiscovered for nearly six months and thereafter when the Annual Auditing came, he was caught and brought to the court, charged for more than eight counts.

He pleaded not guilty for the offence he did. The Court found him guilty and sentenced him to seven years' imprisonment but through a Supreme Court of Appeal, his sentence was reduced to three years. This lad is a nice fellow and why he committed this type of dangerous offence he could not tell anybody, but as I have gone through his conversation and behaviour, this man I think was attracted by money. He has been my closely personal friend and since his offence resembled mine, he really condemns being charged again.

All the money he stole he told me that had been partly spent on
his brothers' education and some on forming Trading Companies in the Town. Swana 2 does not smoke but claims to be a senior alcoholic. As he says he is married chap and has a number of children, he sometimes used to stay alone leaving his family home in North Nyanza.

According to my own point of view this chap really lost a lot of his time by so committing the so-called forgery. He is now very sorry, owing to the present calamities Prison life he is going through. Swana 2, according to my experience on him was not a bad man and can not prove to be so. People before charged and committed to any Prison do think the Prison life to be enjoyable. This man has tasted the Prison life and sometimes keeps so quiet in a lonely place and thinks how he lost his job, and at last tears comes from his lovely eyes.

We pray God to let him go and search for a new job and works hard in order to make his old standard of life look rather comfortable.

Female Imprisonment. The law says that, if any body commits an offence that is contrary to the law, he or she, should be punished according to the law he or she has broken. This is fair and at last a could be adhered to.

In every civilised country there must be Prisons both for male and female. These Prisons as far as I have experienced the bigger populated of the two is the male Prisons. This is of course because the most law breakers are the males.

Female Prison in our country are not as big and many as are those of male. But according to the law, those who break any part of it are caught and punished and sent to jail.

Long ago, during the colonial Government, there was a plan of recruiting some wardress to look after female prisoners. This is quite good for several reasons which everyone should think of and know.

Women who commonly commit offences are mostly drunkard and illegal beer manufactures. The drunkard ones are not married, but do roam about in the towns, looking for men with whom to go about and later drink like fish and then create disturbances in the streets or roads. When they are found by the police they are caught and sent to the Police Station for charge. These type of women are too abusive and when sent to Prison, they first either cry or go to Prison calmly
and sometimes pretend not to be eating any of the food that is
issued to the Prisoners. They do this just to know or to test
whether any of the officer in the Prison could recognise their beauty
and then in favour of this allow them to eat what they want. This
does not mean that they have never before tasted the Prison food.

When they have been informed that there is no other food in
the Prison, they may show off for about two days and on the third day,
hunger drives them to devour these Prison food just like a hyena.
They like eating just in groups as male Prisoners do. Some of them
do have their younger babies along with them in the prison. But this
is what one should really pity. Although the Government provides them
with milk rice and bananas, but this alone, is non sufficient to
their appetite.

Female prisoners are not supposed to do the hard labour. They
do some of the lightest job and in big Prison they make some wonderful
knitting work from which the Government makes a lot of money. But
in other prisons, they do some minor cleaning and etc.

Uhuру: na kasi. Actually, we are now a nation having our independence
Government. But, there are many questions to answered by the public
yet. Those who were used to roam from towns to towns claiming to be
job seekers yet are professional thieves are they going or do they still
plan to prolong this horrible plans? Now, what about women who used
to claim that their husbands were killed or dead during the emergency,
stay in towns selling some vegetables as well as their bodies in pro-
stitutions go on with their games?

Since this country obtained her Independent Government late last
year, many people have been fixed up in some big companies by so em-
ploying them. But, we still understand that some people still roam
about in towns picking up the pockets of the rich or poor. These
type of people are those who used to demand for Uhuру to come thinking
that when Uhuру is achieved such criminal procedure would not be
easily traced and stopped.

4. Life in prison

Not until a few years a go I come to the conclusion there exists
certain creatures somewhere. Those creatures are human being who
are convicted and put in prison as criminals. Most of those convicted
have been in prison more than one time - why? - because they are thieves, poor thieves, who have nothing enough to feed their families. Among those people there are others who do not mean to work although they get a chance because they are lazy and they experienced some bad habits of stealing others properties. Again there are those who are not thieves. Those who killed others accidentally, and collided with bad luck and so in prison. Most of those prisoners receive long sentences and others are sentenced for life.

Late in 1961 I was involved in a robbery with violence and was put in to five years imprisonment, as now writing this essay when in prison and having stayed here for almost three years. Since I was insisted a criminal.

