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Introduction

JANE POOL

When Charles Dickens wrote about the ills of Victorian England, he included abuses common in the prisons of his day. The scientific and technological advances of the twentieth century have greatly improved the living conditions of Dickens's fellow Englishmen and, indeed, of all persons living in the Western world. Unfortunately, much of the alienation which existed in the 1800s between persons confined in jails and the free citizenry continues to exist today. Prisons and jails remain crowded, with little opportunity for minor or first-time offenders to be rehabilitated. Persons convicted of major crimes face an isolation from society which may make it impossible for them to return successfully to the outside world.

Because of an increasing awareness of the individual needs and rights of prisoners, brought about partly by riots and uprisings in correctional institutions, reformers have sought to improve the prison environment. Architecture, educational facilities, legal rights of prisoners, visitation rights and “open” prisons, and reentry are all pertinent topics for discussion. This issue of Library Trends has been written to serve as a review and synthesis of the current correctional facility library scene: environment, history, standards, training and research, and finally, service patterns in different types of facilities.

In order to assess the state of library services in jails and prisons correctly, it appears appropriate to examine the corrections environment. The first article in this issue consists of a discussion of prison sociology: history, contemporary practice and future directions. The author writes succinctly of the dehumanizing effect of crowded prisons and contrasts her goal for the future—a “closed institution,” designed to aid inmates to reenter society successfully.

The second article contains a survey of the information needs of prisoners as revealed in the published literature. In her survey, the
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author notes that inmates appear to be eager for newspapers and magazines concerned with national and international news, read more materials than do members of the general public, and request materials on a wide variety of subjects. Again, as in the first article, the writer emphasizes the issue of inmate participation: in selection committees, in book discussion groups, in access to legal materials, and in contact with outside library agencies through local public libraries and interlibrary loan services.

In the third article, the author discusses current education for correctional librarianship. He, like the writers of the first two articles, places emphasis on the concept of the library as an agency to facilitate successful inmate return to society. In the area of research concerning prison libraries, he mentions significant studies and suggests concentration of future research in the areas of literacy studies, use of various media, and the characteristics of inmate populations.

In 1974 an important study, Survey of Library and Information Problems in Correctional Institutions, was published by the Institute of Library Research at the University of California at Berkeley. The author, Marjorie LeDonne, reviews the study of its findings in the fourth article of the current Library Trends. In addition, she uses the conclusions to focus on advances in correctional librarianship during the past three years in the areas of the study's hypotheses: adequacy of library services, staff resources and coordination, and cooperation with public library services. It is in the area of cooperation with public libraries that she notes the greatest advances.

Quite possibly the most explosive issue concerning correctional facility librarianship concerns law collections for use by inmates. Recent court decisions have held that prisoners are entitled to access to legal literature. The following article includes a survey of recent court cases and a discussion of standards for law libraries in correctional facilities. The author endorses the concept of an adequate legal collection available to prisoners and advances the theory that, in addition, it is necessary to provide access to attorneys and to information outside the prisons for poorly educated inmates.

Many countries, in attempting to rehabilitate or aid prisoners to return to society, provide libraries in their correctional facilities. In a survey of overseas library programs for prisoners, the author of the sixth article reviews trends and cites specific examples. Although several countries have no libraries in their prisons, other nations provide correctional library services which parallel those in the United States.
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The remaining three articles deal with library services to correctional facilities within the United States. The seventh article surveys prison libraries: current standards and future trends of correctional accreditation. It brings up to date and expands the Library Trends article of October 1972, written by Andree Bailey, “Standards for Library Service in Institutions in the Correctional Setting.”

The next article is a discussion of library services for juvenile offenders, a segment of the correctional population too often overlooked. The author surveys the problems and notes examples of individual programs.

The final article concerns public library services to correctional institutions. For years, some state libraries have provided services to state prisons and some local public libraries have provided library services to jails, often on a contractual basis. While isolated examples have existed for many years, the trend for state libraries, public library systems, and local public libraries to provide library services to correctional institutions has accelerated rapidly during the 1970s. In this article, the editor outlines factors which have influenced the extension of public library services into correctional facilities and discusses pertinent examples of services.

On February 15, 1977, the editor learned that it would be necessary to locate a substitute author for the last article. Faced with deadlines, she decided to write it. In addition to the authors of the articles which appear in print, she would like to thank Susan Madden, Joan Stout, and Mary Power for their suggestions of pertinent literature.
The Correctional Facility: The Environment Today and in the Future

EDITH ELISABETH FLYNN

In several ways, the forthcoming chapters will examine the current state of the art of the correctional facility library service—its history, environment, standards, training of professional personnel, research—and analyze the patterns of correctional library services as they exist across the country. Utilizing the perspective of criminology, this chapter is intended as a springboard for these discussions. It must be said at the outset that correctional institutions—prisons and jails—have few friends. Dissatisfaction with them is widespread, in spite of their extensive use in the United States.

A brief review of the history of prison development reveals that the practice of imprisoning convicted offenders is a relatively recent phenomenon. Until about 200 years ago, most convicted offenders were fined, banished, mutilated, branded, tortured, or killed. Jails and prisons existed only as places where persons were held pending ransom or sentencing. In the second half of the eighteenth century, social philosophers and scientists—among them Montesquieu, Beccaria, Rousseau, and Blackstone—rejected the prevalent system of brutal punishments and bloodshed on the grounds of humanitarian concerns and social reform. Gradually, a new theory of criminal punishment evolved which advocated reform of the criminal through a regime of solitary imprisonment. In 1787, Benjamin Franklin, Dr. Benjamin Rush and other like-minded reformers organized the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons. The society declared its belief that “solitary confinement to hard labor and total abstinence” would prove the most effective means in reforming criminals and prodded the Pennsylvania General Assembly to enact legislation providing such confinement by 1790. Thus, the course of penal history was changed and the penitentiary system was...
born. As new institutions were built, the concept of solitary confinement—known as the Pennsylvania system—changed gradually to congregate confinement, where prisoners would be confined to solitary cells at night and work together during the day, under a strict rule of silence. As the new congregate or Auburn system gained in popularity, it was copied by many other states, because it supplied an inexpensive and convenient source of labor in the early years of the Industrial Revolution. A scant four decades later, Alexis de Tocqueville and Gustave de Beaumont, who had studied and admired early American prisons, observed that while some of the penitentiaries they had visited might serve as models for other countries to emulate, other facilities represented "everything which ought to be avoided."

The uneven quality of prisons and jails in the United States noted by Tocqueville and Beaumont prevails to this very day, along with many other problems.

A brief review of contemporary correctional practice reveals that the traditional prison, with its emphasis on the punishment, segregation and isolation of the offender from the community, is once again being superseded by newly emerging standards of human decency and new insights concerning the structure and purpose of corrections. Current innovations in correctional practice are based on the recognition that prisons have been highly effective in serving the goals of retribution and punishment but have failed in serving the goals of rehabilitation and offender reform. The search is on for new models of imprisonment and corrections which protect the fundamental principles of justice in a democratic society and which provide for the legitimate exercise of society's power over the convicted offender. Any discussion of the future of the American correctional environment, however, would be remiss, and indeed seriously misleading, if it did not first examine the fundamental issues and problems in which criminal justice and the corrections system are embroiled today and which will have to be resolved before substantial progress can be made in improving society's response to crime control and the treatment of offenders.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE, CORRECTIONS AND THE PREVAILING SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Today, the American criminal justice system is buffeted by strong winds of public discontent and is in great turmoil concerning its purposes, objectives and methods. Changes in crime control policy are now being advocated which distinctively reflect a "hard-line" philoso-
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phy as far as societal response to the offender is concerned. There are calls for increased police effectiveness, in view of the fact that the majority of offenders who commit crimes against persons and property escape apprehension. There are efforts to reform the judiciary, through the imposition of mandatory sentencing and the reduction or removal of the judges' discretionary powers by means of legislative fiat. Concomitantly, there is a drive to reduce the use of alternatives to incarceration (such as probation or the imposition of fines), in favor of prison sentences designed to lock away more offenders than ever before and for longer periods of time.

The impact of these efforts and changes has been to reverse a trend in criminal justice during which a greater selectivity and sophistication in the use of crime control and correctional methods were advocated. This trend probably reached its zenith with the publication of the report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, which stressed that the great powers of the criminal justice system be reserved for controlling those persons who seriously threaten the safety of others, and which viewed the criminal justice system as the agency of last resort for social problems and the correctional institution as the last resort for correctional problems. Since the publication of that report, many court systems in the United States have assumed a more standardized and punitive function, judicial discretion has frequently been subjected to restraints, and the widespread use of alternatives to incarceration of the past has been supplanted by extended prison and jail terms. Statistics indicate that 1976 saw the highest prison population in the history of this country. The growth of prison and jail populations has now reached crisis proportion, and states are reopening old institutions that had been deemed unsuitable for human habitation in an earlier day. Tents, trailers, airport hangars and even old battleships are now being used to accommodate the onslaught of prisoners. Across the nation, inmates are reported to be crammed into every conceivable space and prison conditions are deteriorating fast.

The reasons for this far-reaching trend reversal are many. Philosophically, the return to the simplicities of punitive action against the criminal is politically attractive, and has been hastened by the writings of such conservative academicians as James Q. Wilson and Ernest van den Haag. There are many within, and without, the criminal justice system who prefer the uncomplicated processes of retribution to the discretionary latitude of social welfare-oriented decisions. From a practical perspective, it is incontestable that the criminal justice sys-
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System has been incapable of stemming the spiraling crime rate. Recidivism rates—the rates at which prisoners return to institutions because of new convictions—are unacceptably and notoriously high. There is widespread disenchantment with the rehabilitation model used by most correctional institutions because of its inherent coercive nature and its failure to achieve an acceptable degree of success. As a result, such liberals as David Fogel, Robert Martinson and Andrew von Hirsch have joined in the call for the swift and certain punishment of criminals to deter crime and for viewing punishment itself as intrinsically just and beneficial.

What lies behind the failure of criminal justice and this general state of discontent? Unquestionably, the inability of criminal justice to reduce crime and the failure of corrections to correct have been due in part to public neglect in providing the system with sufficient financial and manpower resources. More significant in inhibiting change toward greater effectiveness, however, has been the way in which criminal justice has perceived its task and mission. The definition of corrections as society's official reaction to convicted adult and adjudicated juvenile offenders neither states nor implies what corrections should try to achieve. Such a statement is critical if realism is to replace current ideology and rhetoric in this troubled field. Corrections has many purposes, of which rehabilitation is only one. It could be argued that if correctional processes were truly rehabilitative, they should be extended to all who need them and not be restricted to the convicted adult or adjudicated juvenile. Corrections is limited to the convicted and adjudicated offender because there are other justifications for coercively intervening in their lives in addition to helping them. Among these justifications are the protection of the community from the depredations of those who cannot otherwise be controlled, special and general deterrence, the upholding and confirmation of the validity of society's laws, and the punishment of offenders who deliberately break the law. Clearly, correctional purposes must differ for various types of offenders. When a person is sentenced for murder, corrections serves a punitive and deterrent function. When a socially deprived, undereducated, vocationally incompetent youth is adjudicated delinquent, corrections should seek to rehabilitate and reintegrate that youngster into the mainstream of society.

There is no doubt that corrections can contribute more than it does to the reduction of crime. To the extent that recidivist crime contributes significantly to all crime, corrections should be able to reduce
crime; but it should be abundantly clear at this point that the pursuit of a single purpose for corrections—whether it be rehabilitation or punishment—is doomed to failure. Yesteryear's exclusive focus on the rehabilitation of offenders has failed incontestably. Insofar as the word rehabilitation suggests compulsory treatment or coercive programs, there is a growing body of opinion in criminal justice, supported by an impressive amount of scholarly research, that such a purpose is a mistake. Human beings inherently resist coercion, and correctional coercion elicits failure more often than success. The current return in corrections to neoclassical concepts of punishment and "just deserts for evil deeds" will, however, also fail. Despite the intuitive attraction and appealing simplicity of these concepts, it must be recognized that they too are built on faulty premises which deny the complexity of human behavior and ignore the multiplicity of purposes served by criminal justice and corrections. Most importantly, the advocates of greater punitiveness toward offenders and of higher rates of incarceration fail to consider the social and political costs of their recommendations. Rising jail and prison populations have exacerbated conditions under which inmates must live to intolerable levels. Too often, correctional institutions are characterized by inhumane conditions, crippling idleness, anonymous brutality, lawlessness, discrimination, and arbitrary decisions concerning the disposition and lives of offenders. An increasing number of judicial interpretations of offenders' rights reflect the plight of the corrections system and the belief that such practices are unlawful and counterproductive to instilling respect for the law in offenders. Yet, in spite of these developments, state legislatures and the public continue to deny the criminal justice system the tools and facilities it needs to develop a swift and effective criminal justice system that is respectful of due process and equity. Finally, it is essential to remember that in a democracy there is a need to maintain a delicate balance between the will of the majority and the rights and liberty of the individual. Because the defense of the rights of social misfits and criminals is unappreciated by most and odious to many, a society's willingness to grant these rights is probably the most sensitive indicator of the degree to which that society is willing to uphold the rights of all of its citizens. President Madison stated the issue well:

It is of great importance in a republic, not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part. . . . Justice is the end
of government. It is the end of civil society. It ever has been and ever will be pursued until it be obtained, or until liberty be lost in the pursuit.\(^\text{11}\)

Even a cursory examination of the public attitude and the prevailing political climate concerning crime control in this country reveals that individual liberty is in distinct danger. Whenever the rights of society are deemed more important than the rights of individuals, and whenever there are some who are willing to sacrifice these rights in the name of law and order, or the safety of the streets, the very fabric of our society is threatened.\(^\text{12}\)

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS AND INNOVATIONS IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND CORRECTIONS

The discussion to this point has sketched the prevailing social environment of criminal justice in this country and has outlined some of the fundamental difficulties and problems that face corrections today. What follows is an examination and analysis of current developments and innovations in the field, followed by a discussion of the correctional institution of the future.

The most recent efforts to improve criminal justice and corrections have proceeded on the recognition that piecemeal reform and similar ameliorative undertakings will never suffice. If imprisonment of offenders is indeed to be used as an alternative of last resort and limited to offenders who represent a serious threat to the safety of others, the dangers of a piecemeal approach become even more apparent. As a result, a "total system approach" to reform is not being advocated by reformers who view criminal justice as a system comprised of the subsystems of the police, the courts and corrections.\(^\text{13}\)

"System" is defined as a group of related and interdependent activities, actions, or events organized to achieve a common purpose—in this instance, the reduction and control of crime. Total system planning is a process that defines, analyzes, and develops responses to problems of a specific catchment (or service) area. The total system planning process is open-ended and describes the interactions between activities or components of one system (such as corrections) and those of another (law enforcement or courts). Changes in any single component will affect all the other components. For example, delays in arraignment scheduling of accused offenders will directly affect the number of persons awaiting trial and consequently the detention capacity of local jails. Basic to total system planning is the service area
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concept. Service areas are demarcated by the scope of a particular problem that frequently crosses jurisdictions. Underlying this concept is the realization that social problems such as crime do not confine themselves to geopolitical boundaries. While each service area, such as a city or county, may have distinct problems as well as unique resources, there will always exist sufficient commonality to warrant subsystem coordination. In view of the characteristic fragmentation of criminal justice agencies in the United States, total system planning requires interjurisdictional cooperation, as well as functional integration of all subsystems (i.e. law enforcement, courts, corrections), and other related health and social welfare services.

When the foregoing concepts and considerations are applied to correctional institution planning, the new facility must now be viewed as but one element in a network of many service delivery components. The service delivery system network approach recognizes that a diversity of program responses is required to accommodate the varied and individual needs of the criminal justice system client. For example, within a given catchment area—whether it is a county, city-county combination, a major metropolitan area, or a state—a corrections program can now be developed on the basis of a network of dispersed services and facilities, geographically located to perform their functions best. The range of services, programs and facilities would differ considerably from existing corrections resources. Whereas present resources are generally confined to suspended sentences, probation, and jail or prison dispositions, the new system would provide a plethora of programs and services: diversion programs, community treatment approaches, intensive community supervision programs, halfway houses, a wide range of residential programs (with different degrees of structure and supervision), an extended use of fines based on an offender's ability to pay, partial incarceration (such as weekend incarceration, work-, and education-release), probation and parole programs, and ultimately some minimum-, medium- and high-security residential facilities for those offenders who represent a serious threat to the safety of the community. The overall perspective in the choice of disposition options would be the pursuit of the least restrictive assignments of offenders that is consistent with the protection of the public.

Within less than a decade, criminal justice planning has reached a relatively high level of sophistication. Assisted by computer simulation, special emphasis is now being placed on the early assessment and evaluation of individual offender needs, not only in terms of their
specific program requirements but also in terms of the levels of custody needed to protect society from those who are dangerous. To assure maximum effectiveness, such an assessment should logically occur at the point when an accused offender first enters the criminal justice system. Following that line of reasoning, the generic concept of an “Intake Service Center” has recently been developed, which plays a key role in making recommendations to the judiciary concerning a broad variety of dispositional alternatives in relation to individual cases. Among its many important functions are: (1) short-term intake screening that emphasizes the diversion of an individual to alternatives to incarceration; (2) development of presentence investigations for misdemeanants and felons alike, and subsequent recommendations to the courts concerning optimal dispositions; (3) diagnostic services relating to voluntary pretrial programs, presentence investigations, and correctional programs for sentenced offenders; (4) ongoing evaluation of offender adjustment to given programs; and (5) coordination and referral services related to in-house and community-based services. To wit, the Intake Service Center assumes the responsibility for the systematic coordination of the criminal justice system, including the diversion from the system to alternatives to incarceration, detention, and after-care programs for those offenders who receive prison sentences.

In the ideal situation, the Intake Service Center replaces the jail. Because the jail has long been recognized by scholars and administrators as the most neglected and most damaging “correctional” institution in the country in terms of human and social costs, and because the jail has always been impervious to change, its passing should leave few mourners. In less than optimal situations, the Intake Service Center augments jail operations. The concept of the center is now being adopted in many jurisdictions in the United States and has diverted many socio-medical problem cases from criminal justice or shunted offenders into programs that are of real help to them. Recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, it is clearly an idea whose time has come and which will, in due time, change the face of corrections.

