

I think

In any ~~locked down~~ situation of the kind you face
in August there are

~~Some issues~~ ^{possible} have to do with contingencies one wants
to avoid, ~~the most basic one being~~ ^{one's} ~~such as~~ creating a situation in which prisoners
sit in their cells, day in & day out, wallowing in bouts of
self pity, bitterness, a carefully nurtured sense of personal
injustice, a paranoid view of the system, and a carefully
^{cultivated} ~~nurtured~~ hatred for their keepers, which ~~can~~ ^{is} become
irreversible and/or self-sustaining, ~~at least~~ ^{at least} in the short run.

So questions one wants to ask oneself,
Some ~~key elements in the situation~~ in no particular order,
are,

① Why was I sent here?

~~this assumes~~
~~we have~~
~~defensive rationale~~

Same for periodic ~~status~~ reviews. If the only
available data

one can cite is "you
didn't blow up while
you were watching
TV" (as it one
point in Canada)

that's (1) Not enough
of a basis for a decision
(2) Not a rationale
the prisoner should
accept, unless he's
dumb or cynical.

↓

Mich Ponde Bd "did
not take advantage...
should have been
available to you."

- Has one done the best one can to share
with ~~the~~ prisoners the rationale for ~~dispositions~~ ^{what one has done to} them
to avoid connotation of unfairness, ~~arbitrariness~~
& capriciousness? [~~Research~~]

- Has one built hope into the situation?
Particularly, ways in which the inmate can
achieve ^(degrees of) ~~more~~ freedom, and a better quality of
life, through actions he can take or refrain
from taking? Another way of saying this
is, can the ^{inmate} ~~prisoner~~ have some control over his own fate
over time? ^{[because there should be direct links between}
^{behavior & contingencies]}

- How much constructive activity has one
made available, to reduce boredom, which
invites destructive/ ^{or self-destructive} ~~rumination~~?

- How much human contact has one
provided for? Can inmates be ~~at least~~ ^{at least}
paired for conjoint activities? Are there

Implementation issues

In setting up a program, one wants to ask oneself:

Is everyone in on the planning who is on board and will be affected by the planning? Or, how close can we get to this? And by in on the planning I don't mean sitting and talking - I mean

gathering info, working out

Has there been some role playing or rehearsal of scenarios that are likely to arise? ~~all~~ all the details, anticipating all the contingencies.

For instance, Has staff had a chance to review and discuss the folders of inmates to be received? (or like the prospective customers) taking examples of ~~3~~ asking: now what do we do with this man?

In other words, ~~are we~~ ^{is one} thinking in terms of specifics, or talking in the abstract?

Again, I don't want to pretend to give advice, but I envy you the month of lead-in time you have to design your own operation

We can also play games around issues of fear ^{or} trust.

By fear, I mean, who can scare the hell out of whom, and pretend to be fearless ~~himself~~. In my country, ~~this~~ is sometimes called playing chicken.

~~This is a~~ ^{Fear games are} particularly incestuous games because one way to demonstrate fearlessness is to overreact, or act incautiously & precipitously, ^{which inspires fear}.

Some of My police colleagues ^{in the old days} referred to this ~~latter~~ propensity as hot doggishness or as the John Wayne syndrome.

But fear can also create caricatures or inflated conceptions of ~~the~~ ^{one's} opposition, such that the mangy, tired and toothless lion is represented as the King of the Jungle who must be treated with the utmost caution & sustained vigilance.

& part of this picture is what I referred to as a romanticizing tendency we have in relation to violence, which is mostly an ~~unproductive and~~ ineffectual enterprise in which silly occasions lead to serious consequences as ^{misunderstandings} they escalate, ~~and we~~ ^{or as we try to} assert dominance by demonstrating ^{our} impotence or ineptitude.

Which means that I think I physically ³
control you, but you know exactly what button
to press to set me off, which means that you actually control _{me}.

For management purposes, ^{your} ~~the~~ most interesting
~~destructive~~ games have to do with trust.

There are questions such as, do we play cops
and robbers, or keeper and kept, or
controller and evader, or

Do I ^{can I afford to} make ~~a~~ a trust bid which you can
reciprocate ^{and} ~~or~~ do you want to bite
the hand that is extended to you.

Do I feed your anti-authority premise
by playing the part ^{of keeper} you have assigned
me, or do I confound you by disconfirming
your fondly held assumptions, thereby
opening yourself up to a constructive
or beneficent intervention?