For the period I have lived in prison I have got a chance of learning more of the world. Before I was not imprisoned I could not care of my future life, because I was used to taking everything easy as I could not realize that one day I would free trouble, suffering and hardships, I never knew there would come a time when fate will be completely against me. Nevertheless it was all what we call unforeseen, I have been leading a hell of life since my arrest and now it is only few months left to come over all this unforgettable time. I had been thinking that one would take a long time to become old, but I have realized that one does not take time to become an old man as I am old now, I was only a young boy before I was not put in prison. I also understood that the time a man is to live in this world is very short we are all looking forward to leave this world which is full of all sorrows and miseries where a human being is never content.

Because of having more opportunity for meeting with various in another work many types of people, I have got a chance for talking to them and I think I have managed to learn much more from the fools and clever ones than I could learn in the outside world. In prison you have to meet with every type of men e.g. murderers, thieves, thugs, robbers and all sorts of criminals and innocent ones.

Every human being who wants to learn something from a group of people he tries everything possible to be friendly with that group of people so that he may get it easy to go through with his desire and without mind; disabuse to his fellowships.
When one gets in prison he obviously loses self respect and finds it hard to stand the indignity of the abusement. Being abused by some warder and also by some of his fellow prisoners. He always finds everything strange in prison. He begins to think much of the things all around, and the more he think of his situation the more everything for him in prison goes harder and at last he sees himself enveloped in another new world where no one loves him.

For a period of three weeks or two he feels very much scared and he becomes nervous to speak with Officers in prison and also to all Authorities - why? Because he fears that if he dares to approach them - for any help they might sometimes find him guilty of anything and charge him - which is not so.

The time passed by everyday and for about a period of one month or more he begins to think of his home, his family and his property. His mind wanders from place to place and back to his case in Court of law and at last to the prison where he is serving his sentence.

He wishes, if one of his family or friends would come and visit him, as far as he is discouraged by his thoughts and feels quiet un-stable and mixed up all together. Some times his people would come to see him and some times they may not come for a long time. He feels very much confused and he hardly sleeps a couple of days.

The only way left for him to do is only to ask for a peace of paper and write a note to his people telling them that they do not remember him because he is in trouble he asks them to tell him of everything he wants and lastly tells them he would like them to visit him one Sunday if possible. Sometimes he may receive the reply and sometimes he receives nothing.

A prisoner's minds are never stable. He only feels a bit in the best mood when he receives a letter from his family, especially from his Mother and from his wife. To state the fact; a prisoner is a tough place and it needs a tough man to march with. Not only once have I seen a prisoner trying to commit suicide - why? - because he is unable to persevere the hardships and suffering and all.

Those who finds it - past all bearing - are those who have never been in prison before, and, before they got used to it they must be quite desperate of the situation around here.
When some people get in prison it is when they remember to write to their friends and relations, and parents, by that time he will realize that no one loves him because he will not be visited or written a letter by some of his best friends - as he had expected them before to have been for him.

A prisoner usually is to meet with so many other prisoners in prison. Sometimes he may meet with someone he knew before or someone he had met before when he was outside world. Once he meets one he knows they both would talk about very many things which one had met until the time of his arrest. If a prisoner does not meet with anyone he knows he sometimes feels lonely if he is not a talkative fellow and in that period he finds that a prison is a hell rather than a Confinement for wrong doers.

There are other prisoners when they are put in prison become wild and they don't want to couple with other prisoner. They are always fighting. They are mad, Criminal Lunatic who likes to show to other prisoners and prison authority that they are tough. They refuse to work. They want to have double food. Those type of prisoners who even make themself mad and are taken to mental hospitals, they are only cunning fellows. What he is only after is to have betters and more food than others, and to be allowed to go everywhere he like just inside the prison. Afterward they usually change their conducts and began to calm down as they fained that they will never succeeded, and if they succeeded it would be just for few days and that is the reason why they find that because they are desperate they must change their conducts. Prisoners do talk very many things when they are together, they can talk of events which have passed especially political. Most of majority in prison are Kikuyu tribe. It is because they became very poor during the emergency and for this reason their chances to pursue happiness were very remote and so most of majority were the poor lots. Because of this political changes there were no employment and having nothing like money for which they could help their families they decided to steal or rob others property. I have seen very many people, before the emergency were very rich and after the emergency they were as poor as Church mouse. The war had taken away all their property and even their lands were also taken by
the Government which was ruling that time.

After having talked with very many different kind of prisoners I have been able to discover that very many of them have been innocent in all their life long but there came an event which suddenly changed their life to become one of danger and criminal life. Most of those who change their life suddenly after having lived innocent in all their life long to criminal is poverty. It is more likely that more of those kind do feel very sorry for what they did so that to be in prison and most of the majority had only offended once and for this reason it proves that one has been an innocent.