THE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION TODAY AND IN THE FUTURE

One of the basic functions of a correctional institution is to protect the public by incarcerating individuals judged to be a threat to society. Historically, this function has dictated the fundamental design and
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programs of penal institutions. But persistent widespread disturbances (punctuated periodically by outbursts of great violence and bloody riots), unacceptably high recidivism rates, and a general reassessment of correctional institutions by the general public have led to questioning of the adequacy of traditional program and design concepts in providing secure detention.

In the past, corrections facility security has been the predominant concern of administrators and has come almost solely under the purview of the custodial staff of institutions. As a result, traditional security procedures have been perpetuated, while programmatic innovations lagged. Conceptually, two types of security can be differentiated within any correctional institution: perimeter security and internal security. Perimeter security refers to the ability of a correctional institution to confine its inmates within the limits of a given area by means of walls and fences. Internal security refers to the ability of an institution to control the behavior of inmates within the facility in a manner consistent with the safety of prisoners and staff alike. This is usually accomplished by means of personnel and equipment (closed-circuit television) deployment and strict adherence to procedural policies. As a general rule, correctional facilities tend to concentrate their efforts on maintaining perimeter security and neglect to provide for internal safety. Layer upon layer of security devices (such as walls topped with concertina wire, razor blades and barbed wire; multiple chain-link fences supplemented by high-intensity lighting; sensing devices, radar, and attack dogs placed between fences), as well as weapons, have traditionally served to keep the inmates in and the public out. It is not surprising that this formidable array of hardware has managed to serve its purpose well. While no existing correctional facility can consider itself impervious to escape—time, dedication, challenge, and ingenuity are always on the inmate's side—there are relatively few escapes from American correctional institutions. In comparison, Scandinavian prisons have significantly higher escape rates. The plethora of perimeter security, however, has done little to provide for the safety of inmates and staff. Correctional institutions such as penitentiaries, reformatories, and even juvenile detention homes have come to be recognized as dangerous and unsafe in a growing body of correctional law. The courts have stressed that government through the administration of the correctional institution must take responsibility for protecting the inmate from harm, even as society is protected from him. Nevertheless, few wardens and
superintendents can guarantee the physical safety of their charges or assure them that none will become a victim of brutal, homosexual attack.

Why do correctional institutions fail in so basic a task as the protection of inmates and staff? The answer lies in a number of interrelated reasons. First, the physical layout of traditional institutions hampers internal security. Second, short-range cost considerations have historically predominated all planning decisions in corrections. The majority of facilities have traditionally been planned and constructed on the principle of housing a maximum number of inmates in a minimum amount of space, at minimum cost. The intent is to allow a small number of staff to maintain perimeter and internal security in a facility containing the largest possible number of inmates. A fundamental error occurs when the concepts of perimeter security are applied internally, however. This results in the overuse of security hardware, such as maximum-security cell construction, steel bars, catwalks, iron grates, etc., all of which are designed to control and isolate inmates. Because the high-security construction is formidable and expensive (the cost of one maximum-security cell unit fluctuates between $40,000 and $60,000, depending on the region of the United States in which it is built), the original goal of cost savings has never been achieved.

The typical cellblock is a good example of ineffective security construction. Long rows of cells stacked 4 to 6 floors high, housing as many as 600-700 men, are supposed to be supervised by one or two correctional officers at a time. Under such circumstances, it is impossible to protect individual inmates from assault or to identify individuals engaged in disruptive, coercive behavior. As a result, living areas in many correctional institutions have become breeding grounds for deviant, antisocial and criminal behavior; and correctional institutions are justifiably described as schools of crime.

While the overall construction form of prisons varies from one institution to another—there are radial, panopticon, telephone-pole, high-rise, courtyard and campus designs—security considerations and hardware determine all life processes within these facilities. The social environment is controlled, choiceless, repetitive, and destructive to the human spirit. The architectural context of facilities is explicit, predictable, regimented, and offers little choice for inmates and staff. All activities are scheduled; social contact is limited and mostly predetermined. All decisions, space allocation, movement and
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responsibilities are narrowly defined and leave no room for individual self-determination or autonomy.

In the light of the above discussion, it is understandable that existing institutions, with few exceptions, are wholly unsatisfactory in providing effective environments for correctional programming, whether it be in the form of work programs, visiting, recreation, medical services, treatment, educational or vocational programs, or library services. A recent major study, directed at an appraisal of recently constructed correctional institutions of the United States failed to identify any improvement or innovation in correctional institutions. The study concluded reluctantly that under the new shining surfaces of the recently constructed facilities and behind the glowing new rhetoric that described their programs, the intrinsic nature of these facilities was largely unchanged from the legacy of the traditional correctional institution built over two hundred years ago:

"...in our conversations with inmates and staff alike and in our observations, we heard and saw the old preoccupation—control. We also observed deep mutual suspicion, great cynicism, and pervasive hypocrisy as the kept and the keepers played old games with each other while using the new sophisticated language of today's behavioral sciences." 

In the beginning of this discussion it was noted that imprisonment has been consistently effective in punishing and isolating offenders. As an instrument of rehabilitation and reform, however, prisons have failed. One treatment concept after another has been developed and absorbed into the correctional system in a persistent effort to overcome the inherent weaknesses of incarceration. Thus, the original correctional treatment, consisting of solitary confinement, work, penitence and prayer, was replaced by industrial work, vocational training, social casework, academic education, religious counseling, recreation and visiting programs. Then came psychotherapy, pharmacological approaches and other medical services, individual and group counseling, etc. Among the more recent approaches are milieu therapy, reality therapy, behavior modification, transactional analysis, guided group interaction, transcendental meditation, and various forms of community involvement in the rehabilitation process. No doubt, other programs will follow.

There are few indications that the new programs will be any more effective than the past efforts. Nonetheless, it is safe to assume that prisons will continue to exist in American society for a long time to
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come, in spite of persistent and often eloquent efforts to abolish them, or at least to abate their use. This is because correctional institutions serve functions which are not presently filled by any other social institution: the sequestration and incapacitation of offenders who are dangerous to the safety and physical well-being of others, special and general deterrence, and the punishment of criminals who have committed unpardonable acts against society. Yet this likely continuance of imprisonment should not and cannot preclude a profound change in what constitutes prisons and other closed institutions. These changes must not necessarily be made out of sympathy for the convicted criminal or disregard of the threat of crime to society, but they must be made precisely because that threat is too serious today to be countered by a continuation of ineffective methods applied in dehumanizing institutions.

What will the future prison (or closed institution) be like? Clearly, new facilities will differ dramatically from the majority of today's correctional institutions. They will be based on rationally designed goals which will help inmates live a life without crime upon release. Closed institutions will seek to evoke in offenders a positive self-concept as law-abiding persons and to enhance their prospects of leading a productive and satisfying life when they rejoin the free community. The overall social and physical milieu of the new institutions will be directed to developing an environment conducive to the eventual successful reintegration of the offender into society. The social structure of the prison will cultivate a sense of solidarity and commitment to the goals of corrections that is shared by inmates and staff alike. The new correctional operation will be built on the principle of accountability, an element too long missing from the corrections scene. Inmates will be accountable not only to live within the predetermined rules of the institution, but they will be accountable for the demonstration of personal change and a willingness to contribute to the welfare of others. Staff will be accountable to the community for the offenders entrusted to them. They will not be able to resort to repressive physical restraints and traditional custodial procedures in maintaining institutional order and programming, but will be responsible for improving living conditions and control through social and psychological means. To accomplish this, staff will need to reduce the existing social gap between themselves and the offenders, develop equitable rules and procedures, and cultivate the trust and commitment of offenders. Overt signs of authority on the part of staff, such
as uniforms and badges, will disappear in favor of civilian-type clothing for all.

The prisons of the future will be located in the cities and communities from which most of the offenders come. This means that prisons will no longer be constructed in isolated rural areas, as has been the custom for 200 years, but within major metropolitan areas which produce most of the crime and therefore most of the inmates. New institutions will be small in size, featuring fewer than 150 residents. Young and intractable offenders will ideally be accommodated in even smaller programs, varying from twenty-five to one hundred residents each. Smaller-sized institutions will do much to reduce the anonymity, dehumanization and depersonalization of current prisons and jails. The present highly destructive inmate social structure would disappear and inmates would become persons, not numbers. Mass movement and regimentation would no longer be necessary for the running of an institution.

Architecturally, facilities would establish interior security perimeters with administrative and program support elements located outside, to create a "softer" edge and thereby integrate the facility into the fabric of the communities that surround them. When possible, community participation in program and reintegrative efforts would be encouraged by providing joint use spaces such as auditoriums and office space for representatives from human services agencies, crisis intervention centers and similar services. Advanced building technologies would be incorporated which would provide unobtrusive institutional physical controls so that security devices would no longer dominate the institutional character and undermine program efforts as they do now. New institutions would have flexibility as a principal design determinant in order to have the capability of being adapted to changing program needs. Design concepts would provide for individual occupancy and thus privacy, and would establish individual resident territories supportive of new program approaches. The need for privacy and respite from hostile and dangerous environments has come to be recognized in correctional research as a basic human necessity. Residential groupings of ten to fourteen individuals (called residential clusters or modules) will serve to provide more normative environments and facilitate differential programming. Program space will be ample and varied to provide appropriate settings for a wide range of small and large group activities. Staff will be in close proximity to residents to promote maximum staff-resident interac-
tion. Program spaces will be close to residential units so that supervision of inmate movement is reduced and inmate accessibility to programs increased. Differentiated interior security zones will be established so that the total resident population will not be subjected to the close supervision and control measures required generally by only a few.

Programmatically, the new institution would provide individualized services which will stress the development of positive social orientations, work skills, and behavioral patterns conducive to community reintegration. Every conceivable treatment modality, i.e. educative, vocational, clinical, and recreational, will be made available to the inmates. Increasingly, it is being suggested that inmate participation in treatment programs be strictly on a voluntary basis. While all inmates of future institutions will have to participate in a mandatory work program and in institutional maintenance on a daily basis, it is reasoned that treatment, if it is to be effective, should never be coerced. The range of programs offered will be great and range from elementary school education to professional training.

Once an inmate decides to participate in a particular program, he would have to come to an agreement with staff that the program would indeed be helpful to him and that he had the necessary prerequisites and abilities to pursue it. The inmates in each residential cluster, along with two to four staff members, would form small living groups. Within these basic units, inmates and staff would participate in daily group discussions. The problems of daily institutional life, difficulties in human encounters, and matters of institutional governance would be the subject of the discussions. In addition, discussion sessions would focus on the responsibilities of individual group members, on the particular problems of the inmates involved, on the crimes they have committed, and on the physical and social harm they have caused. Avenues for reconciliation with society (and possibly their victims) would be explored. Realistic plans would then be formulated which would assist in the development of a positive anticriminal self-image and which would help inmates lead a life without crime once they are released. Staff members would be frontline men and women and not necessarily have professional or clinical training.

Emphasis will be placed on self-governance to the degree to which this may be possible in correctional institutions. As time goes by, inmates will assume increased responsibility and autonomy over their lives. Gradual participation by inmates in work- and educational-
release programs and home furloughs will provide the necessary testing ground for the assumption of that responsibility.

The vocational and industrial opportunities of the new correctional institutions will also differ substantially from traditional approaches. Principally, prisons will operate industries comparable to those outside. Outmoded machinery, make-work, rampant idleness and slave wages will be replaced by modern equipment, challenging activity, regular work schedules and fair union wages. Inmates pursuing educational programs in lieu of industry work will also be compensated. Similar to outside practice, pay rates will differ according to performance and degree of responsibility. As a result, the work experience and its rewards will provide a sense of achievement and accomplishment. Financial counseling will be provided and wages apportioned in consultation with, and with the consent of, inmates for the following purposes: taxes, subsistence, family support, restitution, spending money for the inmate, and savings. In order to implement innovative prison industry programs, current legislative restrictions concerning inmate labor will have to be lifted.

Because the closed institution of the future will be located in the community, it will have extensive links with community organizations. Human service agencies, churches, social and fraternal organizations, service clubs, public libraries, volunteer groups, professional and trade associations, and organizations which have traditionally aided human beings in trouble (e.g., Alcoholics Anonymous) will participate in the correctional process.

To improve correctional policy, program planning and decision-making, it will be necessary to incorporate evaluative research components on a continuing basis into all new correctional experiments. Despite the expenditure of millions of dollars annually on efforts to incarcerate and change offenders, research and evaluation of such people-changing endeavors have generally been inconclusive and are rarely comparable. As a result, evaluative research in corrections has been called "an elusive paradise." It is likely to remain that way unless newly developed legislative restrictions pertaining to the protection of privacy of individual offenders are lifted. While accused and convicted offenders have an inherent right to privacy, it is suggested that current restrictions concerning the conduct of research have done more harm than good. Restricted information legislation has saved many an administrator from acute embarrassment and permits the continuation of questionable correctional practices. The public and legislators must understand that if the new
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approaches to corrections outlined above are to succeed, they will have to be evaluated to discover which categories of offenders are best served by what programs, and which categories of offenders are harmed by what approaches. Careful research designs using random assignment of inmates and experimental groups are the sine qua non of effective evaluation.

Even though the current state of prisons is in a crisis of major proportion, the rule of the day being overcrowding, separation, punishment and isolation of offenders, the closed institution and prison of the future described above is really not so far away. A number of progressive institutions already exist in the form of the handsomely designed, medium-security prison at Lessburg, New Jersey, and the federal Metropolitan Correctional Centers in New York, San Diego and Chicago. These facilities are outstanding models of architectural planning with single occupancy, ample program and recreation space, and an individualized approach to offenders. The South Central Regional Correctional Institution in Anchorage, Alaska, represents one of the best approaches yet to correctional programming and architecture in existence today. In this instance, master planning and correctional program development preceded—as it should—the architectural design and the facility construction. The Robert F. Kennedy Youth Center in Morgantown, West Virginia, has an attractive campus design, magnificent landscaping, and a sophisticated multimodality treatment approach, accompanied by rigorous research efforts.

Another remarkable institution exists at Vienna, Illinois. Its buildings look like garden apartments and are built around a town square complete with schools, shops, a church, and a library. Garden paths lead to individual houses which provide private rooms in small clusters. Academic, commercial and vocational education facilities equal those of many civilian schools of comparable rank. Extensive indoor and outdoor recreation is provided. Visiting privileges are extensive, and visitors are encouraged in the recognition of the positive function of inmate interaction with family members and friends. The correctional center at Fox Lake, Wisconsin, and the Michigan Training Center at Ionia are both designed so that widely spaced and attractive buildings are set on exceptionally well-landscaped acres. There are winding walks and undulating contours to relieve the monotony of the midwestern countryside.

The most recent effort to bring corrections into the twentieth century, however, is the new Federal Correctional Institution at
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Butner, North Carolina. Because Butner is on the fringe of the "research triangle" of North Carolina (comprised of Duke University, the University of North Carolina and North Carolina State University), the correctional institution is accessible from all three of these university locations. Close working relationships have been developed with them. For example, medical services are provided under contract by the University of North Carolina. Duke University supplies all psychiatric services, and the Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina is involved in an extensive evaluation of the new institution. Functionally, the new institution serves two purposes: the first is to test experimentally the Norval Morris-Eric Steele model for the imprisonment of the repetitively violent criminal; the second purpose is to provide psychiatric and mental health services for mentally disturbed inmates from the federal prison system.

The physical plant of Butner has a campus design. In addition to the administration building, there is a village square, around which are built many storefront-type buildings serving an array of functions: commissary, cafeteria, infirmary, dining facility, library, gymnasium, theater, chapel, school, and vocational training center. Scattered around the site at some distance from the village square are the living units. Another complex of buildings serves the physical maintenance and operation of the institution and includes vehicle maintenance shops, the power plant and storehouses. The village square is attractively landscaped, and inmates located in that area are unable to see any security devices because no fences are visible. The visiting room is located in the community center. Even though it is completely within the security perimeter of the institution, it is large, comfortable and tastefully appointed. The auditorium is modern, has a capacity of about 180, is elevated, and features comfortable theater-type chairs. The attractive chapel accommodates between twenty and thirty people and serves all denominations. The dining room is bright and can hold not more than 130 persons at any one time. It has movable tables seating not more than four, and has comfortable, movable chairs. Staff members eat in the same dining room, going through the identical line that inmates do and consuming the same food. The atmosphere in the dining room is "normal" and pleasant because it is almost impossible to tell the inmates from the male members of the staff. It is not unusual to see staff and inmates sitting at the same tables. Staff members reflect a racial mix in keeping with the population of the institution. Women staff are involved in all operational
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activities, from serving as line-staff correctional officers to conducting treatment programs. The school and library are modern, bright and flooded with natural light. All program facilities reflect comfort, flexibility, and feature modern equipment. Residential units feature individual rooms for inmates with solid doors. Each man has his own key. Rooms have a normal-sized window made from tempered glass. Each housing unit contains a music room, a reading room, a hobby-craft room, a video room, two television rooms, a large activity area for pool and other social games, and an officer’s station. The entire institution is air conditioned. In spite of the fact that Butner holds the most intractable prisoners of the federal prison system, the total atmosphere at the institution is relaxed and exudes an air of confidence. Facility, program and staff are mindful that they are dealing with human beings who have rights in spite of the fact that they have been convicted of a vast array of crimes.

As can be seen from the foregoing discussion, Butner is an operational model of a new correctional approach that is being tested today. If Butner and the other new correctional programs and institutions discussed in this chapter prove their validity, they may well change the nature and face of corrections in this country. The facilities are the very antithesis of Attica, San Quentin, Trenton, and Lucasville, which have splashed across the public’s conscience with violence and bloodshed. The new facilities are, however, expensive to build and expensive to operate. Butner, for example, cost more than $11 million to build. Its operating budget is approximately $5 million per year. At that rate, it costs approximately $14,000 to keep one inmate in the institution for one year; and it is the taxpayer who supplies that money. With that kind of cost, there must be substantial doubt as to whether or not the less affluent states and jurisdictions will be willing to follow the Butner model, no matter how successful it may turn out to be.