Or As a staff member, do I walk around
proclaiming that nothing you say can be trusted
because you are a notorious manipulator &
con artist, ~~and that~~ [~~Bugle~~]

So we never get to talk?

Challenging attitudes

Who ought to be doing the challenging?

You, obviously. (I don't bite hands that feed me ~~crunch~~.)

Whose attitudes? Staff attitudes, or inmate attitudes?

Since Ed referred ~~me~~ to my talk in Oxford, ~~last yr.~~
I'd have to assume he means both, because
I said at the time that staff attitudes &
inmate attitudes can mutually reinforce each
other, and that we can play incestuous games
we ought to challenge ↓

In these games, we can both gain in the short run
but lose in the long run.

For instance, we can play, "I am an extra-tough,
vicious, out-of-control menace"

(which makes me important & compensates for
my low self-esteem) and lets you play

"I ~~am~~ a Slayer of Dragons and ^{only} Defender
of the public Order" (which makes ~~me~~ you
important, and makes ^{your} job more exciting
and titillating.)

Slaying Dragons beats handing out
towels in the locker room.

~~staff~~ contacts of a noncustodial nature between at least ~~one~~ staff members and the inmate?

- Are there opportunities for the prisoner to feel listened to? attended to? Talked with by someone he feels is interested in him as a person? (His health, state of mind, concerns, biography, complaints, ~~grievances~~ grievances, daily routine, mental health?)

[Grievance distribution in Canada]

- Are we talking definite or ^{vaguely} indefinite confinement? Are we and the inmate clear about conditions or requisites for release?

- Do we know as much as we want to know about the prisoner? Do we think we understand why he has done what he has done? Do we understand why the prisoner thinks he has done what he has done? Can we get more information that helps us understand the prisoner? Can the prisoner get a better handle on the motives for his actions? Misbehavior?

To me, these questions seem crucial, on a number of counts:

- ①. ~~Staff fear or~~ ^{Our} anxiety or apprehensions get reduced when the inmate becomes more of a known quantity. Violence that is motivated, even if the motives are alien to us, is less

scary than violence which ^{feels} is random or
promiscuously explosive, or seemingly unmotivated.

② If we understand what sets the person off, or even
what his perceptions and concerns are in ~~in violence~~
^{crisis} ~~related~~ situations, we can consider such facts
in approaching the person or managing him.

It also helps to keep in mind a third fact, which is that

③ People who are problems ^{tend also to} ~~also frequently~~ have problems.
This relates to one of my favorite subjects to sermonize
about, which is that in sophisticated management,
~~custody~~ ~~custodial~~ & mental health concerns must be ^{the best road}
inextricably linked. ~~[quote self]~~ & that ~~custody~~ ^{is not the}
Dynamic security ^{shortest line}

The question of Do we understand why the prisoner has done
what he has done? is related to another question,
which is, Do we think it ^{is} part of our job to ~~maintain~~
^{assess} when the inmate is likely to no longer ~~do~~ keep
doing what he has done, because he has changed?

And a second question, which is,

Do we think it is part of our job to affect the
inmate's ~~mode~~ of adjustment to prison in such
a way as to reduce his tendency to misbehave?
^[point 4 of mission statement]

In other words,

Are we a ^{(containment or} storage depot, or more than a
storage depot?

I presume you will talk about this
a lot

And lastly, can we
~~But the most important challenge must be to~~
 face of the prisoner's most fondly held
 assumptions, which are

(1) That ~~he~~ is where he is because
 the system put him there instead
 of because he put himself there

(2) That his misbehavior was inevitable,
 and its motivation ineffable

We have a right to make prisoners uncomfortable

~~But the most constructive~~
~~the greatest~~ discomfort to which we ~~must~~ right to
 subject the prisoner is not physical discomfort,
 but the inescapable rage of systematic
 self-inquiry we demand of him.

isolation) I don't think we ^[either the staff or the inmates] can
 afford the ~~luxury~~ of letting men vegetate
 in ~~their~~ cells, ~~blaming the system for their~~
~~situation and evading the painful challenge~~
 of trying to change.

In this sense, I'd propose to make the
 system tougher for everyone, if I had my
 druthers, and this is consonant with the
 Peterhead Tradition that if you have a
 tough problem, send him to Peterhead.

The challenge is, are we tough enough to solve these problems?