The first offender of course is the one who becomes a second and a third offender and so forth but, he becomes like that or he pursue that way, because he is desperate; and he decides to try once again his luck and see whether he would win himself through and get himself a place in the world, and while he is trying all this it is when he becomes the second and third and so forth offender.

If the Government could manage to help and help prisoner first offender, who has served a long sentence, it is more likely that he want become a second offender. Most of the criminals I have met in prison have come from poor families, and for years on end they have been poor and they get the most hard problems to raise their families.

When one is put in prison for quite a long sentence he becomes very nervous and scared of his life which is already ruined as far as he is quite sure that he had nothing for which he could manage to lead his life with, since everyone knows that money is the key of everything in this world.

When an innocent man is jailed there is a danger to his life which he doesn't realize untill later on. The criminals are very cunning they are like politicians. They try to influence their fellow innocent prisoners by giving them the events they have faced, let us say the things they have done and the most dangerous scenes they have managed to escape. They tell very wonderful stories which some of them might be lies, and even some are quite unlikely to happen in all walks of life. Those who are able to be deceived and mostly those who have never been in jail before they become very much attracted by their stories and as they had always trying to earn their living by
working hard and eating the fruits of their sweat, they now find that
their way of earning their living has got many torments which pave
the way of life and once they get their freedom they begin to practice
the other kind of ways they learned from the stories they were being
told by their fellow criminal prisoners.

Although it does not sound sense to my proposal that there would
be jails for criminals and there also would be a separate jail for
those who have been innocent so that they would never be taught bad
characters by those who always make a jail their permanent homes to
live. If the first offender would not be imprisoned together with
the second and the third offender, it is probable that this first
offender will lead his innocent life after he goes out of prison.
Never the less a human being is never the same. They are created
different in all characters and in each way and again a human being
was naturally created with Sins that means that any one more or less
can commit an offence and if he will have no a defendant can go to
prison as well as any other human being.

If I were a government, there could not be a long sentences for
prisoners especially first offenders. Because the more a prisoner
lives in prison the more he is to learn his mistakes which he did in
his plan and the next time in future he will not follow that mistakes.
There are others who surrender after their sentence and would never
commit an offence anymore unless by bad lucky or ascendant. There
are others who decide to continue with their bad habits when they come
out of prison and they are again caught and sent to prison. They go on
liked this and for year on end they will never stop because they don't
have anything of their own and again they have experienced the prison
and found out that in prison there are alright because they have lived
for quite a long time, and they have been impoverished by the long
long sentences they have been receiving and completing all the time.

Those becomes the expert thieves and they do rob or steal money
or even a lot of money and they never save their money - why - because
they are expecting to rob some other money when they will finish
which they have. Once they get money they spend their money drinking
beer and going with beautiful ladies in the towns or in the cities and
enjoying live and heartly knowing that there would come a time for him
to be arrested if he is discovered and face the charge in the Court of law. Sometimes he may fight his case and win and sometimes not. It is always possible for him to be put in prison when he is arrested as far as his passed record would show that he had been a criminal although he doesn't seem as so it was he who committed the present offence.

If there could be a short sentence to a criminal and a severe punishment probably there would be less criminals than what there are now - with long sentence.

If the government could help an x-prisoner of this long sentence - the help of giving him some money - start a certain business - the one who is willing to do so; and give jobs to those who are willing to work, I don't see any possibility for them to be rogues any more as far as I know now that most of the rogues exists because they are impoverished by prison and no one cares for them to assist them after their long terms of serving in prison.

I have heard many prisoners saying that once he will get freedom he will never try to rob or steal anybody's property as now he has found himself better off after having stayed in prison doing nothing for his own good but suffering and leading a hell of life unnecessary for the one wants a decent life.

When a prisoner is put in prison he must have some bitterness within him and when he goes out of prison no wonder he goes with that bitterness and if he is not sensible he would commit a crime and sent back to prison. I have heard so many prisoners saying that when he goes outside world, when released, he would certainly repeat his crime since he doesn't have any cash and now he is poorer than what he had been before he came in prison. But if he would get a job somewhere or he receives help from the government he would not repeat the crimes which makes him to go in prison.

In Prison to-days is different to yesterday prison. Prisoners were not being trained various courses in prison, but there are many types of works done in prison by prisoners today e.g. Carpentry, Upholstery, Shoe-maker, Tailoring etc.

Most of the majority prisoner do like to know these jobs and some do not want, but those who don't want to know are very few.
Prisoners are trained all these courses and those who lives in jail for a long period, they come to know their jobs very much. After prison whose who knows well their jobs do get employment and they get some money to help them in future life. There are others who don't get jobs after they got out of prison because some employers fear that this ex prisoner might rob or steal his money or goods. Sometimes this employer might be speaking the truth since I know that there are still prisoners who don't want to work even if they get a good job. Those are the criminals who have been in prison not only once. Once he gets a job somewhere he don't stay there for about one year without committing a crime because he always likes to have cash in hand and not to wait until the end of the month. Moreover he is lazy and he is unable to work hard.