In spite of this caveat, it is clear that a dramatic change in corrections is necessary. It is essential to abate the use of institutions, to plan comprehensively by looking at the entire criminal justice system. Offenders must be assigned to programs in accordance with their special needs and in keeping with the requirement of protecting the public from further harm. The crippling idleness, anonymity, and destructive impact of current prisons must yield to rationality, truth and enlightenment. To reiterate, these changes must not be made out of sympathy for the offender. They must be made precisely because
the threat of crime is too serious to be countered by a continued use of ineffective approaches, and because when all is said and done, it will be found that a humane, albeit strict, response to society's misfits and criminals will ultimately prove to be the best social defense against crime and the criminal.
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Information Needs of Inmates

LESTA N. BURT

Little published information is available on the information needs of inmates of correctional facilities; however, much can be gleaned from those articles that are available concerning general or educational needs of inmates. Many articles focus on the fact that after the basic physiological needs of food, safety and shelter are met, the higher basic needs of "belongingness and love" and "esteem and self-actualization" need to be met in a prison setting. This achievement is difficult because of the prison setting itself, and because of the type of person who is usually incarcerated.

General profiles of the "average" prisoner are found in the literature. According to the 1966 President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice and the Draper conference (1967), the inmate generally has an unstable work record, is impulsive and overreactive, and has difficulty in planning ahead or considering alternatives. While seemingly glib and smooth, he is fearful, and lashes out in hostility or uses manipulation. Furthermore, many have medical problems. In 1972 William McCullough stated that about one-half of the inmates score below the fifth-grade level on standardized achievement tests and have mental and emotional problems.

INFORMATION NEEDED ON PSYCHOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY

The failure syndrome must be overcome and the self-concept improved before significant learning can take place. Jeffries points out that the inmate's self-concept is often distorted and that he needs books on personality development, personal growth, and the mind and how it works. Roth reports that inmates usually consider themselves academic failures and that: "Self-improvement follows self-respect in the process of rehabilitation, and the chance to complete one's high school education is a necessary step." Mildred Moody believes that a
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skill does not change motivation and that reading guidance, book discussion groups, and library activities planned as adjuncts to therapy and education can provide the motivation for change.\(^8\)

In September 1972, Bernard W. Detlefson, curriculum coordinator of the Windham Independent School District at the Texas Department of Corrections (TDC), conducted an inmate interest survey of student inmates to use in curriculum planning.\(^9\) A total of 4,199 inmates in 13 units of TDC replied to the survey, which listed 91 subjects. Teachers read the survey to the students, who then marked the answers. It is significant that the five subjects most frequently chosen dealt with ways to handle health, emotions, and human relations problems. The twenty-five most popular subjects are listed below, preceded by the number of inmates preferring each subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Inmates Preferring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body Health</td>
<td>2,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Emotions</td>
<td>2,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You and the Law</td>
<td>2,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>2,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Education</td>
<td>2,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Appreciation</td>
<td>1,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro History</td>
<td>1,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding</td>
<td>1,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math (General)</td>
<td>1,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations</td>
<td>1,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing</td>
<td>1,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Education</td>
<td>1,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Repairs</td>
<td>1,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relations</td>
<td>1,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>1,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Man (Prehistoric to Modern Man)</td>
<td>1,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Mechanics</td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Problems</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio, TV Repair</td>
<td>1,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>1,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>1,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Automobiles</td>
<td>1,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Problems</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>1,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SUBJECT INTERESTS OF INMATES

This writer conducted a nonrandom interest survey in TDC's Ferguson and Goree units (for young first offenders and women, respectively) in 1968. The range of subjects was not nearly as great nor as closely tied to the curriculum as was Detlefson's. The most popular subject category for the men was history and for women was poetry, with poetry ranking second for men. The Detlefson survey did not include poetry; history, as a general subject, was not listed—the historical topics of Negro history and the development of man which were listed, however, ranked seventh and seventeenth in popularity, respectively.

Constance House administered a reading interest survey in June 1974 at the Ferguson and Goree units while she was a graduate student in library science at Sam Houston State University. As participants in a federally funded institute to train correctional facility librarians, House and several other students engaged in a study to determine the effect of group book discussion on inmate attitudes. The idea for the reading interest survey arose from this study. House included fiction with nonfiction in her survey and asked the respondents to rank their preferences. Many respondents marked only their first choice, which was fiction. Other than the 36 percent of the white males who listed "travel" as their fourth choice, the preferences were dispersed over a wide range of subjects. Women as a group preferred fiction, biography and poetry. The greatest overall travel interest was European travel; however, the preference among black men within the travel category was for Africa (86 percent). Black women demonstrated an interest in traveling to Africa which was only one-half as strong (40 percent).

The need of white inmates for cultural identity could account for their strong expression of interest in travel in Europe. Jeffries brings up the interesting point that whites, as well as blacks, Latinos, Chicanos, and native Americans, have a need for cultural awareness and identity, and a need to develop dignity and pride. According to Jeffries, inmates are interested not only in books concerning the backgrounds from which they have come, but also in books on poetry and writing, art, music, nationalism and revolution, Africa and China, philosophy, psychology, Westerns, detectives, and science fiction.

William Coons spent fifteen months in Attica before the riot and reports that it was difficult for inmates to get permission to go to the poorly stocked library, although "there is a will among a prison..."
population to raise the level of consciousness, to find some means of bettering one's condition." Coons found an amazing amount of interest in works dealing with the more abstract elements of human thought, such as philosophy, theosophy, religion, and contemporary social sciences. Books on these subjects are generally ordered by inmates or sent to them by people outside the institution.

Emilio Cosio reports that history and biography hold the lead in increased nonfiction reading. Those inmates with a higher educational level are interested in books dealing with philosophy, psychology and sociology, as well as warfare, aviation and ships. He also reports a great interest in travel.

The needs of inmates, reports Carl Reed, often turn out to be different from what has been anticipated. The warden of Allegheny County Jail in Pittsburgh—who, in this writer's opinion, should be commended for asking for volunteer librarian service when so many wardens refuse such an offer by zealous librarians—anticipated that the inmates would like a library filled with light, recreational reading; however, the residents requested textbooks for English and math, shop and car repair manuals, and black literature (75 percent of the population is black).

In 1974 Rhea Rubin encountered many difficulties in establishing library services in the Cook County Jail in Chicago. She was, however, able to supply "needed books, magazines, and cassettes for art, legal research, Swahili, hygiene, literacy, motivation courses given by inmates for other inmates, and the GED classes offered by the Catholic Church" before she was allowed to set up the library. There are fewer programs in jails than in state and federal institutions, although the people in jails especially need library service. Rubin also points out that it is very important that inmates be given the opportunity to select library materials, because it is one of the few areas in which they have a choice. She reports that ethnic literature, current periodicals, self-improvement materials, and poetry were most in demand. It is necessary to take inmate interest into consideration when selecting magazines and newspapers as well as books and audiovisual materials.

House found that importance was placed on the need for current information; inmates in her survey had expressed a strong desire to read magazines and newspapers. Newspapers as a source of information would serve the further purpose of keeping residents in touch with the "outside world," thus reducing institutionalization and facilitating their reintegration into society. The inmates’ responses to the sections of a newspaper they read in the House survey were
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different from what has been reported in earlier reading interest
surveys of the general population. The women preferred news about
world affairs, civil rights, and politics and government to a greater
extent than did the men surveyed. In addition, white women cited an
interest in editorials and letters to the editor. The reverse results had
been reported in the past. Although the white female interest in the
women's section of the newspaper (80 percent) is predictable, the 7
percent interest expressed by black women was not expected. (Even
black males expressed a greater interest (14 percent) in the women's
section than did black women.) Both groups of women showed an
equally high level of interest (80 percent) in the horoscope section.

Studying the informational needs of the inmates in one male and
one female institution in Illinois, Jeffries found that standard maga-
zines were ignored, but that National Enquirer, Mohammed Speaks
and Guardian were well read. Cosio reported that the receipt of seventy-five different newspa-
pers brought a 100 percent increase in library attendance at the
Central Correctional Institution in South Carolina. He speculated
that this was probably because these newspapers were, in many cases,
the inmates' only contact with news from their home town. This
writer found, however, that the male inmates surveyed at the Wis-
consin State Reformatory at Fox Lake had a phenomenal knowledge
of world affairs; therefore, it would seem that inmates read newspa-
pers and magazines even if home town newspapers are not avail-
able.

Group discussion on books, newspapers, films, etc., is another
method of sharing information and increasing access to it. The
majority of the inmates queried in the House study indicated that
they would like to take part in book discussion groups. Several
participants in the Institute to Train Correctional Institution Librari-
ans mentioned above have informed its director that they have
established group book discussions in their facilities. One Texas
institution warden confirms the intellectual stimulation the book
discussions afford.

Suvak reports that use of a prison library is about ten times as
heavy as use of "outside" libraries. He says fiction is twice as popular
as nonfiction; the most popular material is reported to be Westerns,
mysteries, occult literature, and Islam. Most studies of adult reading
interests find that the ratio of recreational to informational material
read is two to one. A comparison of these results indicates that
inmates have a greater desire for information than the average adult.
Another factor which must be taken into account in providing informational material for inmates are the groups within the inmate population, such as “Islam,” “Motorcycle Gang,” Jewish community, etc. Suvak states that it is the responsibility of the library to provide materials which will facilitate learning for all groups. Frank Andrews points out that a collection soon grows stale with a stable and controlled population and that a liberal budget is therefore necessary. Andrews also states that libraries were formerly set up in prisons as a kind of tokenism; with the emphasis now being placed on education, however (even some colleges offer courses in penal institutions), the need for a good library with a strong reference section is obvious.

Accounts in the literature emphasize increased circulation when new books are added to the collection. Curro states that a nonfiction and reference collection on location at the Erie County Penitentiary in Alden, New York, which is operated as a station of the Erie County Public Library, circulated 6,000 books to 170 inmates in its first year of expanded services. The old library was small and the books were old; men formerly ordered books from the cellblock through catalogs, and the books were sent to them. Inmates are now able to come to the New York library. Accessibility is clearly an important factor in library use. In 1971, Rittenhouse reported a monthly circulation of 1,550 books to 226 inmates at the Erie County Penitentiary. The new collection was developed with the help of instructors, correction officers, inmates, and the Erie County Public Library staff. The teachers requested nonfiction materials in the third- to twelfth-grade range. Rittenhouse reported the inmates’ reading interests to be the same as usually reported for the general population.

Information Flow

Jeffrey Schrank reports in “The Institution Trap” that: “information flow from the staff to the members is restricted. Staff usually knows much more than they admit.” This writer, however, has found that the inmates usually think that the staff members are withholding information which they actually do not possess. There is a tendency for inmates to suspect ulterior motives when new programs, etc., are initiated because the inmates feel vulnerable. Correctional institution staff can, however, take advantage of the current awareness service provided by the Law Enforcement Education Act (LEEA) to acquire information which would help in dealing with inmates and in passing on substantive information to them. This would theoretically give inmates food for thought and reduce their constant, nonproductive search for the “inside dope.” Many times,
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staff, as well as inmates, do not know what avenues of information exist—the current awareness service of LEEA and interlibrary loan being two examples. For instance, it is well known by the professional librarian that interlibrary loan is an important resource for answering informational needs when there is a constant collection which has a constant population. This service is relatively new in prisons, because few prisons have had professional librarians who are aware of interlibrary loans and the methods for acquiring materials by this method.

Margaret Cheeseman states that borrowing materials is an essential function of the institution library program; "however, this means, as a minimum, a knowledge of resources and methods, and some bibliographic tools."26 Rubin, for example, fills all requests by interlibrary loan if the requests are too specialized to merit purchasing.27 She and her staff are very careful to explain how and when a request will be filled in order to establish and keep trust. Shinn concurs with Cheeseman, stating that interlibrary loan should be made available to all inmates, including access to law library materials.28 Andrews reported in 1973 that Rahway prison receives interlibrary loan materials from Woodbridge Public Library with federal grant funds.29 Suvak30 states that interlibrary loan is an important factor for inmates involved in serious ongoing research.

The prison library studies which were required as a condition to the receipt of federal monies from LSCA Title IV pointed out that interlibrary loan is an important part of library service. These studies further found that the librarian in the institution was the most important element in determining the use that was made of the library. The librarian was responsible for choosing material that was relevant for the inmate population and furnished the all-important need for a human being who cares.

SELECTION

One question in the House survey described earlier asked if there were specific books the respondents would like to read which their library did not possess. Sixty percent of the men and 33 percent of the women listed a specific title. Aline House, director of libraries for the Windham Independent School District, who also helped to compile the survey results, ordered these books. This response would indicate that inmates need to be included on book selection committees so that their informational and recreational needs can become known. It would seem that a suggestion box, at the very least, should be established in every institution.
Andrews placed a library suggestion box at the entrance to the dining hall at Rahway State Prison in New Jersey. He reported that the largest nonfiction demand came in art, essays, heritage, history, religion, poetry, philosophy, politics and occultism. He also reported that there was an overwhelming demand for escape-oriented matter and a Spanish-language collection.

Selection of materials cannot be separated from information needs, because the materials which meet those needs must obviously be made available. William Clontz, an inmate librarian in Georgia, recommends that a selection committee composed of responsible inmates, members of the prison staff, and public librarians in the area select the materials for a prison library. He states further that members of the committee should speak with inmates to determine their interests because much money has been wasted on books selected without a knowledge of inmate reader interests. Shinn believes that the institution librarian should be on the state board of corrections and should involve correctional officers on a library committee. In this way support for the library may be gained and input of the officer's knowledge can be secured. Cheeseman points out that when selection has been used, it has not been geared to the interests and needs of the patrons, "but to a 'balanced collection' and 'books that they ought to read.'"

The limited vocabulary and reading skills of many inmates also need to be taken into consideration in the selection process in correctional institutions. Because of the large number of inmates whose language skills need to be improved, it is the opinion of this writer that a paperback dictionary should be given to every inmate who indicates an interest in owning one. In response to a question about the kind of problems experienced in trying to improve their reading, the majority of the inmates in the House survey listed vocabulary as being the greatest problem. When writing letters and doing school assignments, spelling becomes an obstacle which a good dictionary could partially alleviate. Cosio reported that dictionaries were in great demand by inmates, thus substantiating this need in other states.

Jeffries points out that inmates have the same recreational and information desires as the general public, but need the materials written for adults with a low educational level. Cosio found a high readership for low-vocabulary books and has stated that large-print books are in demand by both the visually handicapped and the slow reader.
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The inmates of correctional facilities have a wide range of informational needs; therefore, materials of varying levels of difficulty need to be made available.

INFORMATIONAL PROGRAMS

Morgan of Arizona outlined the program he envisioned for the libraries of correctional facilities in Arizona to include discussion groups, structured library use courses, interlibrary loan, readers' interest profiles, and bibliographies for the staff and residents. These promotional and instructional programs are as important as selecting and organizing the right material.

An interesting concept was being pursued in 1973 at Lucasville—that of "tutor librarian"—a concept borrowed from the British, according to Suvak. Persons knowledgeable in selected subjects are available at a desk in the prison library, not only to provide reference assistance, but to offer aid in solving problems, working through material, and making learning contacts. Suvak stated that: "Tutor librarians generally help open up fields of interest to the prison residents through prolonged contact in which the subject area is explained in depth."³⁹

Lovett discusses the kind of information service which is possible when professional staffing is provided in institutions:

Professional staffing has made it possible to develop an information service such as the names and addresses of agencies from which the inmates or their families can obtain help; information on the rights of prisoners, the poor and the veteran; form letters to use when requesting information; the use of a typewriter; and legal material from the county or state law libraries.⁴⁰

Provision of booklets which would contain information on where to receive legal, housing, food, library, and other types of information in the inmates' home area or destination (to give to inmates as a parting gift from the librarian) was stressed in the Institute to Train Correctional Institution Librarians held at Sam Houston State University. Vern Costa is one of the participants in this institute who has printed such an informational bulletin for his patrons in a California correctional facility. Rubin also compiled a release information packet for inmates of the Cook County Jail.⁴¹ Haering reports that the library is an important resource during an inmate's preparole period. Through the up-to-date directories of social agencies, legal resources, drug
programs, and local newspapers with employment ads, many inmates were able to present credible plans to their parole boards which helped promote their release.

The State of Illinois has developed a comprehensive plan for library service which includes all public libraries, the state library and all institutional libraries. Library service is provided through the state library, including funding and librarians. Service is provided through contractual arrangements with the ten public library systems embracing the correctional facilities and regional offices. This plan assures that the institutional libraries will be comparable to libraries on the "outside." Cosio reported that the South Carolina Department of Corrections began to organize library services for their seven correctional institutions with professional assistance for the first time in history because of LSCA Title IV-A funds.

The rights of prisoners for legal materials have been mentioned in many articles since the Gilmore v. Lynch decision was reaffirmed by the Supreme Court. States have developed different ways of complying with this ruling. Jeffries reports that Illinois has supplied all adult institutions with $15,000 law collections and photocopying services and, it is to be hoped, "will provide legal counseling, typewriters and necessary legal and carbon paper." LeDonne, who conducted a nationwide study of libraries in correctional institutions, reported in 1974 that law materials were the most important concern to inmates. In most states there was limited access to materials, lack of scope and currency of materials, and a need for professional assistance. The Texas Department of Corrections secured a federal grant to buy law collections for its penal institutions. Lawyers are provided for the inmates because of the complexity of law terminology.

Correctional institution libraries have come a long way, from the few personal books loaned by chaplains to inmates to the well-stocked libraries manned by professional librarians in some institutions in some states. Title IV of LSCA is responsible for the very existence of libraries in some correctional institutions. Library service and collections are very uneven across the nation—and even within the states, according to a nationwide survey done by the author.

It is most important that the informational needs of inmates be met. If one believes in library service, one must believe that everyone should have the opportunity for it. There should be special concern that residents of correctional facilities be provided with the best possible service, because those on the "inside" now will be on the
“outside” soon. Every means of assuring that inmates return to society as good citizens should be utilized.
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Training and Research in Correctional Librarianship

HARRIS C. McCLASKEY

In connection with treating our charges in correctional institutions, we speak often of rehabilitating men, of changing their lives. As a matter of fact we don't change other people's lives; we can only help them to do so themselves.

In this process of so assisting men, we lay stress on academic and vocational training. These do not of themselves change men. These are effective tools in helping a man to lead a better life, once he has determined to do so. However, something must happen to a man intellectually and spiritually before he is going to get the inspiration so to direct his life that he will make good use of such talents and skills as he may have, or may develop under our tutelage in the schools.

For purposes of reviewing training and research in correctional librarianship, it is meaningful to turn to the thinking of leaders in the field of corrections. The above statement was made by Garrett Heyns, a pioneer who devoted most of his professional energies to correctional rehabilitation in the states of Michigan and Washington and served as executive director of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training from 1966 until his death in 1969.

Heyns would be the first to recommend that the librarian who works in a correctional setting examine the environment in which services are given, in order to understand that environment and to be actively involved in identification of those issues for which there are no easy solutions, no ready formulas. This involves self-understanding translated into continual learning and caring about the skills of negotiation, compromise, and the alignment of power structures.

Let us first consider where we are today. The various jurisdictions which comprise the world of corrections have not advanced equally far in the 1970s. As one reads the literature on corrections, it is clear that the primary goal is to do the best job possible in building an
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effective system of corrections and prevention. The need for improved personnel is central to achievement of this goal. Fundamental to staff excellence are effective training programs articulated with tenure, adequate salaries and promotional possibilities as part of a career service. The librarian must realize that this pervasive need for personnel applies to all correctional employees, including librarians and library staff. The team concerned with changing individual lives has generally recognized the need for strong library and information services, but in relation to a spectrum of goals and programs. For the librarian familiar with services to individuals, knowledge of prison administrative organization and communication modes is mandatory.

The librarian who works in corrections must believe that the offender can change, and this includes understanding individuals in relation to education, vocational training, treatment within the institution and community, and the affective power of family and social relationships. This requires building library programs around people rather than fitting individuals into predetermined library planning. Observation of corrections reveals a magnitude of agencies working with the same individual, often with little reference to one another: the police, representatives of the courts, welfare agents, etc., may be involved concurrently, even on the same day, with minimal knowledge of what others are doing or why they are involved.

Equally important is recognition of the fact that correctional librarianship is not for everyone, even though all librarians are involved to the degree that they must understand problems and needs if they are to support planning and action. The correctional librarian must complement basic values and goals and work effectively within the correctional environment. This demands ethical awareness and the avoidance of actions which are inconsistent with good citizenship, good moral character, and with the dominant values of society. Changes in the terms/labels used to describe the correctional setting have moved from "dungeons" to "correctional" or "training" institutions. These changes are significant in that they represent a transition in the thinking about functions of agencies and in the perceptions of individuals involved.

The characteristics of the librarian who will work well in corrections are essentially the same as those required of all librarians, but with added emphasis on broadness of sympathies, absence of prejudices, penetrating insight evident in a person that both inmates and staff can respect, amenability to criticism, and the ability to set sights beyond the attainable. Appropriate education for this librarian must be
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geared not only to the present but to the future, a future of at least ten to twenty years. The continuing pattern of increased populations in urban areas is affecting the flow of information and the development of all library services. Changes in the correctional world—specifically, the implementation of standards and new programs—has brought the focus to rehabilitation and the addition of a range of personnel (administrators, educators, parole specialists, penologists, physicians, police scientists, etc.) whose information needs to support their work are increasingly specialized. Library services needed by correctional staff have become integrated both with prevention and with a shift from traditional, isolated institutions and programs to involvement with the general community. These factors require librarians familiar with subject content, who can design and activate delivery programs which are interdependent with the world of information resources.

Notable among the changes in corrections is the emphasis on community-based programs concerned with both prevention and treatment, programs which are of necessity involved with multiple governmental jurisdictions. While current events following the impact of Watergate have reintroduced the death penalty in some states and reinforced conservative philosophies, the commitment to community-based action, utilizing treatment-based parole services and a range of treatment settings designed to match individual prisoner needs with appropriate programs, is a reality. Concurrent with this is the growing emphasis on the rights of prisoners, especially those rights related to accessing legal information, and the signal decisions of the courts.

In the last decade librarianship has demonstrated growing social awareness and increased concern for the information needs of prisoners. This is evident in the work of the American Library Association's Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division (HRLSD) (formerly the Association of Hospital and Institution Libraries or AHIL), taskforces of the ALA, Social Responsibilities Round Table, and the recent creation of the Section on Library Services to Prisoners within HRLSD. These groups represent concern and action and provide a core of resources for future planning. In addition, the work of such agencies as the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), and their stated concern with all users of library services within the context of a national network, must be heeded. The concept of the national network is based substantially on the utilization of extant (and envisioned) information data bases,
which are tailored to both specific and broad areas of subject content and linked to mechanization. The use of computers to provide bibliographic access to information is a reality; it remains for the correctional librarian to be both informed about and active in its use. Equivalent to the growth of bibliographic networks is the interdependence of all libraries. The potential of the network, based on both the computer and human services, links the correctional setting to the total world of information. The days of local autonomy, reinforced by the traditional nature of prisons, are now limited; the advantages of cooperative efforts must not only be realized, but can aid in selling library services to prisoners, staff and correctional planners.

Consideration of the educational needs of the correctional librarian have been—and continue to be—considered in relation to general library education. While services in correctional settings are specialized, they comprise a specialization integral to all library education. This is not to deny the need for specific focus, but traditional concepts, theories and techniques remain basic; the correctional librarian isolated from a growing profession would be so narrow as to exclude access to resources and support. Specialization in the field of corrections is necessary in addition to training in librarianship.

The longstanding argument, however, continues: Can the needs of the librarian best be met through a generalist approach, or by addition of specialized courses in library school curricula? The 1972 ALA Standards for Accreditation permits specialization in a particular area; thus, an educational program devoted exclusively to the needs of the correctional librarian is a possibility, providing there is tangible evidence that the area of specialization is comparable to those of other academic disciplines and is of sufficient stature to be taken seriously within the worlds of academia and professional practice. Library education is broad enough, with increased awareness and clear planning, to allow latitude for specialization and response to the specific needs of the correctional librarian. Progress is being made in the identification of those components which will enhance individual skills so that professional growth can both be established and continued.

In 1971 Albert Roberts summarized the thinking of correctional leadership concerning librarianship in a review of the historical background of prison libraries. He stated that the library should be organized and administered by a professional librarian, trained and experienced in both librarianship and correctional work. Of specific importance, Roberts emphasized, is the need to guide inmates and
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staff to appropriate materials: "A well-trained librarian is necessary because there is no substitute for a real professional in selecting the library materials best suited to the needs and interests of the institution. Personalized guidance is needed to change the nonreader into a reader—librarians are trained to do this."

Before turning to standards and specific programs of library education, attention should be given to the fact that correctional library services are concerned with a wide range of individuals, including children, young people and adults, whose needs, while paralleling those of the general population, are characterized by a variety of special requirements. Homogeneity, therefore, cannot be assumed.

STANDARDS

The main reference source for correctional work in the United States is the Manual of Correctional Standards, which first appeared in 1946 and was revised in 1959 and 1966; each edition contains a chapter on libraries. New standards are now in the process of being approved by both the American Correctional Association and the American Library Association. The various revisions, echoing general changes in corrections, move from a security/custody orientation to an increasing emphasis on individuals and rehabilitation. The new standards state clearly that correctional librarians should be actively involved in institution planning and programming, meet regularly with other institution department heads in planning, and take an active role in the total rehabilitative program. Recognition is also given to the need for training in legal reference services on a continuing basis. It is recommended that salaries be competitive with area, state and national library agencies and comparable to other professional personnel on the institution's staff, with compensation for continuing education and travel to workshops, conferences and institutes of both library and correctional groups.

To achieve this level of professional involvement, the standards specify procedures and requirements for personnel selection, training and classification. The basic professional training requires a fifth-year degree from an ALA-accredited program of library education, plus a basic knowledge of penology, sociology and psychology, which can be obtained through continuing education. Three significant staff categories are specified:

1. Librarian—Fifth year degree in library science; with knowledge of audiovisual materials and equipment; three to five years
experience in public, school, or institution libraries; specialized
training in use of legal reference materials to be gained by
continuing education; and a sensitivity to current social prob-
lems and the correctional setting.

2. Assistant Librarian—Fifth year degree in library science; or
bachelor's degree in the social or behavioral sciences with 15-18
hours credit in library science and experience in a public or
institutional library.

3. Library Technician—Minimum of two years of college, plus
secretarial skills and some knowledge of library techniques and
procedures.5

These basic recommendations parallel essentially the “Library Stand-
ards for Juvenile Correctional Institutions” approved in 1975.6

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

In 1966 Ray Trautman urged competition for the most sought-
after graduates of library schools.7 This was earlier asserted by
Maryan Reynolds, speaking before the 1963 Congress of Corrections,
in which she recognized the absence of a corps of librarians with
appropriate course background or experience in corrections. Her
recommendation also emphasized attracting the very best librarians
to meet the then-current standards which required the librarian to be
an educator, an information specialist in all subject areas, a public
relations expert, a cataloger, an administrator, and an expert in
human relations—something which any qualified librarian should be
able to accomplish. Reynolds also identified the importance of the
correctional institution or system's recognition of the need for and
support of a strong library program.8 More recently, Agnes Griffen
asserted the need for librarians who could analyze and understand
the environment of the correctional institution; explore, define and
negotiate specific library functions; and serve all groups in the insti-
tution—i.e. to possess all the basic characteristics of a good librarian.9

Any account of specific educational programs must consider Mar-
garet Monroe's analysis of education in librarianship for serving the
disadvantaged.10 Monroe recognized that library education is charged
with the responsibility for preparing librarians to work with a wide
range of library service needs and contexts in a world which lacks a
homogeneous character. Even though the term disadvantaged is a
negative one, it is currently in use, pervades our indices, and provides
the context for finding information about the public offender. In
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1971 Monroe surveyed all ALA-accredited library education programs to determine what specifically was being done to train librarians to provide special services to the "disadvantaged." Fifty-five instructors representing thirty-five library schools responded. Results indicated that there were: (1) nine courses in seven schools specifically designed to prepare librarians; (2) twenty-four basic or core courses which gave particular attention; and (3) a cluster of traditional, elective courses incorporating selected service elements. When specific groups were identified, however, criminal offenders and their needs ranked lowest. Among the major purposes of such educational programs the following were cited: understanding of special groups, service to individuals, provision of service techniques, and understanding of the dynamics of society or the community as a whole.

Especially significant are the instructional methodologies utilized in the various programs for producing sensitivity, awareness and insight: student papers or projects, class projects on selected groups in a general course, field observations, institutes, internships, and special courses on special publics. This array of methodologies is applicable to a wide range of groups and certainly parallels the requirements for correctional librarians as specified by standards and individual writers.

Monroe also found concern expressed as to whether subject content should be integrated into established courses or separately developed; support for separate courses was based upon the need for content depth and specialized experience. The question remains whether such coverage belongs at the master's level or at specialist or continuing education levels. In addition, course content involved specific materials, exposure to the dynamics of various groups, and interdisciplinary education; the latter is specifically identified in the literature on education for the correctional librarian.

A recent review conducted by this writer of courses offered by ALA-accredited programs of education revealed little change in Monroe's findings and substantiated her data that subject content for specialized groups, especially the "disadvantaged," involved instructor use of research findings, concepts, and theoretical structures from the fields of business administration, communication, education, psychology, and sociology. Monroe also identified increasing use of student field experiences, including observation, field projects, practicums, and internships. This continues but remains controversial, especially within the contexts of the beginning-degree level and time constraints.

SUMMER 1977
In considering the above findings, it is interesting to contrast the professional development concerns of correctional educators. Franklin Semberger reported on objectives generated by the 1971 Florida Institute of Correctional Educators. Consensus called for bringing together correctional educators to assist each other in realization of their roles in the world of corrections and to delineate the needed professional responsibilities and images which should be held. The interdisciplinary aspects of the institute have particular relevance for correctional librarians, as does the affirmation of the need for cooperation at all levels of the corrections system—local, state and national.

Of equal significance is the need for librarians, especially library educators, to be cognizant of the past, present and future impact of federally supported library training programs. Sarah Reed has reviewed the considerable impact of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) and the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II-B, especially noting improvements in the pool of library school faculty members, the increased number of minority members of library school faculties and library staffs, and increased specialization in both library education and library services. The potential for federal funding must be considered in areas of interdisciplinary and multimedia education, areas specifically addressed by correctional library standards.

Specific attention must be given to the ongoing plans of the NCLIS regarding their concerns for the institutionalized user, faculty quality, and fellowship support for students with academic majors in the specific areas valuable to corrections. Continued aggressive involvement in these areas cannot be stressed too strongly.

SPECIFIC EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

In reviewing actual programs pertinent to the education of correctional librarians, it should be noted that most accredited programs of library education allow no more than six credits of academic study to be earned outside of the library curriculum; these credits are frequently limited to computer sciences, management and education. Academic articulation, enhancing interdisciplinary, interdepartmental programs, has significant potential at both the master's and post-master's levels, and deserves both further consideration and study.

Realism demands recognition of the current restricted employment market for correctional librarians in relation to needs for both formal and informal continuing education. The potential for research,
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especially within library schools, also deserves further consideration, especially research focused on users and the correctional environment, rather than being limited to an emphasis on actual and recommended library services.

Among the ALA-accredited education programs which currently offer opportunities for the student and librarian interested in correctional library services, the following should be noted: Case Western Reserve University, School of Library Science; Catholic University of America, Graduate Department of Library Science; Columbia University, School of Library Service; University of Maryland, College of Library and Information Services; University of Minnesota, Library School; University of Washington, School of Librarianship; Wayne State University, Division of Library Science; and University of Wisconsin (Madison), Library School. Among the educational programs not currently accredited by ALA, specific attention should be given to the Community Information Specialist (CIS) master’s degree program at the University of Toledo (Ohio), and the recent experimental institute for twenty students at Sam Houston State University's Library Science Department. The latter was funded by a grant under the Higher Education Act Title II-B for a twelve-month period beginning August 13, 1974; a report on this program is currently being developed for distribution. Participants were required to hold a baccalaureate degree and be admissible to the Graduate School of Sam Houston State University. The Master of Library Science degree, awarded to those completing requirements, contained a minor in criminal justice focusing on legal research, reference services, readers' services, administration, organization and information retrieval, as well as on an understanding of inmates and the correctional institution setting. Research supporting the institute proposal revealed a total of thirty-three professional librarians serving full-time in fourteen correctional institutions in the United States in 1973.

It is important for the individual considering correctional librarianship to weigh various factors in selecting an educational program: content and analysis of basic, required courses; the possibilities for independent study courses; research papers and projects; and the opportunity to study in related fields as part of the degree program or concurrent with the program. At the master's level, narrow specialization could leave the graduate unprepared for a profession in which it is common for practitioners to change both positions and responsibilities. Strong, informed faculty advising should include exploration of career possibilities (the correctional librarian will not always find a
created position and may have to sell his/her services and create positions) and specific strategies for job hunting in the correctional world.

LAW LIBRARY SERVICES

Prison law library services, especially since the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the State of California's decision in *Younger v. Moore*, have achieved full legal standing reinforcing the prisoner's right to information. Legal information needs of prisoners center in three areas: (1) postconviction relief, (2) civil problems, and (3) mistreatment or abridgment of constitutional rights in prison. If librarians are to provide significant services in these areas, they must acquire the needed expertise at both specialist and general levels. Celeste MacLeod has carefully summarized both the evolution of prison law library services and information needs. Attention is also called to courses related to legal literature in the curricula of the University of Minnesota's Library School and the University of Washington's School of Librarianship.

RESEARCH

The body of research culminating in the work of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training provides basic information valuable to education and research in correctional librarianship. The commission's work, funded by the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965 and administered by the Social and Rehabilitation Service, had as its primary objectives study of the correctional needs of minority groups and of public attitudes toward crime and corrections. Results of the research substantiated a lack of organization in the field of corrections characterized by overlapping jurisdictions—some of which with organization that was wasteful of personnel resources. Probation and parole services were found to be particularly complex because of the many differing patterns of authority, administrative responsibilities and organizational structures. It was difficult to obtain reliable and comparable data on probation and parole, and this problem was compounded by the myriad patterns of corrections found in the various states.

Effects of noncoordination were dramatized in a correctional personnel survey which asked individuals what goals they thought were most emphasized in various correctional settings, i.e. in adult and juvenile institutions and field agencies. Twenty percent of the re-
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spondents said punishment was the primary goal; 42 percent said rehabilitation; 34 percent said protecting society; 2 percent said changing society; and an additional 2 percent were not sure. This confusion pointed to the critical need for an organized and coordinated system of corrections in the United States.

While corrections and library services have a long history, most observers would admit that very little was achieved prior to this century, and it was not until the third decade when ALA and the correctional world became cooperatively involved with each other. In the 1940s the American Prison Association established a Committee on Institution Libraries, generating the movement toward surveys; surveys still constitute the main body of research in correctional librarianship today. S.H. Souter conducted the first survey, reported in 1941, which revealed that one-half of the institutions studied lacked funding continuity for library services, and one-half indicated that inmates could read in some type of library facility.

Involvement of the ALA accelerated action, with the founding of the AHIL in 1956 and with another survey in 1963 which substantiated the earlier findings. In 1963 the ALA Standards for Library Function at the State Level affirmed responsibilities of the states and encouraged cooperation between institutions and state library agencies. In 1964 Maryland surveyed its correctional institutions' libraries and thereby stimulated both the 1965 AHIL inventory of libraries in state and federally supported correctional institutions and the significant passage of the Library Services and Construction Act Title IV, which funded library services to a variety of institutions substantially supported by the states, including correctional libraries. The 1965 AHIL survey, based on data obtained from 924 institutions within the United States, found that staffing was critically deficient, i.e. only one-quarter of the respondents reported professionally trained librarians working on even a part-time basis. The U.S. Bureau of Prisons was somewhat better, with 20 percent of its total budget allocated for all social service programs.

In 1966 Marion Vedder conducted a survey of state library agencies to determine patterns of organization, especially administrative responsibility, and the current status of library development; this was updated by Lesta Burt in 1972. While growth is indicated there is still much to be accomplished. Most significant and of current value is Marjorie LeDonne's Survey of Library and Information Problems in Correctional Institutions. This major study, reported in 1974, had as its purpose the provision of current information for making decisions
to plan strong library services. Focusing on goals and objectives, the study included intensive analyses of programs in ten selected states. The study concluded that needs continued to be great, and recommended that one pattern of library services be provided in the future. Because this survey is discussed in depth elsewhere in this issue of *Library Trends*, attention will be given to specific elements regarding staffing. Essentially, the study recognizes both the growing coordination responsibilities of librarians and a change in focus of the responsibilities to the administration of programs rather than to staffing specific libraries. This changing role of the correctional librarian is characterized by broader responsibilities, fuller participation in institutional planning, increased capabilities in library program development, and the supervision, planning and coordination of library services in several institutions. This is based on the objective realizations that individual correctional institutions cannot compete for qualified personnel, that many institutions are geographically isolated, that salaries are not competitive with other library positions, and that a career ladder is usually absent. In addition, among those states surveyed, a move toward contracting for library services was identified, e.g., in Florida, Illinois, Virginia and Washington.