Prisoners are not bad people as all the people think they are 'no'. In prison you can get most trusted ones. There are those who have been inside here for more than three years; such prisoner are the good servants and I am sure that if such a man can get a job somewhere in the outside world he would do it honestly and he would stick to his job for quite a long time because such a man has been pursuing working everyday for the last years without even getting the lowest salary ever given even in the settlers farms. Again such a prisoner had been deprived of any life enjoyments and all these he has found that they mount to nothing and if at all he could get himself somewhere he would earn his living; there would be no need of wasting the time by quitting the jobs and go for committing crimes and ruin his shortest life which now left - and needs a great care.

These courses which are taught in prison are very nice to prisoners because there are some who love it very much and they enjoy it and the more they enjoy with their courses the more they know it. Those who likes their work in prison are those who hope that they will work somewhere after their release, either to be employed or to open his own small business in future life. But those who refuse to work in prison industries are those who don't hope to work after their release they or want to commit crimes or they want to steal or rob some others property or they want to wander about doing nothing and mostly in big Cities like Nairobi, Mombasa, Kampala etc. Every
prisoner gets 10° every day for his work which he has done that day and if he gets sick he cannot be paid anything that day. When a prisoner gets on well with his work he is increased 5° to his 10° and he gets 15° every day. After having lived in jail for quite a long time he is increased his salary to 20° and that means he must have got necessary ability to do the work he is told to do.

There are others who even go for grades tests before they finish their sentence; such as carpenter, shoemakers, most of them get their grades. Those who do not go for grades they are issued good references by the Industry Officer to enable them to get jobs in outside world. About these money which prisoners earn in prison they have a deposit of ½ of his monthly pay and he is given these money at the day of his release. Although this is a very little amount it helps one to buy some necessary things like sweets, cigarettes, tea, food, on his way home and he enjoys his freedom once again and feels as if he is born again or he has entered the heaven. There are many prisoners who had nothing when they were arrested and if there were no such little amount he won't enjoy that important day of his freedom from this tropical hell. There are others even who would go to steal money for their own need because they felt that they have nothing to eat since they don't have any friends who would welcome them because they were rogues who wander about doing nothing but harm to others.

In prison you can learn that many African people like to know how to write and read those do not know because I have seen several of them who didn't know how to read or to write and they learn all this in prison. There are others who don't take interest in anything but to eat and sleep while others are playing various games which are provided in prison by authorities.

The others are those who are a bit educated – or even more – like leave with the School certificate. Those, as I have learned likes to read books e.g. novels, magazines, romans, books etc. and mostly they like to increase their knowledge if possible. Among those prisoners we can find other who even enroll themself to Corresp. Courses if one had money he brought with him in prison for which he would pay for his subjects he enrolls.
Even nowadays I do see the classes in which prisoners are taught to read and write by other prisoners. Some of them take much interest learning in these classes. Sometimes every month prisoners are given a film show and this is only the time when I see the prisoners being very happy because they enjoy cinema more than anything else in prison. When the time of cinema is finished and they are back in their wards they talk of what they have found or have seen and everyone seems very happy of that film show. The kinds of films which prisoners like more are those of new, independent countries and films for enjoyments, such as dances and adventures, games. Such as olympic games and even for cowboys which are never shown in prisons nowadays because it is said that prisoners may learn bad habits from these types of cinemas. Prisoners can talk of many things when they are together and they do talk in turns and changing subjects from one subject to another. They talk of how one would make a lot of money by trading and how one would buy a Shamba and becomes a farmer. They can also change their subject to and talk of women, beautiful women one has ever met. This subject is the one I have found that take much interests with the prisoner. I have had many of them telling others that "Misfortune never came singly" they had already married just a few days before their arrest and they are doubtful whether their wives would date to wait till the last day of the long sentences.

Those who were not married like me talk of their girl friends and also there are others who talk of town women. One can say that his girl friend doesn't write him a letter since he was arrested and he can seem a bit sorrowful when he says that "my girl friend might have hated me or deserved me because I was charge by theft". Next time he can try to write to her and telling her she must persevere if at all she loves him. Sometimes a girl can write but there are others who never write and she no more loves him.

Those who had married just prior to their arrest sometimes they are told by their parents that "Your wife has gone" - and if not that he would be told that - "Oh! your wife has got a new born" - Such a man can think too much of his wife - how it happened for her to bear a child, the child shouldn't be mine at all - she will tell me all this.
One who his wife is gone she goes with someone else or she goes alone to the town and she become a harlot. He looks very sad to hear all this. He writes to his parents to tell them to report all this to the parents of the girl and they can demand his property back.