Specific research concerned with the education of correctional librarians discusses problem areas in education: censorship, materials selection, control of both users and materials, and efficient utilization of library space. Specific recommendations of significance for library education include the following: (1) a professional librarian should serve as an agencywide coordinator of library programs within each correctional agency; (2) librarians should serve as administrators of institutional library programs; and (3) continuing job-related educational activities should be provided for library staff.

The various states, supported by the Library Services and Construction Act, conducted surveys of institutional library services and have generated reports relative to their action. In addition, a variety of bibliographies are readily available. The most useful is that contained in LeDonne's report which includes the significant references to library-related information about adult and juvenile correctional institutions at federal, state, county and municipal levels. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Information Resources, and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency Information Center served as primary sources. Comprehensive bibliographies on correctional library services prior to 1970 have also been compiled and are cited by LeDonne.
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In the area of bibliotherapy, it is important to note the work of Rhea Rubin, who surveyed the theoretical bases for prison library services. Of special significance is the doctoral research conducted by Lesta Burt in two Wisconsin correctional institutions, one for men, the other for women. This carefully designed project provided research control for variables of age, sex, race, crime, number of months incarcerated, and the number of months remaining to be served. Burt concluded that bibliotherapy involving book discussion may be a helpful adjuvant to correctional programs for improvement of both attitudes related to selected behavioral concepts for all inmates, and attitudes toward prisons. She also found that such bibliotherapy may be effectively conducted by librarians when working with small inmate groups. In summary, Burt recommended that group book discussion programs be utilized as an agent in creating anticriminal attitudes to complement structured rehabilitation programs.

Other than the studies cited above, research related to correctional librarianship has yet to be tapped. An analysis of academic research, i.e. that conducted within or connected with library education, reveals, in addition to Burt's doctoral study, a total of six master's theses which are primarily focused on the analysis of existing library services utilizing survey techniques.

In conclusion, it should be noted that the literature of both corrections and librarianship is giving attention to: (1) the need for literacy studies concerned with the efficacy of graduated reading programs, (2) the use of various media with individuals exhibiting various information needs, and (3) the characteristics of inmate populations.
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Survey of Library and Informational Problems in Correctional Facilities: A Retrospective Review

MARJORIE LEDONNE

It has been three years since the final report of the Survey of Library and Information Problems in Correctional Institutions was published by the Institute of Library Research at the University of California in Berkeley. The study was initiated in 1972 under a research grant from the U.S. Office of Education. In subsequent years, other research has been done, and many changes have been brought about against which the observations and recommendations made in the 1974 report should be weighed.

Prison libraries have existed for nearly as long as have prisons, yet major decisions governing their development are, even today, rarely made by librarians. They are most often made by wardens or superintendents of institutions, by directors of educational programs, and occasionally by state directors of correctional agencies. Until recently, no body of information upon which decision-makers could rely was available for their guidance. The most recent statistical survey of the nation's adult correctional libraries was done in 1965. A comprehensive national survey of juvenile correctional libraries has never been done. By the 1970s, library standards adopted by the American Correctional Association (ACA) in 1966 had been challenged as inadequate and their revision was underway. Existing library literature was of little help in facing new issues to either correctional administrators or librarians. David Gillespie's 1968 analysis of correctional library literature showed that analytical theses were few, and that most articles appearing in journals described library programs but gave little evaluation of a program's impact on the total operation of a prison. For the most part, the literature did not discuss problems of service, nor did it address basic issues of library objectives, admin-
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istrative procedure or the library's position in the administrative structure. If these issues were seldom discussed in library literature, they were totally ignored in the literature of sociologists and correctional professionals. With the advent of the 1970s, court decisions and a new level of public interest in prisons and civil rights forced many library-related issues to the surface. Decision-makers searched for solutions without benefit of a literature providing the shared thought, the variety of opinion, or the experience and insight of others.

THE STUDY

PURPOSE

In 1972 the Institute of Library Research (ILR), working in cooperation with ACA, undertook the two-year study designed to draw upon the experience and observations of inmates, librarians, administrators, and others; to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of correctional library programs; to identify problems and potential solutions; and to develop an overview within which issues could be weighed. The study was to be a major, but beginning, step toward filling an information void. As the study progressed, hope grew that it would also alert librarians in community and academic libraries to ways in which they could cooperate to improve correctional library services; that it would increase the awareness of legislators and correctional administrators of the need for library and information services for confined persons; and, finally, that it would foster a shared sense of responsibility for improving these services.

PROCEDURE

The study was made up of four components, each one represented by a volume of the final report. These were: (1) an on-site investigation of library programs for adult and juvenile offenders in state and federal institutions in ten sample states, (2) a survey of responses made by each state to the federal Supreme Court mandate for prisoner access to legal reference materials, (3) the development of profiles summarizing correctional library development in each state and federal territory, and (4) a search of the literature and pertinent unpublished documents. Sample states were selected by an advisory committee composed of librarians and correctional experts of national reputation and experience. The committee was guided by predetermined criteria and developed a sample which included:
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Representative geographic, economic, ethnic, and cultural characteristics;
Both small rural and large industrialized states with large metropolitan areas;
A variety of patterns of service to correctional institutions; and
A cross-section of all types of institutions under the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Prisons.
States selected for the sample were Washington, California, Montana, Arizona, Illinois, Connecticut, New York, West Virginia, Georgia, and Florida.

Within each selected state, on-site visits were made to all institutions under federal jurisdiction and to at least one state institution in each of the following categories: adult male maximum security, adult male minimum security, adult female, and juvenile. At each institution structured interviews were conducted with persons who could give a variety of viewpoints—inmates, wardens, superintendents, supervisors of educational programs, librarians, and inmate library clerks. In each state, directors of departments of corrections and of juvenile correctional agencies were interviewed, as well as institutional consultants serving with state library agencies. Interviews were confidential and in most instances held privately. Only within the Federal Bureau of Prisons were prisoners not allowed to meet with the investigator without staff supervision. Arrangements were made in advance for the interviews to be taped, and in only a few instances was permission not granted. These procedures were not designed to gather statistical data, but to acquire new insights into the problem of correctional library service and to illuminate the differences in the perceptions of correctional administrators and library professionals in areas which could affect library policy and development.

Interview questions were developed to test five hypotheses:
1. That correctional library services are generally poor;
2. That services are not appropriate to meet the particular needs of the population being served;
3. That services would be improved by the addition of a librarian at policy-making level within the central office of each correctional agency;
4. That services would be improved if libraries were removed from their present subordinate position within educational programs; and
5. That library services would be improved by closer cooperation with outside libraries.
Interview questions were based on the particular relationship of the subject to the library program. More than fifty questions in all were developed to ask of six categories of interview subject: (1) superintendents or wardens of institutions, (2) directors or assistant directors of correctional agencies, (3) institutional consultants with state library agencies, (4) directors of educational programs, (5) librarians, and (6) inmates, including both those who used their prison library and those who did not. The following core questions were asked of all interview subjects:

What are the objectives of the library program? Or, why do you think there should be a library in a correctional institution?
How well does the library program in this institution (in this state) meet these objectives?
What do you see as problem areas in the operation of the library program?
What do you see as possible solutions?

All staff members and institutional consultants were asked several additional questions:

What are the objectives of the institution (or of the department)?
Would you prefer to have library services developed internally by the correctional agency or externally from an outside library?
Is there a need for a coordinator or director of library services within the agency's central office?
Should the library program be independent and parallel to the educational program or subordinate to it?

Although many answers addressed legal reference needs, none of the questions asked specifically about legal services; the findings on legal reference services in the second volume of the ILR report were based, not on interview questions, but on a questionnaire developed by Maragaret Hannigan of the U.S. Office of Education and sent to all state library institutional consultants early in 1972.

MAJOR FINDINGS

The hypothesis that correctional library services were generally poor was confirmed. There were exceptions, however, and in several instances prison libraries surpassed nearby public libraries and were providing services to staff and families of staff, as well as to inmates. Where legal collections recommended by the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) had been established, they often surpassed law
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library resources in the community. In some states citizens had no access to legal reference collections. For the most part, correctional libraries fell short of community libraries and well below standards set by the ACA in 1966. The one standard consistently met was the number of volumes required per inmate. Because this criterion is so visible, it was frequently cited as evidence of the adequacy of a library even though the materials were outdated, little used, and sometimes inaccessible. Poor building design, inadequate funds, insufficient staff and clerical help, isolation of libraries, lack of training opportunities for staff, and poor administrative support were some of the factors which undermined the quality of prison library programs.

The second hypothesis—that the services provided were not appropriate to meet the particular needs of institutionalized persons—was substantiated in all institutions visited. Library hours were geared to the convenience of staff rather than to client need, and hours were inadequate to provide access for main line populations. Staff shortages did not allow the extension of services to maximum-security areas where restrictive confinement increased the need for reading and listening materials. In contrast, court-mandated legal reference materials were frequently delivered to all areas of the institution, with security staff and counselors serving as couriers. Inappropriate collections were the result of haphazard selection procedures compounded by inappropriate donations. In some states, where services were provided by outside public libraries, even carefully selected materials shared with institutional libraries proved to be far better suited to community interests than to those of prisoners. In the state of Washington this has been corrected by the participation of institutional librarians in the selection process and by soliciting suggestions from inmates. Cumbersome purchasing procedures in some states also made collection development difficult. Unique materials from small publishers were especially difficult to purchase. Moreover, in 1973 most commercial publishers were not producing a sufficient variety and number of materials for ethnic and cultural minority groups, nor were much-needed, high interest/low vocabulary materials with appropriate subject matter and format available. Today the situation has improved with minority interest materials, but those for adult beginning readers are still in short supply. All librarians interviewed also lamented the lack of audiovisual materials and equipment. The needs and interests of prisoners, combined with below average reading skills, demand a variety of media, yet most collections seen were limited to print.
It was the conclusion of the investigator that inappropriateness of services was due in part to library objectives that were out of touch with new trends in correctional thinking. Librarians consistently emphasized "rehabilitation" as an overall library objective, whereas correctional administrators cited most frequently "assistance to prisoners in achieving successful reentry into the community" as their primary objective. The concept of "rehabilitation" assumes the presence of an abnormality which "treatment" will restore to normalcy. It is not surprising, then, that librarians focused on the period of confinement—the period of "treatment"—and gave little attention to the information needs of persons leaving the institution. Librarians emphasized enriching intellectual experience, self-directed education, recreational and "escape" reading, the provision of a pleasant library environment, and the treatment of prisoners with dignity, respect, and individual attention as a means of improving the prisoner's self-image. These are worthy aims and should not be abandoned, but they do little to assist persons to return to the community from isolation, locate a job, find housing, develop social and recreational contacts, or overcome myriad other hurdles. The information services needed call for a new direction for correctional libraries which parallels the effort of community libraries establishing information and referral services for their information poor.

In 1975 Brenda Vogel, Library Coordinator for the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services, conducted a survey of the information needs of prisoners in seven Maryland institutions. The needs identified by the study are given below in order of their priority:

1. In-house information on institutional procedures, regulations, current happenings, etc.;
2. Information concerning families and community resource information for family assistance;
3. Legal information concerning criminal charges, appeals, etc.; and
4. Job market information and other reentry information.

Meeting these information needs will require new levels of communication and cooperation among institutional libraries and between them and outside information resources. At the Correctional Training Facility at Soledad, California, an inmate committee took over a reentry information project when the staff member serving as reentry counselor was reassigned to other duties. The inmate project director
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contacted major corporations and potential employers, inquired about their hiring policies for exoffenders, and prepared a listing of designated contact persons in California for exoffenders seeking employment. With LSCA funding the project was expanded, and produced statewide directories of halfway houses, community services, and local information and referral services. An exoffender group in Sacramento, California, produced a directory especially for use by released prisoners of community resources in the Sacramento area. Similar directories were developed by the Missouri State Library and by the librarian at Cook County Jail in Chicago. At the California Medical Facility in Vacaville, an inmate committee has gathered together statewide information on current educational programs, available scholarships, and support services for exoffender students. These information services have much to contribute to public libraries and to public library clienteles, and would certainly benefit from closer ties with community library-based information and referral services.

The third hypothesis—that services would be improved by the addition of a library coordinator within each correctional agency—was strengthened by interviews and observations, but not proven. Directors of educational programs and local administrators did not always see this as desirable; most librarians did, but also feared central office control as much as they desired central office support. Since the ILR study, the Illinois Department of Corrections has discontinued its position of library coordinator and has turned over responsibility for library services to the Illinois State Library. Centralized coordination continues but under the direction of the Illinois State Library’s institutional consultant. Where administrative responsibility for library programs rests with the correctional agency, most top-level administrators and all institutional consultants saw the establishment of a coordinator as desirable; consultants, however, gave it a higher priority than administrators did. In California, where both hospital and correctional institution libraries have developed with very little centralized coordination, five state agencies have formed an interdepartmental task force to address staffing problems of libraries in the state’s residential institutions. The question of central office coordination is one of the problems to be considered. During 1977-78 an LSCA grant will initiate a library coordinator position within the California Youth Authority as a pilot project. If the position has a favorable impact on the quality of services provided, it will be retained on a permanent basis. In any case, the project will provide the task
force with valuable information which should be applicable to other state agencies administering residential institutions.

The hypothesis that library services would be improved if libraries were separated from educational programs was not supported by the study. Although correctional library development has been neglected under educational program administrators, there was no evidence that libraries would do better if shifted to some other position in the administrative hierarchy. More important changes would be the establishment of adequate, line-item budgets; the provision of in-service training opportunities for library personnel; improved communications with institutional staff and with outside libraries; integration of library planning into overall correctional planning and statewide library planning; and improved managerial techniques which establish program objectives, performance standards, time limits, and reliable methods for evaluating progress. It was the conclusion of the investigator that unless these steps were taken, there would be little advantage in having librarians report to a different department head.

It is unlikely that these changes will be achieved by educators alone; they are beset with their own problems which absorb their attention. Moreover, the needs of their own programs tend to limit educators' concepts of the library function to the provision of support for classroom programs, a function to which neither teachers nor librarians give high priority. In studies carried out by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), correctional educators in both adult and juvenile institutions gave libraries a low priority in describing educational program needs. In the WICHE study, only 40 percent of the educators polled who served in adult institutions saw library materials as badly needed; they considered the need for librarians to be less serious than the need for: (1) additional teachers, (2) vocational counselors, (3) psychologists, or (4) research personnel. Only 38 percent of educators in juvenile institutions saw a need for improved library services. In a recent issue of *Journal of American Corrections*, David Friend, assistant project director for still another study of correctional education, was quoted as calling for improved correctional library services and stronger ties to outside libraries. Nevertheless, the final document which emerged from the study, *Correctional Education: The Forgotten Human Service*, itself did not mention the need for library development in correctional institutions, nor did it recognize the contribution libraries have made in the past.
Survey of Problems: A Review

If changes for the better are to be realized, correctional librarians, administrators, and others who see a larger role for libraries than as backup for classroom programs must take the lead, and the library profession must support them in their effort.

The final hypothesis, that library services would be improved by closer cooperative ties with outside libraries, was supported by the ILR investigations and has been further substantiated by experience in all areas of the country. The ACA "Library Standards for Juvenile Correctional Institutions" and the new unpublished standards for adults call for cooperation and backup services from outside libraries. Each year the number of states with statewide arrangements for institutional/public library cooperation grows. In some states, all services are provided by outside library agencies, i.e. Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Illinois. In others, correctional library programs are supplemented through statewide reference and interlibrary loan networks. New York, Nebraska, Connecticut, and many others fall into this category. In California, interlibrary cooperation varies from one area of the state to another. Proposed legislation, if passed, will provide funds to reimburse public libraries for interlibrary loans made to institutions. A recent study of state institution and public library cooperation in Ohio reported similar unevenness of service, with 89 of Ohio's 249 public libraries serving local, city and county institutions. Figures were not broken out for either state institutions or for correctional institutions, but the data indicate a trend that has advanced considerably since the 1974 ILR report.

LEGAL REFERENCE MATERIALS

Because legal reference materials will be discussed elsewhere in this issue, recent developments will not be detailed here. I would, however, like to report a development which has stemmed in part from ideas expressed in the ILR report. I refer to the potential use of microfiche for prison legal collections. The Young Lawyers Section of the American Bar Association (ABA) has established a committee on prison libraries which has joined forces with the ACA Library Committee to negotiate with law book publishers for the provision of legal reference materials on microfiche to prisoners. The National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture has also recognized the potential of microfiche for solving many prison law library problems.
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PROFILES OF STATE PROGRAMS FOR CORRECTIONAL
LIBRARY SERVICE

ILR profiles of state programs are now badly out of date. A recent article by Jean Marie Zabel in Special Libraries gives a brief overview based largely on a review of published materials. More recent but very limited information is in the ABA report Behind Bars. This document describes an on-site visitation program carried out by the ABA Young Lawyers Section over a four-year period from 1970 to 1975. Accounts from twelve sample institutions were included in the final report representing various sections of the United States and a U.S. military prison in Germany. The major library focus was upon law library facilities and services, but some accounts also describe general library programs. All in all, these reports indicate little improvement since 1974. The best source of current program information is the continuing publication of correspondence and reports appearing in Inside/Outside, a newsletter for correctional librarians. The newsletter, published by Joan Stout and Gilda Turitz, did not exist at the time of the ILR survey. It has done much in the years since then to relieve the isolation and obscurity of correctional library service.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SEARCH

The following selected list of titles identifies most major documents published since 1973, some of which have not previously been cited in this review:

Akey, Sharon. An Annotated Bibliography of Recent Prison Literature. San Jose, Calif., San Jose State University School of Librarianship, 1974. (ED 094 784)


These standards are designed for community-based services, but would also be helpful to institutional libraries providing reentry information services.


Descriptions of more than 130 games and simulations, grades K-12, which would be invaluable in training law library clerks or library patrons.
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Containing descriptions of more than 400 films, filmstrips, and tapes for classroom and library use for grades K-12, and includes teacher reference.