As any human being may be prisoners have friends outside world as well as inside the stone walls. As far back up to 1962 we prisoners were allowed to send letters from one prison to another if one has got his friend imprisoned to another prison or if one of whom we were accused with same charge is in that prison. But now it is quite impossible to write to our friend who is in another remote prison because this was all banned by the prison government but who knows the reason for doing so.

Those who had women friends in the town sometimes are visited by those women and they show great sympathy to their convicted friends, even I have seen so many being fetched by cars at the time of their release by those women friends and with great joys.

In prison, one of the things which a prisoner is deprived of and he finds that it is one of these most important things deprived of is sexual. Most of the majority do persevere all this, but there are some idiots who are unable to forget all about women and the more their sexual desire arises their mind the more they think of other prisoners as women and they try or even they do commit sins, if not in great secret. As it is nature’s sexual desire created by God one is given power to control his body desires and I don’t see the reason why such people could commit such great sins although one is confined for life sentence or to any term.

After all the greatest lose a human being had ever got is to enter jail for a long term. First he loses his life opportunities, self respect, and human dignity, and also his friends.

Sometimes I feel preoccupied despite the fact that I have managed to state a little about life in prison but the situation seems aspecting harder for me as I am about now to get to an end of this long journey I started in 1961.

5. Life in prison

Life in prison is somehow difficult than the life out of prison
Difficulties in prison are everybody is treated the same, weather he is of any race. The food is only different, the rest clothes beds and all the other things are the same. It is rather more difficult for a new man to settle in and get mixed up with other prisoners. It takes about three days for a new man to see the officer-in-charge and get his prison record fixed up, it includes to see the health officers and his recommendation whether he has not got any danger sickness due to which he might die during is sentence piode. After finishing off his official matters the fourth day he come in to the big yard and where he is suppose to serve his sentence so naturally he has to get mixed with the other prisoners. In each yard there are eight to ten rooms and in each room there are twenty to twenty-five prisoners. Most of the prisoners are kind hearted men. In fact as in the sea there are also bad fishes in the prison are the same, for a new man it is very hard to find something for smoking because you only get cig when you have worked for a month. In the prison the Prison Association has made some arrangements the work which prisoners do for the Government. They must get something out of it in that way the prisoners have got the earning scheme system in the prison. As the warders get paid after three days the prisoners also get aid out of what they have earned. Some are earning ten cents a day and some more. In the prison there are also grades for the prisoners which are known as stages. These stages are in different colors. Stage I hasn't got any colors Stage II in this stage prisoners wear shirts with a red strip on the sleeves. Stage III this is the stage to which one comes only after he has completed 3 months without making any mistakes. This stage has a very long period, you have to finish 15 months to get 4th Stage some are being released only the period of stage three and some do reached the fourth stage. In this stage you wear blue strip on the sleeve in this stage one sleep on the bed he get a mattress a pillow and two blankets the lock up time is a bit different than the others. Others as Stage II are locked at 5 p.m. Stage III at 6 p.m. and Stage IV at 6.30 p.m. More than Stage IV there is another stage as Special stage. These prisoners are the ones who are next to the warders. They are called Trustees. They have got black clothes and as well they can escort the other prisoners in the
Prison boundary. And they are free to go anywhere in prison. They are locked up at eight o'clock in the evening.

Let us go to the workshops there are different kinds of workshops some Carpenters, Natail and Rope making sec. In the other prisons there are some more sections as Mach. Engineering, Spraying, Penal beating, building and wire making sec. Few of the prisoners work as cleaners and few are cooks. They have to get up at night make tea for the others who are suppose to start their work at 7 o'clock. There are different kinds gangs as written above these gangs work on different dept. While these gangs are working cooks prepared food stuff when gangs come off 12.30 they walk through veranda take food and go to Mass – After having food all the prisoners are supposed to come in their wards in the rooms. Everybody takes his blankets and put at there places where they sleep. This how it goes through out their sentence.