Contains lists of basic and expanded collections recommended by the AALL, directors of law libraries offering services to prisoners, and a listing of law librarians willing to serve as consultants to prison law libraries.

American Correctional Association. Committee on Institution Libraries. "Library Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions." These standards are still unpublished but are available on request from Barratt Wilkins, chairman of the ACA Library Committee, Florida State Library, Tallahassee, Fla. The standards were adopted by ALA but not by ACA. Components will be incorporated into correctional standards now being developed by the National Accreditation Commission for Corrections, and will be used as criteria for institutional accreditation.

Juvenile standards have been adopted by both ALA and ACA.

Much of the information in this pamphlet is applicable to larger state prisons as well as to jails.

Topics covered include the Library Bill of Rights, Freedom to Read, Intellectual Freedom, Before the Censor Arrives, Intellectual Freedom and the Law, and Assistance from ALA.
MARJORIE LEDONNE

Books for Prisoners: A Report of a Project. New York, Association of 
American Publishers, 1974. (Available from the National Council 
on Crime and Delinquency, NCCD Center, Paramus, N.J., Order 
No. S 14103.)

Bar Association Support to Improve Correctional Services (BASICS). 
Includes a discussion of prisoners' rights to legal materials and 
services and current listing of pertinent court decisions, and an 
evaluation of existing programs.

Davison, Susan E. Bibliography of Law Related Curriculum Materials; 
Annotated. 2d ed. Chicago, ABA, 1976. 
This bibliography should be in every correctional library, especially 
those for juveniles. Although it is designed for juveniles (grade levels 
are given), it would be helpful for adults with low reading skills.

Ensley, Robert F., ed. "Correctional Library Services," Illinois Li- 
This issue includes articles on a variety of subjects from all areas of 
the country and represents the views of correctional administrators, 
librarians and inmates.

Lack, Clara, and Bettencourt, Bruce. "The Santa Clara County Li- 
brary Adult Bibliotherapy Discussion Group Bibliography." San 
Jose, Calif., Santa Clara County Library, 1975.

An unpublished bibliography of selected materials dating back to 
1916.

———. "Juvenile Correctional Institutions: Library Services." 
An unpublished selective list spanning the 1970-75 period.

Rubin, Rhea, J. Barred Visions. Chicago, Chicago Public Library, 
1974. 
An excellent bibliography of prisoner writings compiled by librarians 
working at the Cook County Jail, Chicago.

———, ed. "Bibliotherapy," Health and Rehabilitative Library 
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A collection of six papers covering services to American Indians, blacks, Mexican-Americans, Appalachians, and to prisoners.

A discussion of the all-important role of inmate clerks providing legal counsel and law library services.

An invaluable handbook for assisting untrained inmate clerks and patrons unfamiliar with the use of a law library. The manual is well indexed and easy to use.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In reviewing the recommendations made in 1974, I find none that I do not endorse today. Although the recommendations were based upon the secondhand experiences and observations of others, their validity has been confirmed for me by subsequent work serving as the California State Library Institutional Specialist. The preparation the ILR research project provided has been truly appreciated, as well as the great good fortune I have had in working under Carmela Ruby, whose reputation in the development of institutional library services is nationally acknowledged. Equally valuable has been the experience of working with, getting to know, and learning from the librarians, teachers, administrators, and the small army of men, women, and young adults who fill more than thirty correctional institutions and camps in California. There is no way that this rich experience could not affect and expand my perceptions; so, while I may not wish to change earlier recommendations, I would like to add one more. I feel that it is fitting that it should now head the list, for it is especially important. Marie Logan, librarian at the Atascadero State Hospital, once stated most eloquently (and I should like to borrow her words), "People confined in institutions are among the most troubled and needful in our society, and it takes a special kind of person to serve them well." I have come to realize that while space, time, money, training, and adequate support staff are all important, the key to
quality correctional library service is the turn of mind, the energy, and sense of dedication which the librarian, teacher/librarian, or inmate clerk brings to the job.

1977 RECOMMENDATION

State civil service specifications must be redesigned to identify persons with a special interest in and aptitude for institutional library service. Library school job counselors must assist in channeling appropriate, interested people to this most rewarding branch of library service.

1974 RECOMMENDATIONS

Planning
1. Coordinated long range planning should be done for correctional library development.
2. Immediate plans should be specific, quantitative, and scheduled.
3. Specialists in library planning should serve as consultants to architects through all phases of design development for correctional institutions.

Funding
1. Funding for ongoing operations should be provided by local sources.
2. Recognition should be made of the library and information needs of institutionalized citizens as well as those in the community.

Interaction with the Community
1. Correctional libraries should expand services to provide practical, current information to assist inmates in successfully reentering the community.
2. Public, school and academic libraries should recognize their responsibility to develop new methods of gathering and sharing reentry information.
3. Educational institutions, private foundations, community service organizations, labor unions, and government agencies should recognize their value as sources of reentry information and include institutional libraries on their mailing lists.
4. Libraries in correctional institutions should be included in cooperative interlibrary loan networks.
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5. Library services for correctional institutions should be augmented or provided under contract with community and/or state libraries.
6. In contractual arrangements, correctional personnel should participate in decisions affecting the library program.

The Organization of Community and Institutional Support

1. Library advisory committees composed of inmates and staff should be established at each institution.
2. An advisory council for institutional libraries (including those in hospitals, charitable, and correctional institutions) should be formed at the state level, composed of representatives of participating agencies, the state library, and state government.
3. Concerned outside citizens, both professionals and the general public, should band together to form a cadre of support for correctional administrators and librarians as they seek to improve library services to confined persons.

Staffing

1. A professional librarian should serve as agencywide coordinator of library programs within each correctional agency.
2. Professional librarians should serve as administrators of institutional library programs.
3. Paraprofessionals should be hired to carry out the daily operations of library programs.
4. Opportunities for paraprofessionals to advance in grade and salary should be provided.
5. Positions of inmate library clerk and law library clerk should be developed as a job-training and educational activity.
6. Continuing job-related educational opportunities should be provided for the staff of correctional libraries.
7. Outside volunteers should be used wherever possible to augment library services.

Policies

1. Library services should be predicated upon the individual's right granted under the First Amendment of the Constitution to read and have access to all information and all points of view.
2. A statement of overall library policy should be developed jointly by librarians and administrators and displayed prominently.
3. Each correctional agency and each institution should develop and publicize a clearly articulated statement of censorship policy.

4. The personal purchase of reading materials by inmates should be encouraged and facilitated.

5. Clientele should be closely involved in planning library collections, services and programs.

6. High priority should be given to meeting the acute library and information needs of those confined in isolation and segregation.

7. High priority should be given to the library and information needs of the staff.

8. All necessary methods of delivery should be utilized to provide maximum service to inmates and staff in all areas of the institution.

9. Access to library services should be extended to evening and weekend hours.

10. A handbook of library procedure should be developed for the use of inmate library clerks and volunteers.

Materials

1. An adequate selection of current acquisition tools should be available to inmates and staff.

2. Emphasis should be placed upon the acquisition and use of audiovisual materials in correctional libraries.

3. A broad range of materials should be provided for adult beginning readers.

4. Legal reference materials should be provided in accord with recommendations of the American Association of Law Libraries.

5. Instruction and assistance in the use of legal reference materials for both inmates and staff should be provided.

6. More appropriate and more economical methods of providing legal reference information to prisoners must be found.

7. Photocopying machines should be made available as a means of expanding access to legal reference materials and as a protection for them.

Accreditation

1. An accreditation program should be established for libraries in correctional institutions.
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Law Libraries for Correctional Facilities

O. JAMES WERNER

Until 1969 American courts had been very reluctant to interfere in the administration of correctional facilities even in cases where prison regulations obviously discouraged prisoners from exercising their rights by seeking court remedies. Unless an inmate was patently denied access to the courts, the courts followed a "hands off" doctrine of not questioning a prison administration's regulations.1

In 1969, however, the U.S. Supreme Court handed down its influential Johnson v. Avery decision,2 which started a trend that culminated in the leading case of Gilmore v. Lynch.3 In the Johnson case the Supreme Court held that a state may not enforce a prison regulation which forbids inmates from helping other inmates to prepare legal papers, unless the state provides some reasonable alternative to help them prepare their petitions to the courts. The Supreme Court affirmed the principle that access of prisoners to the courts for the purpose of presenting their complaints may not be denied or obstructed.4

In the Gilmore case, a federal court in California went a logical step further and declared that reasonable access to the courts is a constitutional imperative, and that prisoners have a constitutional right to an adequate law library unless an equally effective method of legal assistance is offered them by their institutional authorities. The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the decision on appeal, approving the lower court's decision. The lower court said that access to the courts encompasses all the means an inmate petitioner might require to get a fair hearing on all grievances alleged by him. The court implied that a prisoner needs a law library comparable to that of a criminal lawyer,5 and that a certain amount of legal expertise is required just to file an acceptable petition with a court. It found that regulations of the California Department of Corrections infringed on the rights of
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prisoners to reasonable access to the courts by restricting them to an inadequate list of law books. The *Gilmore* case has been the one cited most often in regard to the prisoner's right to legal reference materials; since it was decided, the situation has improved measurably, to the benefit of inmates seeking court remedies and more adequate assistance in preparing their petitions to the courts.

**RECENT COURT CASES**

Some of the cases that have been decided since *Gilmore v. Lynch* should be noted. In *Mead v. Parker*, inmates at the federal penitentiary on McNeil Island, Washington, petitioned for relief, alleging that the prison had refused to provide them access to legal materials. The lower court dismissed their suit on grounds that it was not the function of courts to superintend the control and management of prisoners in a federal institution, again relying on the "hands off" doctrine. The U.S. Court of Appeals reversed the decision and sent the case back to the lower court, stating that the prisoners' petition did state a legitimate claim upon which relief could be granted if the allegations could be proved.

In *White v. Sullivan*, inmates in the Alabama Penal System filed a civil rights complaint alleging, among other things, that they were denied access to a law library by the prison authorities. The court said that their library, which consisted of incomplete copies of the *Alabama Code*, did not constitute a sufficient law library. It said that a prison must provide inmates either reasonable law library facilities, legal aid, or legal services, in order to provide them with full access to the courts. The court ordered acquisition of the following materials: *United States Code, Code of Alabama, Alabama Reports* after volume 269, *Alabama Appellate Reports* after volume 44, *Supreme Court Reporter* after volume 75, *Federal Reporter, Second Series* after volume 274, *Federal Rules of Civil and Appellate Procedure, Federal Rules of Criminal and Appellate Procedure, Alabama Rules of Civil Procedure, Black's Law Dictionary*, a *Harvard Law Review* volume on habeas corpus, and a book of legal forms. The court also ordered that the inmates must have reasonable access to the law library.

The case of *Adams v. Carlson* involved inmates of the federal penitentiary in Marion, Illinois, who sought an injunction to prevent prison officials from retaining legal materials confiscated from the inmates after a disruption and a fire in the cells. The U.S. Court of Appeals ordered the return of all legal materials that had been
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confiscated and said that prisoners must have access to legal materials, particularly when they are unable to retain attorneys and must act *pro se* (representing themselves in court). It is a violation of due process of law, the court said, to deprive an inmate of materials he needs for reasonable access to the courts. Legal materials should not be withheld on the dubious ground that they might serve as matter to burn during some future disturbance (the excuse given by the prison officials) that is not anticipated.

In *Johnson v. Anderson*\(^9\) officials of the Delaware Correctional Center at Smyrna tried to limit inmates to a single law book, twice a week for one and one-half or two hours. The federal district court held that such a rule unlawfully deprived inmates of their right of fair access to legal research materials. It said that effective access to the courts is simply too crucial a right to be awarded or withheld as a disciplinary tool, and it enjoined the prison from applying such a limitation. The court said that it is up to the prison officials to prove that other sources of legal assistance were available to inmates if the prison put such a limitation on legal materials. In this case the officials had failed to show that this was true.

*Battle v. Anderson*\(^10\) is a case in which inmates of the Oklahoma State Penitentiary claimed they were denied access to the courts because: (1) the prison officials failed to provide them with an adequate law library or a reasonable and adequate alternative, and (2) the officials refused to allow inmates to have personal legal reference materials in their possession or to assist each other with their legal problems. The federal district court concluded that the prison's law library and legal assistance program failed to provide constitutionally adequate access to the courts. It ordered the officials to prepare a plan that would insure access to the courts by inmates, and it enjoined the officials from interfering with the acquisition or possession of legal materials by inmates, including court transcripts, law books, legal periodicals, court documents, etc. The officials were ordered to arrange for capable and experienced inmates to help other inmates with their legal work. They were also told they must advise inmates that they may subscribe to any legal periodical and may obtain law books and legal assistance through correspondence.

*Cruz v. Hauck*\(^11\) involved inmates of the Bexar County jail in Texas who sought judicial relief from jail regulations restricting the use and possession of legal materials. The appeals court said: "Access to legal materials is but one source, albeit an important one, of providing an adequate pathway to the courts." It sent the case back to the lower
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court to determine whether all inmates, not just those charged with a state offense, had adequate access to the courts through the services of a court-appointed lawyer (one of the acceptable alternatives to an adequate law library). The court said that if inmates are not allowed to store softcovered legal books in their cells, the authorities should arrange to store them in other available areas of the jail. It also said that prison rules should permit inmates to obtain law books from any source, subject only to screening for security, and that procedures should be established for prisoners to use legal materials in their cells for a reasonable period.

A case involving detainees in a city jail is Giampetruzzi v. Malcolm. In that case, unconvicted detainees in the administrative segregation unit of the New York City House of Detention for Men sought relief from a jail limitation on the number of legal books and other materials that might be kept in a cell. The federal district court held that, under a state regulation, the jail limitation on legal books was unlawful, even though a limitation of five nonlegal books would be considered reasonable. Detainees in the administrative segregation unit were not allowed as much time in the law library as other inmates, but the court felt the amount of time was sufficient in proportion to the number of persons in the unit compared with the number in the general jail population.

In Padgett v. Stein, inmates of the York County Prison in Pennsylvania alleged that their law library was inadequate because it possessed only the annotated statutes of Pennsylvania. The federal district court ordered the prison authorities to submit a plan to guarantee inmates effective access to the courts, either by reasonable access to attorneys, by reasonable access to legal materials, or by any other reasonable means desirable. As alternatives, the court mentioned: a legal services program at the prison, perhaps in conjunction with the county legal services; establishment and maintenance of an adequate law library; limited access to the county law library, perhaps through the establishment of a legal clinic in the prison; or the transfer of inmates to an institution that has an adequate law library.

A prisoner at the Middle Georgia Correctional facility sent a handwritten letter to the federal district court in Wilson v. Zarhadinick, and the court deemed it to be a civil complaint that legal materials taken from the prisoner denied him due process of law by denying him access to the courts. A hearing revealed that there was no law library in the facility, and that there were no plans for one. The court held that the state must furnish a law library of basic legal
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materials to research the major areas of immediate concern to prisoners, namely, habeas corpus and civil rights. It added that essential materials would include annotated statutes of state and federal laws, and reports of modern state and federal cases. The court felt that a law library was called for in this case because legal counsel provided by the state was not adequate. It said that a prisoner without legal assistance has such a severe handicap in pursuing his rights that denial of assistance is in effect denial of access. The state's obligation to provide viable access to the courts requires as a minimum that it furnish legal materials to inmates, unless other adequate means of legal assistance is provided.

A case that may have major impact in this area is Smith v. Bounds, which was accepted for review by the U.S. Supreme Court on April 3, 1976. The U.S. Court of Appeals approved a district court order and plan for North Carolina prisoners to have law libraries. The plan called for one central library and seven core libraries around the state that would each have a minimum legal collection. The district court said that the state has the obligation to provide prisoners with legal research facilities or an acceptable alternative, but it is not obligated to provide additional assistance in the form of independent attorneys' services. The U.S. Court of Appeals agreed; however, it found the district court's plan deficient in one respect: female prisoners would be afforded less accessibility to legal research facilities than would male prisoners. It ordered that the plan be modified by removal of such discrimination.

The fact that the Supreme Court has agreed to hear the Smith v. Bounds appeal implies that the present Court may wish to reconsider the direction in which courts have been going concerning prisoners' rights to law libraries and legal services; it could easily have refused to hear the appeal by referring to the holding in the Gilmore case. It does seem that recent cases decided by the Supreme Court have evidenced a tendency to restrict rather than to broaden the rights of prisoners.

A case which questions the adequacy of an existing legal collection in a federal prison is Gaglié v. Ulibarri. Inmate Gaglié asked the federal court to direct the prison authorities to provide an adequate law library as required by the Gilmore case. The lower court ruled in his favor, and the U.S. Court of Appeals affirmed the decision, holding that the Bureau of Prisons Policy Statement 2001.2B did not provide for an adequate law library, nor did the law school legal assistance program or public defender's office provide effective research assistance. The Bureau of Prisons list called only for reports
of federal cases since May 1972, but the court ordered the library's reports to begin about 1960. It said that the law school program provided only limited aid, and that the public defender had a heavy case load, making it doubtful that he was able to provide effective assistance to the inmates. The court of appeals, however, said that it was not deciding whether some lesser number of books than that ordered by the lower court might be sufficient, because that issue had not been presented on appeal.

In *Hooks v. Wainwright* inmates of a Florida correctional institution brought a civil class action alleging that they were denied their federal constitutional rights because the prison law library was inadequate, or alternatively because the state provided inadequate legal counsel to assist prisoners. The federal district court held that Florida has a duty to furnish inmates with extensive law libraries, or to provide professional or quasi-professional legal assistance. After finding that the prison authorities did not furnish lawyers to indigent inmates, the court said: "It is constitutionally mandated that the prison authorities furnish indigent inmates with some form of legal assistance which to that extent assures meaningful access to the courts." The court reasoned that to deny indigent prisoners adequate law libraries or legal assistance would be to deny them equal protection of the law, for there can be no equal justice when it depends on the money a person has. Such denial also deprives a prisoner of due process of law, because it hinders his reaching the threshold of the courts and therefore the guarantees of due process. The court said that the cost of legal services is not an adequate or reasonable justification for not providing those services, and it directed the parties to submit a comprehensive and detailed proposal and timetable for establishing adequate prison legal services and/or law libraries.