I am a young boy of aged 20. When I was outside I never knew what was prison so one day unluckily I was caught by Police and sent to Court and was sentenced for 3 years imprisonment. When I came in prison all my ideas and all my hope I could not forget thinking I cried a bit and then I was called in the office they made my record and took my fingerprints and gave me white shirt and short pants. I put on those clothes I was looking worse than a baboon I thought monkey was better in a fancy dress I never knew prison was an unlawful place. After that they took me to the ward and put me in a single cell with two blankets and locked up. When I was laying on ground I could not stop thinking the past days which I spent happily I could not sleep that night in the morning I came to big yard where I saw all the other prisoners sat in lines and got counted and then went to see the officer in charge. After seeing the officer we came to the yard I felt very long unhappy and very sad I went and sat on one of the corners I was too much worried how to stay in prisoner without any friends. And when we were locked up I made friends with other prisoners. And after few days some of the warder came my friends and also the cook. I was feeling a bit happy and every Sunday I go to kichicken help the cook and do some under grounding get more than enough food for my self. A few months ago I fell sick I or any other pris ner can't get treatment
because they say that you are prisoners and have to obey the orders. I made friends with other warders. They bring me cigs many other. My prison life is a bit better than other prisoners sometimes I feel very sad and very up set. Every time when I get a bit chance I tell the warder to let me out of yard I go and jump about in other yards and got to kichicken find some food and fill up my stomik and at night I am at the same place on my blankets not thinking of today or tomorrow I push my day any how. I pray in morning evening I suggest when I was outside I never prayed and in prison I pray to god to help me and take me out of prison as soon as possible.

We are 4 of us all of them are Indians we joke and play around and pass our time. Few months ago I heard from our cook that a female prisoners come to prison. The female prison is next to our prison in the hospital. So I made a plan to go and see her I told the warder that I am sick and he took me to hospital. While coming back from hospital I told warder I wanted to see the female in the prison he told me no. With so many ideas and jokes he took me there. When I came to the gate I saw many African female prisoners and one of them went and called. When she came she started crying and telling me to help her. I felt very sad and unhappy, I told her not to worry. So at once I noted that she had left young kids behind I do not know what she had done so I come back in prison and told the cook to send more than enough food for her. I could not see her crying and so unhappy she was. I am a man in prison is tough for me and for female you think out your self. They are so many ways to be in prison and prison life is very bad one. Prisoners in their cells so many new prisoners come day by day.

On Sunday morning when I got all my prisoners friends were happy and we joked about and past out time. But suddenly I came to my blankets and I laid down I look up and started thinking about my own self layin in prison and all my loved ones are outside enjoying their life and eatin' things they like me in prison havin' same food for months.

By the way prison is not a bad place because it keeps you from evel, road accident and many other uses and prison is a good place for them who are out of jobs can't find any things to eat and to sleep
outside but in prison he gets every things.

I am a prisoner so I have to obey Prison laws and if I break a prison law my four days are increased but I am very careful about my number. Every day is my lucky day I am out of any troubles. I am very tired of sitting and sleeping on the ground at the same place. As I have told you before that it is very difficult to know how man feels as he is under command or under Prison.

Prison life is more or less same as the life Military because it has orders which have to follow as to wear the same clothes and get same food and same things etc. An in prison is the same, I myself feel very bad about my life I have complete ruined my life and I think every now and then and all the hours I count days are passing very slowly but I can't do any thing in prison I don't feel like learning some new thing I stay as I came to day.

6. How prisoners are treated

Prisons, in the sense in which I understand them, as places to which convicted criminals are sent for varying terms in punishment for their crimes, and which scarcely existed before the eighteenth century. Or in any case one could take it as, prisons are maintained for holding men, not for punishing them in fact it is decidedly not a gesture of mercy, or evidence of sympathy for the criminal nor is there any idea of rehabilitating him.

I am going to start from Sunday to next Sunday, mentioning all possible ill points towards it and some values.

On Sundays - Prisoner wake up at about half past seven in the morning, and soon they get off their mats they are counted and let for breakfast at about 8.00 a.m. any who wishes to go to school or may call if a church, goes and if not he stays out at the yard (men) right at about half past ten they are given lunch and locked in cell at about eleven until half past two, when they are opened for supper and given only twenty minute for washing, after which they are locked in again at half past three until on monday at six-o'oclock in the morning. The food given to the prisoners has very little improved although it is actually not the standard fit for human consumption. The sleeping cell are overfilled that its always difficult for one to stretch his legs,
the mats are so hard that one feels better sleeping on the floor.
The blanket, are all dirty and old, they have never been washed since
they were made or bought, you can stay for a or as to your sentence
and you will never see a blanket washed, fleas and bug are the por-
pulsa parasites, at least every prisoner has twenty to thirty fleas
in his blanket, infectious diseases are in great quantities.