Inmates in the Nevada State Prison, in a class action on behalf of all the inmates, presented evidence that the law library was woefully inadequate. They asked that the prison maintain a roster of writ writers (nonlawyers, usually fellow inmates, who are able to prepare petitions to courts), and that it notify incoming prisoners of their availability. The court held that the state must provide reasonable access to an adequate legal reference collection, and it remarked that the state's interest in curtailing expense was not an acceptable excuse for failing to make such provision. The court said that prisoners should have access to the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court and of other federal courts, the *Pacific Reporter, Shepard's Citations* for all such decisions, the *Nevada Revised Statutes*, the *Nevada Digest*, the Modern
Correctional Facility Law Libraries

Federal Practice Digest, and reference works on criminal law, such as the Criminal Law Reporter. It suggested also that the Nevada Board of Prisons might obtain the advice of the attorney general, the state public defender, and others regarding the composition of the law library collection.

In Noorlander v. Ciccone a regulation of the U.S. Medical Center at Springfield, Missouri, provided that excess legal materials in an inmate's cell must be sent to his home or, if he prefers, destroyed. The court held the regulation to be reasonable and said the right to represent himself did not require that an inmate be provided with a law library by the medical center unless the public defender program was ineffectual and other alternatives were not adequate to assure his access to the courts. It also stated that a full evidentiary hearing must be held to evaluate the adequacy of an institution's law library or the adequacy of the public defender program.

The importance of keeping the prison law library open for inmates' use is underscored by one of the holdings in Liddy v. Wilkinson. In that case the prison law library was closed because the sole inmate library clerk was transferred to another job (as a form of punishment, he alleged). The court held that in the absence of justifying circumstances, an inmate law library clerk should not be reassigned until a suitable replacement has been made available to keep the library open during regular hours.

Not all cases brought by prisoners to obtain reasonable law libraries require a decision by the court. Some of them are concluded by the parties (the prisoners and the institutional authorities) reaching an agreement which is accepted by the court and embodied in a consent judgment. One such case is Black v. Duffy, brought by inmates of the San Diego County (California) jail against the sheriff. The consent judgment stated that in order to meet or exceed the minimal constitutional standards regarding access to the courts by inmates, the jail authorities were required to purchase and maintain legal materials listed in the judgment, and to place them in the jail in a cell physically accessible to all inmates. It further required the jail authorities to use their best efforts to establish a borrowing system satisfactory to the San Diego County Law Library to provide inmates with access to additional legal materials not available in the jail law library. The list of legal materials required for the jail library included selected state codes, court rules, federal court rules of civil and criminal procedure, selected titles of the U.S. Code, volumes of criminal forms, a law dictionary, a volume on search and seizure law, a treatise on habeas
corpus, practice books on California criminal law, evidence and criminal procedure, a Spanish-English dictionary, the *Criminal Law Reporter*, and the local legal newspaper.

There have been a number of court cases in which the denial of access to legal materials for prisoners has been upheld for one reason or another. *Farrington v. State of North Carolina*23 is a case which appears to contradict the *Smith v. Bounds* decision. Both are North Carolina cases, but from different federal districts. A state prisoner claimed he was denied access to the courts because the institutional authorities did not provide a law library for prisoners. The federal district court said that the U.S. Constitution does not require a state to furnish law libraries to prisoners if the state appoints lawyers to represent indigent inmates in postconviction proceedings and does not prohibit inmates from preparing writs for other inmates. Because North Carolina did follow that policy, the court held that a law library was not needed in order for its prisoners to have access to the courts. The court mentioned that there are approximately 12,000 prisoners in North Carolina, and that fewer than 100 had prepared petitions for postconviction relief.

In *Bauer v. Sielaff*24 an inmate of the State Correctional Institution in Huntington, Pennsylvania, sought damages and injunctive relief, alleging that he was improperly deprived of his personal legal materials while he was in maximum security. The court held that the deprivation was not improper because the inmate had not proved that he was denied access to the courts. He had failed to produce evidence that he was intentionally denied his legal materials, and he had failed to prove that he had suffered actual damage thereby. The court pointed out that his lawyer had still pursued his pending appeal and that he could still communicate with the lawyer. He had in fact been able to file a handwritten complaint that included legal quotations and citations.

In the Oregon case of *Chochrek v. Cupp*,25 the U.S. Court of Appeals affirmed the lower court's denial of a writ of habeas corpus to a prisoner who had alleged that he was denied access to the courts because he was denied sufficiently frequent access to the prison law library. His case was dismissed on grounds that he had failed to allege that other adequate means of legal assistance were unavailable to him. This again shows how the courts consider a law library as only one alternative available for assuring reasonable access to the courts.

The inmates of the Colorado State Penitentiary alleged in *Hampton v. Schauer*26 that their right of access to the courts was infringed by
the inadequacy of their law library, as well as by other factors. The suit was dismissed by the federal district court, however, because the court found overall legal facilities and assistance to prisoners to be effective and free from restrictions. The court said there was no evidence that any inmate had been unable to present his cause to a court as a result of the law library's inadequacy, noting that inmates had testified that there was a 100 percent improvement from the unworkable law library of two years before. Lawyers had testified to the present inadequacy of the library, and the prisoners had offered in evidence the recommendations of the American Association of Law Libraries for an adequate prison law library. On the other hand, the warden testified regarding the institution's plans to continue to improve the library. The court said that a prison's law library is but one factor bearing upon inmates' access to the courts. Although there was evidence of some delay, the court was more impressed with the following factors: inmates' free access to the public defender who had discretion to pursue postconviction relief; liberal prison regulations which allowed prisoners to contact lawyers, help each other, purchase law books, and obtain free writing supplies and free photocopying; and the availability of an inmate law librarian to help the prisoners.

In Knell v. Bensinger27 an inmate of the Illinois State Penitentiary was denied access to legal materials and legal assistance while he was in disciplinary isolation. The lower court denied his petition for an injunction and damages. The U.S. Court of Appeals affirmed that decision, stating that it was not unreasonable to deny the inmate access to legal materials and assistance where his disciplinary isolation was imposed for violation of prison regulations and was limited to fifteen days or less. The court felt that such denial of access to the courts was de minimis (too trifling to take notice of), because it was for a short period of time.

Once an inmate refuses the services of a government-appointed lawyer, he can not complain that jail officials will not provide him with a law library to help him prepare his own defense. When an inmate of the Fulton County (Georgia) jail awaiting trial on a charge of mail fraud did that,28 the court said that he could not claim denial of either due process or equal protection of the laws because the government had fully satisfied the requirement of providing access to the courts by offering him a lawyer. The prisoner has no constitutional right to choose which kind of access to the court he prefers. In response to the inmate's allegation that he was refused delivery of mail which contained law books, the court affirmed that he was entitled to receive all
mail properly sent to him, including law books, but the mail was subject to security censorship.

If an inmate awaiting trial is represented by a lawyer, the county sheriff is not required to supply him with law books, according to the U.S. Court of Appeals in Page v. Sharpe. The court distinguished this case from the Gilmore ruling by pointing out that, in Gilmore, "jailhouse lawyers" rather than "real lawyers" were helping other inmates.

In Russell v. Oliver an inmate in the Virginia Correctional System claimed he was denied access to the courts because of the lack of access to law books. The court, however, held that his right of access was not unconstitutionally restricted by the lack of law books because: (1) prisoners were free to file complaints (and a large volume were filed each year), (2) lawyers were appointed if a material issue of fact existed, and (3) the state had a program under which the court appointed attorneys to counsel and assist indigent prisoners regarding legal matters relating to their incarceration. The court said that the state need only provide some reasonable and effective opportunity for a prisoner to gain equal access to the courts, and that the plaintiff had not shown that an inadequate law library resulted in lack of opportunity to secure postconviction relief in the courts.

Although it was not one of the issues in contention in People v. Heidelberg, the court said that the U.S. Constitution does not require that an inmate who is representing himself in court be provided with law books if he had been offered a lawyer appointed by the court and had refused one.

Even though a prison's law library may lack older volumes of the court reports which an inmate feels he must have for his research, that may not be sufficient to show he is being denied access to the courts. In Stover v. Carlson, inmate Stover challenged the sufficiency of the law library at the Federal Correctional Institute in Danbury, Connecticut. The library contained federal court reports beginning in 1950, relevant parts of the U.S. Code, a federal digest, a legal encyclopedia, and some lesser titles. His petition for a writ of habeas corpus was dismissed on the merits because he had failed to show he was denied meaningful access to the courts by the absence of the older court reports in the library. The court pointed out that prisoners at Danbury had access to an excellent legal assistance project of the Yale Legal Services. The court felt that such services, plus the existing law library, assured prisoners of reaching the courts, which is all that the Constitution requires. The court said that prison officials had struck a
salutary balance between inmates' right of access to the courts and the
government's need to spend its money carefully. It said there was no
showing in this case that the prisoner's rights had been burdened,
while on the other hand the cost of meeting his demands would have
been financially high.

In Wilson v. Zarhadnick an inmate of the county prison farm of the
Georgia Prison System complained that the warden had confiscated
or withheld his personal legal materials. Even though he had not
complained about the absence of a law library in his institution, the
lower court required the state to furnish a law library containing a
basic legal collection. The U.S. Court of Appeals said the lower court
went too far, because the question of a law library had not been an
issue in the controversy. It said further that if an inmate is not
indigent, as this one apparently was not, and if he has adequate
financial resources to employ an attorney, the state is not under a
constitutional obligation to furnish him legal research materials.33

Even though a prison may have a law library of sorts, the question
may be raised as to whether that is enough when many of the
prisoners are illiterate. Inmates in the Mississippi State Penitentiary
brought an action claiming they were entitled to access to an adequate
law library and state-supplied lawyers.34 During the trial a consent
order established an adequate central law library with rules that
provided reasonable access by inmates. The court ultimately ordered
the prison authorities to devise a plan that would insure that inmates
who needed assistance in gaining access to the courts would be able to
call upon competent writ writers. The court said that the right of
access to the courts required the state to provide some source of
assistance for literate and illiterate inmates alike. It pointed out that
the widely scattered residential camps in Mississippi and the admin-
istrative prohibition against intercamp visits operated as a de facto bar
to inmates' procurement of the assistance of competent writ writers.

Jordan v. Johnson35 is a case involving the hours a prison law library
is open. Inmates at Southern Michigan Prison claimed that the
warden's regulation regarding law library hours violated their consti-
tutional right of access to the courts. The court held that a flexible
eleven and one-half hours per week came within the sphere of
discretionary actions of prison officials for the orderly administration
of the prison. In addition to the eleven and one-half hours per week,
additional time was allowed when an inmate had to meet a court-im-
posed deadline.
In the United States, court decisions in recent years have resulted in the creation and improvement of law libraries in correctional facilities, but in Great Britain the situation is as it was in the United States several years ago. Until recently no prisoner in England could consult with a solicitor (attorney) without the Home Secretary's permission, let alone initiate court proceedings. Following a complaint to the European Commission on Human Rights, however, the Home Office modified its practice so that permission would not in the future be denied in cases involving physical injury to a prisoner.

The British rule was further challenged before the European Commission on Human Rights by a prisoner who had been denied access to legal advice. He claimed that the rule regarding prisoners violated a provision in the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of 1950, which guarantees the determination of a person's legal rights by an ordinary court. When the case was referred to the European Court of Human Rights, it held that Great Britain had breached Articles 6 and 8 of the convention by refusing the prisoner access to a solicitor so that he could bring a court action against prison officials. The officials had refused the prisoner's request to correspond with a solicitor and had accused him of involvement in a prison riot. The court held that Article 6, Section 1 secures to everyone—including prisoners—the right to have any claim relating to one's civil rights brought before a court. Consequently, the article embodies the right to a court, of which the right of access to a court constitutes one aspect. The court also held that under Article 8 a prisoner has the right to respect for his correspondence, including correspondence with his solicitor.

New prison rules were promulgated in England to comply with this decision, but they have been criticized as being so restrictive that they negate the spirit of the court's ruling. The new rules provide that visits from one's solicitor must be in the sight and sound of a prison officer, and when the matter involves a complaint against the prison staff, it must be investigated under normal internal procedures. Once proceedings are begun in a court, visits with an inmate's solicitor need only be in the sight of a prison officer. Apparently, prisoners in England are an exception to the principle laid down in the twenty-ninth chapter of the Magna Charta of Edward I (1297), i.e. that a person is entitled to unimpeded access to the courts for the enforcement of his civil rights.
In Sweden prison regulations are far more liberal than in the United States, so much so that there would seem to be little need for prison law libraries, except for self-education. Swedish prisoners are allowed to have private legal assistance whenever they want it, and they have a right to bring complaints about prison officials to the national ombudsman. Swedish prisoners do not lose their general civil rights; they can still vote, they can correspond with or visit any person, they can write to other prisoners, and they have a right to organize for their own interests.42

In Canada the rights of prisoners do not seem to have produced many court cases, but in one case it appears that the Ontario courts are inclined to follow a “hands off” policy. It was held in Re Armstrong v. Whitehead41 that a disciplinary hearing by a jail superintendent was not an inquiry in the nature of a judicial or quasi-judicial hearing (at which an inmate is entitled to a lawyer’s representation). The court said that proceedings relating to discipline in a correctional institution are not subject to review by the courts.

STANDARDS FOR CORRECTIONAL FACILITY LAW LIBRARIES

In recent years standards relating to prisoners have been offered by the American Bar Association, a national commission, the National Sheriffs’ Association, the American Correctional Association, the American Library Association, and the American Association of Law Libraries. Only the last three, however, have produced standards directed specifically to law libraries within correctional institutions.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

ABA Standards—In 1968 the American Bar Association (ABA) published “Standards Relating to Post-Conviction Remedies.” Standard 3.1 states that the initial step in postconviction relief is the preparation and filing of a court application, and that it is usually done by a layman in prison without the assistance of an attorney and without access to more than limited legal materials. It goes on to say that minimum conditions desirable in a prison would include: “(i) availability of stationery and writing supplies, (ii) the right to purchase and retain legal reference materials in reasonable amounts, (iii) reasonable access to any legal reference materials in the prison library, and (iv) free and uninhibited access to courts and to private counsel” (one’s own attorney).44
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Beyond the minimum conditions, the ABA states that it is desirable to arrange for, or to permit, counseling of prisoners on the validity of their legal claims. It suggests that in doing so the following may be appropriately considered:

i. regular visits by lawyers or law students ... arranged by an independent agency, such as the local bar association or defenders association or a law school;
ii. establishment and supervision of an adequate collection of legal reference materials related to criminal law and procedure in the prison library;
iii. distribution of specially prepared pamphlets or brochures to prisoners, prepared by reliable and independent agencies, outlining the scope of post-conviction relief in language and form understandable to the prisoner.45

The American Bar Association says that the state optimally should establish a regular agency to provide legal advice and to represent prisoners in court. It suggests that either the public defender or a special agency created by the state could do that work.

As the court cases discussed earlier have shown, the minimal requirement that prisoners should have uninhibited access to the courts is the principle from which flows the need for adequate prison law libraries, unless the authorities provide such alternatives as legal counsel or some kind of program that assists prisoners in preparing documents to be filed in court.

ABA Report—The ABA Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services published a report in 1973 entitled Providing Legal Services to Prisoners: An Analysis and Report46 which discusses at some length the importance of a law library in a correctional institution. It states that a law library is a minimal requirement for any prison law program, although it is not a sufficient means of assuring access to the courts. Law libraries are fundamental in overcoming the barrier of distance which the state has erected between inmates and their access to the courts. Any person petitioning a court, whether attorney, paralegal or prisoner, needs to survey legal materials. The report points out that even after the Gilmore case, prisons in 1973 did not afford inmates meaningful law libraries, thereby frustrating their access to the courts.

The report further says that states must provide a substantial library, one that an average attorney would need in order to deal
Correctional Facility Law Libraries

effectively and competently with the variety of cases that prisoners have. The report continues, however, that law libraries are not enough, because many prisoners are illiterate. It refers to the president's crime commission finding in 1967 that 82 percent of all prisoners had not completed high school, and that 55 percent had not even finished the eighth grade. By 1974 the educational level of inmates of state correctional facilities had risen, but still 61 percent of them had not completed high school, and 26 percent had only an eighth grade education or less.

Apropos of the latter statement, it should be mentioned that in the 1975 case of Stevenson v. Reed, expert testimony established to the court's satisfaction that reading materials found in law libraries generally are college- or college-graduate-level reading. Of the inmates at the Mississippi prison, 88.2 percent had not finished high school and 56.3 percent had completed less than the ninth grade. Statistics on state correctional facilities in 1974 showed that, nationally, 8 percent of the inmates had completed one to three years of college, and only 1 percent had completed four or more years.

The ABA report refers to a survey which shows that public defenders are overworked; that law student programs are erratic, diverse in competence and scope, and concerned with other goals; and that bar association programs suffer from geographic distance which is costly to private attorneys. The report affirms that alternative solutions must therefore be sought. It recommends comprehensive legal services, provided primarily by staff lawyers and supplemented by paralegals, law students, and in some cases, prisoner assistants, social work students and volunteer attorneys. The report states that a prison legal services office should be independent from the corrections department but located within or near the institution served.

In regard to prison law libraries, the report says that states should establish law libraries in their institutions for prisoner use in addition to providing resident legal services. This should be done for the following reasons: (1) some prisoners do not trust lawyers or paralegals, and wish to represent themselves; (2) inmates benefit from doing legal research because skills employed may be useful later; and (3) the resident legal counsel can also use the law library.

In a discussion of the contents of a prison law library, the report mentions that one set of basic legal materials for each 300-500 prisoners has been recommended. It says that smaller institutions can be served by (1) transferring inmates to a larger institution to use its library (the most common method), (2) circulation of books and
photocopies from outside libraries, (3) reference service by an outside library, (4) service by a mobile unit, or (5) utilizing a small institutional law library backed up by an outside library.

Concerning the staffing of prison law libraries, the report recognizes that a certain amount of expertise is required in running such a library, and suggests that law librarians and lawyers might be relied on to provide consulting services. It also indicates the disadvantages of relying on guards to run the law library, namely, that they are seldom sufficiently educated, and that they have dual loyalties that can result in halfhearted assistance to inmate researchers. There are also drawbacks to having a prisoner librarian, despite the fact that the low pay and high incentive might make this an attractive choice to the prison administration. Inmates are subject to transfer and reprisals; not many of them have a good education; and they would usually require considerable training before they could actually serve as prison law librarians.