In Mondays at six o'clock prisoners get off their mats when the
doors are bunged by the askaris as a sign of time to be counted,
they roll their blanket and mates and sit in fives as the only easy
way of counting, the door is opened and the officer counts followed
by a Seargent Major, when they finish, the door is closed again,
until the officers are gone then one cell after another is opened for
breakfast porridge for or as African diet and tea for Arabian and
Indian diet. Only ten minute is allowed for taking breakfast and
washing face if your able to brush your teeth, then at about half past
six every-body sits according to sections of work. This is excluding
cooks. There are more that six sections of jobs, (i) Shamba section,
this job to say the truth is more than slavery labour, one is given a
plot of four yeards by fifty to cultivate while an askari is behind
them, when you stand up while you have not finished, your taken for
prosecution before the officer in charge of refusing to work, put into
small cell for seven days or what ever judgement the J/C shall deem
necessary. The small cell is, as the prisoners call it a cage, if a
person is put in it for seven days or less he bread, for he is given
half a bowl of porridge in the afternoon and evening but no breakfast
in the morning. In the Chair section, it is extremely a dreadful job
that none could ever do in the town for fifty shillings an hour, its
cut coconut fibre, and every prisoner is to make a rope out of it
for four hundred and fifty feet if not taken too prosecution to be
placed in small cell, the only inhuman thing is that people eat food
at this place and dust get into food but there seem to be no action
taken by the Medical officer, the other section is the Sarifer Makenzi,
in here prisoners are really suffering of the hard work and no strength
is offered. Iron making and making iron tools, using electricity no
vegetable is given to them, no milk and no fruits to strengthen them-
selves, and they always become weaker and weaker, when we return to
the kitchen, the out cleanliness is quite un hygienic the instru-
ments and bowls are dirtily washed that a dog would never attempt
eating from such, the only thing that makes me sick is that the O/C
doesn't see this because he has a special day the askaris force
prisoner to clean it for inspection, in their word they seek for pro-
motions, is this civilisation? There is no place for keeping these
bowls in fact, they are spread or piled on the floor where every body
passed before, the food is also cooked in away that an unhealthly man
is easily attacked by typhoid. I can't express how much I feel to
this but as it is and we have here a Medical Assistance, then what
is the use of having him here when he does not look at such needs of
human consaption. We as prisoners although we shan't be here all
our lives in any case may be, have studied the motto of M.O. as he be
working as is on duty but not working for looking after the life of
the prisoners.

Now then, this is all on Monday, prisoners leave their working
places right at one o'clock and straight to take food, after fifteen
minutes they rise up in fives to be counted, on the soaring floor,
after wish they wait for terminals then the cell block is opened
and everybody goes to his cell room, to rest and do all they can,
apst, etc. At two o'clock any who wishes to see the O/C for some
trouble or the welfare office is called and some go for football some
to school, or any activities they choose at about half past three they
all return to their cell rooms and get food and eat. They are given
only about half an hour to eat and then stand up in their overcrowded
cells and counted again. This is at about four o'clock and they are
locked till next morning at six o'clock. I needn't waste time ex-
plaining how this dreadful cell is but its no better than a pigs house.
I even blame them to have wasted the white wash, it would have looked
better white washing a motor car gear box than th a room, just the
look of it drive away the sense of nobility, and turns ones mind do
worse in future to repay his being retained in such a un health cage.
The lavatory has no door and its just four feet from where prisoners
are asleep, all the waste smell is what we breathe and is our oxygine,
the medical officer visits but he seems to enjoy prisoners breathing
such dirty air, it no the dirty air one could call carbon dioxide,
but its so terrible that when we are locked in we cover ourselves from top to bottom with the unwashed century blankets. The most convassation we do is all on crime attending or high classes and by this ill treatments and the length of the imprisonment the convict only gets experience of crime offending, and possible one can decide to offend till he exchanges death for life and darkness and light days while having repaid the caged days by committing a more serious crime of the laws lack of human thought while using prisons as slave galleys. The work and the looking goes on like that day after day till Friday, on Saturday morning as usual but they leave duty at twelve noon and take lunch after which they are counted and after the fifteen minutes the cell block is openen and they are locked in. The bulling of prisoners is greatly done and I don't blame the officers but their subordinates these askaris are quite illiterate and don't have the mind of knowing the law they enforce it to such an extend that I call bulling and not maintainance of Prison Laws and orders. Such uneducated askaris or uncivilised as I take them have no wish of co-operating with prisoners but only take it as prisoners are brought to be bullied as the form of punishing reads. The prisons as to change prisoners mind to sense of humanity and to do better in their lives but prisons today treat prisoners in a inhuman ways that they change them instead of thinking to improve their future lives they think of nothing but remain and increase their pagan and wild characters and hardly can change as they call it a school of criminology.

For instance prisoners have the liberty of getting cigarettes from their visitors as to any who is accustomed to smoking, this is exactly what happens to other prisons but to this prison it is prohibited, does it mean this is different from the other prisoners and has its own different laws and orders or what? is it that we lack a law specialist officer in charge. Why should it treat prisoners in differently to the treatment in other prisons. The other is the visiting room. This really look like a motor-car bonnet, the glass and screen through which to speak makes every word understandable while in other prisons it is not like this, its to say the good public who visit people are also imprisoned by this cage and go while hearing nothing to what they were asking one another this shows that there is no good
looking or we lack civilized officers in this prison who don't have
the senses of humanity.

It is lacking of civilization when one thinks to bring one's or
a mad man's mind to normal is to treat him inhuman. Since the sixteenth
century and before, prisons have been improving but still up to now
they are like slave galleys were before.

The first is the locking in of prisoners and regular times of
diet. There is no particular times of diet at all and if it is writ­
ten in the Prison Orders then it is a picture and does not work, al­
most all prisoners are unhealthy due to no specific time nor the di­
gestive system, and the most is underfeeding and improper diet.

Prisoners are locked in cells thirty to thirty-three, and you
can imagine how quite unhyngienic it is and over-crowded in cells at
twenty five feet by ten, the locking time is exactly ten past five
in the evening and wake up at six o'clock, the breakfast is a small
bowl of porridge and go for the very hard work. Up to half past one,
one could tell how much hungry he could be, and some times take lunch
at one or half past just as the askari finds it necessary or becomes
human to understand prisoners are hungry. The food is maize food with
dried beans only three oaces I am sure this is not the measurements
written in the order but when a prisoner claims to make it read to
the prison order he is punished and their saying is "The judge did
not tell you to come and each such oaces as written in the order,
your brought to be punished and you must be". The beans have lots and
lots of weavils that after eating one can easy vomit, but he does not
throw it as its the only, he must eat. The Medical Assistant has been
informed about it but he at all doesn't seem to take any, look at the
kitchen. We would even be greatful to have no Medical Assistant other
than having him to act as a medical picture. The place for eating
bowls and the bowls them selves are awful to look at, it is a barbaric
sort of paganish to treat humans in such away and if an immediate im­
provement is not done to such unhuman treats by both the prison staffs
and the Medical Assistant who also has the moto to punish and not to
work as a medical officer, sooner or latter there will be serious
sickness on prisoners and may result to deaths and no one shall have
the blame but I know the reason is the ill treating.
The work that prisoners are doing, in horrible, for instance, we have the chair, there is a coir rope making that if one outside any person calls you mad, bicicles this the illiterate askari is so cruel and unhuman that he looks ugly by his treatment. Its fibre cut into small bits at six inches to seven the least, you when given your supervised to join them by twisting them in your hand till you make four hundred and fifty feet. If you haven't finished your take straight to the 0/C who give you seven days in a small cell and your days increased as to what he deems fit. A small cell, you can by yourself imagine how bad it is, if prison cell or in for punishing as the prison staffs take it then you see another place in there for punishing a punished human, prisoners call it a grave. When put there, the food you get is quarter the bowl and no beans, locked all through the seven days never to see the sun, nor to see any person except the askari on duty, in the morning, or excuse me I forgot to tell that he sleep with only one blanket, when he wakes up in morning his blanket is taken away from him and a bucket of water is put in it and locked in till lunch is brought he does not at all take breakfast he eats only afternoons and evenings, all these times a quarter a bowl of food and no beans. I tell you when he finishes his days he is no better and no fatter than a pin no matter how much fat he was when he was put in. I don't blame the 0/C about this but I blame the Medical Officer for it is done during his presence and he signs for such barbaric of manifestation of paganism, and probably lack of medical experience I can't tell but I bet its due to ignorance and lack of humanity.

This very work at the chair section is terrifying as the dust blows about and even if swept one cannot sweep the dust in the air, and it the place when prisoners eat, how much unhajionalnic is this the Medical Assistance has been informed about this too but he never even comes near it, then what is he brought for? When we go to another section is the blacksmith, the prisoners get into loss of eye sights due to mouldings and making iron items, pouring iron bars and etc, when they ask for exchanging work as due to not accustomed and pain of eyes they are placed in small cells, this really may look exaggerated but in actual fact they are happening, and I can't blame the
askaris nor the O/C but I honestly say such inhuman and barbaric things happen and that he is the head and does nothing to improve it. The other thing that makes me feel sick is the visiting place.

This shows really how the prison staff has no respect to the public outside, when they waste their money and time to come and give warnings probably or give their sorrowful heading to wards the prisoners bad behaviours and convince him to lead a better life the prison staff bush them, for they misunderstand one another by the visiting cage, its build like a customers gold store with a glass window surrounded by wire, it is really surprising that I wish not explain at it as more but I and all the prisoners would be grateful not to be visited at all due to this inhuman treatment and unless a vigorous step to this is taken till the public realises, there may rise some physical and mental troubles.