The ABA report mentions a program offered by West Publishing Company, the major legal publisher, for training inmate library staff. In the program, four lawyers conduct a series of training sessions for fifteen prisoners at a time, utilizing films, lectures and textbooks. The results are reported to be surprisingly good. These fifteen prisoners in turn teach other prisoners how to use the legal materials and assist them in doing their legal research. Writ writers have not usually been among those seeking the training offered by West Publishing Company.

Among other programs mentioned in the report is one in which professional law librarians have instructed inmates in legal bibliography and research, and another in which legal aid personnel do the teaching. The former program was carried out by Morris Cohen (then law librarian at the University of Pennsylvania) and members of the Law Librarians' Society of Washington, D.C.; the latter was operated by the Legal Aid organization in New York City.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE STANDARDS AND GOALS

In 1973 the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals issued its correctional standards, some of which touched on prison law libraries. Standard 2.3 deals with access to legal materials, and provides that each correctional agency should establish policies and procedures to guarantee the right of offenders to have reasonable access to legal materials. It says that an appropriate
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law library should be established and maintained at each facility with a design capacity for 100 or more inmates, and that a plan should be devised and implemented for smaller residential facilities to assure reasonable access to an adequate law library. The commission maintains that this standard would apply to all prisons and one-eighth of the county and municipal jails (about 500). In all, 1,000 institutions would be affected.

The same standard further provides that the law library collection should include the state constitution, state statutes, state court decisions, state procedural rules and decrees thereon, and legal works that discuss the foregoing materials. Also to be included are federal court decisions, court rules and practice texts, one or more legal periodicals, and appropriate digests of cases and indexes for the described materials.

**NATIONAL SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION STANDARDS**

The National Sheriffs' Association published "Standards for Inmates' Legal Rights" in 1974; two of the rights enumerated concern prison law libraries. The fourteenth right provides that if a prisoner has no legal counsel, he or she has the right to prepare and file legal papers with the court. From this can be inferred the right to have access to law books and other legal materials, including reasonable amounts of writing materials, and the right to confer with other prisoners about his case. This latter right is based on the *Johnson v. Awry* decision. Right 15 provides that inmates must have unrestricted and confidential access to the courts and to executive agencies of government. It says the same rules apply to correspondence in this area as apply in the case of the prisoner's correspondence with his attorney—that is, no examination or censorship of correspondence. Mail from an attorney should be examined only for contraband and may not be read by prison staff.

**AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION/AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION STANDARDS**

"Library Standards for Juvenile Correctional Institutions," produced by the American Correctional Association (ACA) and the American Library Association (ALA), include some standards relating to legal reference materials. These standards, two years in the making, apply to libraries in institutions for delinquent youth, but not to short-term detention facilities where juveniles stay less than sixty days. Standard 2.3.3.3 provides that the book collection in a juvenile
correctional institution should include legal reference materials which satisfy user needs and court mandates, and in regard to the latter it cites the ACA's *Guidelines for Legal Reference Service in Correctional Institutions*. Standard 2.5.4, while discussing the size of the library, states that there should be space adequate to house legal reference materials, and Standard 2.6.3.5 points out that the budget should include funds to provide access to adequate legal collections, as recommended by the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL), in its *Guidelines for Legal Reference Services in Correctional Institutions*.

This writer feels that it would be advisable for any standards addressed to the funding of legal reference collections to note particularly that there must be continuing funding for the upkeep and expansion of such a collection. It is not unusual for some law libraries to spend as much as 80 percent of their annual book budget for upkeep materials. For example, the estimated cost of annual upkeep for the minimum collection for Wisconsin prisons recommended by the AALL was $1,000, which is 14 percent of the initial cost of the Wisconsin minimum collection.

The ACA/ALA Standard 2.6.4 states that its formula dollar amount per inmate for the annual budget of the juvenile correctional institution library does not include funds for legal materials. Funding for legal materials should be added after the formula is applied to an institution. Standard 2.10 wisely provides that the institutional librarian should have specialized training in the use of legal reference materials, probably through continuing education programs.

*American Correctional Association Guidelines for Legal Reference Service*—The second edition of the ACA's *Guidelines for Legal Reference Services in Correctional Institutions: A Tool for Correctional Administrators*, published in 1975, aims to help administrators fulfill the judicial mandate for access to courts through the alternative of an adequate law library. It recommends that the legal reference collection be in an area generally accessible to all inmates, and that it be adequate to house the recommended collection and ten years of growth materials. The collection it calls for is that recommended by the AALL, which it reprints fully. Besides the usual advice to provide good ventilation, temperature control and lighting, it recommends that an area for counseling should be provided, although it need not be in or adjacent to the library. For the sake of legal researchers, this writer strongly recommends that this area not be in the library!

The guidelines recommend that library functions in the institution
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be coordinated under a professional librarian who has had special training in audiovisual and legal reference services. If the law library is not a special section of the institutional library, it should be located in an adjacent area where supervision by one library director can effect economy of staff and provide maximum use of paraprofessionals. The legal reference staff, both professionals and paraprofessionals, should have continuous training by law librarians, attorneys, and others qualified in using legal materials.

It is imperative, state the guidelines, that the law library be open for use by all inmates a maximum number of hours per week in order to allow optimal use of the materials. Space requirements should be empirically tested in order to arrive at both a workable formula for seating in proportion to the total inmate population and a formula to determine the hours the library needs to be open. Factors to be weighed in arriving at a formula are: (1) the average time a prisoner needs for his research, (2) the number of inmates needing to use the library during a given period, and (3) the number of inmates the library can comfortably accommodate at one time. Using these factors, it suggests the following formula to determine how many hours the library needs to remain open during a given period: the number of researchers multiplied by the average time each needs in the library, divided by the number of persons who can work in the library at one time, equals the number of hours the library should be open during the given period. The writer suggests that after one arrives at the number of hours the library should be open, one still ought to use a reservation system so that inmates can count on certain times for doing their legal research. Such a reservation schedule should also take into account the times an inmate can get to the library in view of his work assignments and other activities. The guidelines add that special consideration should be given to inmates who have a court date set. It also states that correctional administrators find that doing research in the prison law library has definite therapeutic value for inmates and contributes to their rehabilitation and paraprofessional vocational training.

Connecticut Department of Corrections Program—Some state departments of correction appear to be making a bona fide effort to provide legal assistance to prisoners in accordance with the Johnson and Gilmore decisions. An exemplary program is that of the Connecticut Department of Corrections, which describes its program in its booklet entitled "Legal Assistance to Prisoners." The booklet explains
that in criminal cases, the Connecticut court will appoint a private
attorney and the state will pay for the attorney if the inmate is
indigent. For civil cases, the Connecticut Prisoner Association
operates a project under contract with the Department of Correc-
tions, which supplies an attorney for indigent inmates.

The booklet also describes the legal reference materials that are
made available to inmates. In each institution there is a basic law book
collection, backed up by a microfilm collection of the more volumi-
nous basic research materials, such as court decisions. By using
microfilm for those materials, each institution is able to provide a
fairly comprehensive library of statutes, cases and related materials
for approximately $1,000, including the microfilm reader. The film-
ing is done by the state library on its own equipment, filming its own
books. The state library also provides photocopies on request from its
law collection. In addition to the basic research materials for Con-
necticut law, the state library has also put on microfilm approximately
100 landmark cases on correctional law from all jurisdictions.

Another worthwhile booklet produced by the Connecticut Depart-
ment of Corrections is Landmark Decisions in Correctional Law,57
which lists and annotates in fifty-eight pages many important prisoner court
decisions under seventeen topics.

American Correctional Association Standards for Adult Correctional
Institutions—At the time of this writing, the “Library Standards for
Adult Correctional Institutions” of the ACA’s Committee on Institu-
tion Libraries is in its final draft stages and is yet to be adopted.58
The draft standards will be discussed here, however, rather than
awaiting their final adoption.

The ACA draft standards are directed to state and federal adult
institutions only and are not appropriate for jails, work farms, or
other similar institutions. Standard 2.3.4.2 provides that an institu-
tion’s book collection shall include legal reference materials that
satisfy user needs and court mandates. A footnote referring to the
ACA guidelines and to the Gilmore and Johnson cases states that every
inmate must have available legal assistance or an adequate law library
collection that meets court mandates.

In Standard 2.4 the various services that should be available to
inmates are enumerated, and legal reference services are included in
reader services. Standard 2.4.2.6.1 says that the legal collection and
reference services should be coordinated with total institutional ser-
ices and should be supervised by a person who has been trained in
the use of legal materials. It adds that in a small institution the legal collection and services may be administered as part of the general library, and that in some cases it may be a specialized branch of the main library. Standard 2.4.2.6.2 provides that specialized training in legal reference service should be continuously available to the staff of each institutional library, including the library director and paraprofessional library aides from the inmate population. It further states that training should be given by law librarians or lawyers who are familiar with the needs of inmates of various types of correctional institutions and with all types of legal materials and services. Standard 2.4.2.6.3 defines legal reference service as making legal resources available to inmates who wish to study legal aspects of their cases, usually with the intention of preparing court writs. The writer feels that this definition is too narrow and that legal reference service should provide inmates with library materials that will help them to determine their rights in both criminal and civil matters that affect them. The standard points out that this requires that inmates have immediately available to them the basic legal resource materials in state, federal and general law, and it refers to the recommendations of the American Association of Law Libraries in ACA's guidelines.59 Legal reference services, it says, should also include copying equipment, microform reader-printers, and a sufficient number of typewriters for typing petitions to the courts. (The writer would add: "or for typing any other legal document.") Arrangements should be made, says the standard, with large law libraries for requesting reference service and for copies of needed materials not available in an institution's library.

Standard 2.5.6 calls for library space that is ample for reading, conferences, and legal reference and research. This standard, as well as similar ones discussed earlier, assumes that legal materials will be kept with the other library materials. It is the writer's opinion, however, that legal research is generally a more serious activity than other library usage, with more immediately at stake for the inmate, namely, his possible freedom. For that reason, the legal collection should be in a separate room, or in a walled-off area, for the sake of quiet and to avoid distractions.

According to Standard 2.6.2.5, the budget of the institutional library should include funds for an adequate legal collection, such as that recommended for each state by the AALL. This standard is subject to possible misinterpretation because of the reference to materials recommended for each state. The AALL Committee on
Law Library Service to Prisoners specifies certain recommended federal materials and general legal materials that should be in all prison law libraries, and it also recommends which state materials are appropriate for correctional institutions in each state. The federal materials are extremely important even in state institutions, because most of the court cases involving prisoners' rights have been in federal courts and have involved federal law.

The formula for the annual purchase of library materials, set forth in Standard 2.6.3, states specifically that it does not include funds for initial collections and for legal materials. Funds for legal materials must be added to those called for by the formula. As pointed out earlier, funds for the annual upkeep of legal materials should be approximately 15 percent of the initial cost of the materials, increasing during periods of inflation.

The qualifications of the correctional librarian, discussed in Standard 2.10, include specialized training in the use of legal reference materials, such training to be gained in continuing education.

COMMENTS ON THE VARIOUS STANDARDS

All of the standards described above, to the extent that they are followed and implemented, will improve the quality of law libraries in correctional institutions, and for that reason they should be communicated to institutional administrators and publicized as attainable goals. It is the writer's opinion, however, as well as the opinion of others, that legal collections and reference service in prisons can not ultimately provide what is really needed. Prisoner self-help is not what is required; it is merely an expedient substitute. What is needed are legal services.

The court in Thibadoux v. LaVallee put it very well, after it had to deny prisoner Thibadoux's petition for habeas corpus for the fifteenth time:

This case presents an unfortunate example of the difficulties and frustrations experienced by a convicted defendant who does not have reasonable access to legal counsel to assist him in presenting his legal argument to the court. Simply to provide penal institutions with law libraries and the aid of inmate legal clerks is not enough. There must be some opportunity for inmates to have access to counsel who would be able to assess the validity of the constitutional deprivations which they have suffered in their convictions. . . . In most cases, the opportunity given to an inmate to discuss his
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problem with someone not connected with the prison system would help alleviate the feeling of unfairness which develops in the minds of some prisoners. In situations in which there is an arguable claim, the petitioner would be able to set forth his argument in a clear and forceful manner.\(^{61}\)

Because of the high degree of illiteracy and the lack of education among inmates, it is unrealistic to expect them to handle their own legal problems above a very simple level. Such expectations are akin to expecting them to deal with their medical problems by providing medical collections in the prison library. It may work for minor aches and pains, but beyond that the inmates must have access to a doctor and medical facilities. When one considers that a minimum basic legal collection initially costs about $7,000, and then about $1,000 a year to remain current, it may be more economically feasible for some institutions to provide access to attorneys and paralegals who work on inmates' legal problems than to establish large law libraries that offer little more than frustration to poorly educated or illiterate inmates. The compromise worked out by the Connecticut Department of Corrections may offer a practical solution that satisfies both the inmate who wants to act as his own attorney and the inmate who is not equipped to do so. By providing both attorneys and a basic law library that relies heavily on microforms and is backed up by the state library, the Connecticut Department of Corrections appears to be meeting the needs of its inmates within reasonable economic bounds. Their program certainly merits close watching by the library and legal community.
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Library Services to Correctional Facilities in Other Countries

PHYLLIS I. DALTON

Corrections facilities in countries outside the United States have been established and have continued to exist for many reasons. Some of these reasons appear to be in conflict: they generally follow the pattern of punishment for the offense, punishment as a deterrent to crime, and confinement for the protection of society. In some instances, however, they include well-developed programs for rehabilitation and education, with the strong motivation for returning the offender to society as a productive member of the community.

Library services in these facilities also follow several patterns, because library programs reflect the aims and purposes of the facilities served. The status of these differing programs of library services to correctional facilities in other countries was determined by a survey of the people in the countries themselves—both in the field of librarianship and in the correctional field. The survey encompassed both a discussion of significant conditions, practices, and movements in other countries with people who have firsthand knowledge, and a review of the literature concerned with library services to correctional facilities in other countries. Library services provided from state, public and institutional libraries were considered. Significant information concerning the activities of library services in correctional facilities in other countries was also provided by international organizations and agencies. The publications of the United Nations relating to criminal justice were informative. The embassies of the countries provided referrals and were a source for facts and materials. An overview of library services to correctional institutions in several countries was provided by the International Federation of Library Associations, Sub-Section of Libraries in Hospitals.

The United Nations has long been concerned about the treatment...
of persons in correctional institutions (which in the traditional sense are prisons), as well as about such institutions in less traditional settings. In 1955 the First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders adopted the current "Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners"; these rules were approved by the UN Economic and Social Council in 1957. The council invited the governments to give positive consideration to adopting and applying the rules to the administration and operation of their correctional institutions.

Although libraries are specifically included in these rules under Rule 40 (Books), they are also a part of Rules 37-39 (Contact with the Outside World). Both newspapers and periodicals for use by prisoners are included in these rules. Rules 77-78 (Education and Recreation) have implications for libraries, because of the recreational aspects of libraries and because of the need for libraries to support educational programs in general and programs for illiterates in particular. Library services are also influenced by other rules, such as Rules 79-81 (Social Relations and After Care).

A survey was made by the United Nations in 1974 to determine the extent to which UN members were implementing these rules. Part II of this survey (Rules Applicable to Specific Categories) was designed to provide an assessment of the extent to which rules are actually implemented. The responses in this summary report are as follows:

1. forty-two member countries indicated that they had implemented Rule 40 (Books), eight had implemented it partially, and five had recognized it in principle;
2. forty-nine member countries had implemented Rules 37-39 (Contact with the Outside World), and six had implemented them partially (in two countries, however, newspapers and periodicals are allowed only by special permission or under supervision);
3. thirty-nine member countries had implemented Rules 77-78 (Education and Recreation), thirteen had implemented them partially, two recognized them in principle, and one had not implemented these specific rules; and
4. thirty-seven member countries had implemented Rules 79-81 (Social Relations and After Care), ten had implemented them partially, seven recognized these rules in principle, and one had not implemented these specific rules.

The total prison population in 1974 in the member countries outside the United States was reported to range from 688 in Fiji to 206,100 in
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India. These minimum standards for the treatment of prisoners are very important, and they constitute the UN's major recognized effort for setting standards in criminal justice administration. Two decades after the establishment of these standards, the evidence of progress toward their full implementation into active penal practice is partially reflected in this most recent survey. A survey made in 1967 concerning the implementation of the "Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners" yielded similar results.

Prison library service is costly to establish and to maintain at an effective level in any country. As the number of prisoners and the number of institutions or community-based facilities increase, so does the need for services from libraries in order to meet the requirements of the institutions. In some countries, the basic philosophy concerning the goal of correctional institutions is the rehabilitation of the offender, to be achieved through classification, treatment and research. Although the chief aim of the penal system may be to deter the potential law breaker, there is frequently an effort made to reform the convicted offender as well. The element of deterrence primarily involves the fear of detection, an aversion to publicity, and the possibility of punishment, rather than the severity of the punishment itself. The accepted concept in these instances is to return the offender to society as a law-abiding citizen.

In other countries, the element of rehabilitation is not evident for a variety of reasons. In these countries, the chief effort made is to remove the convicted offenders from society. This imprisonment may also include a strong element of punishment for the offense. The aims and philosophies of the prisons are indeed reflected in the library service, and in its very existence; they also affect the size and makeup of the collection of books and other materials, the types of services made available, and the access to the library itself.

Prison libraries are not new; Ireland's first prison library was established in 1827 at Richmond General Penitentiary for the purpose of rehabilitation. It has been possible to identify, with a fair degree of certainty, all but one of the twenty-one items comprising the original library. The history of prison libraries in Sweden also covers a long period, dating back to the 1840s. Various plans of library services have evolved in correctional institutions since the beginning of prison library service. The patterns differ from country to country, as well as from one political jurisdiction to another within a country. Regardless of the organization of the service in relation to the institution or the pattern adopted, however, the public library
Phyllis I. Dalton provides a distinct influence on the library service in correctional institutions. The delivery of library service in correctional institutions is often provided by public libraries, with methods ranging from complete service with support from the central government itself, to supplemental service to the central government provided by bookmobiles, book vans or deposit collections. A few examples of public library services indicate the variety of the patterns of that service.

Until about 1960, contacts between Danish prison libraries and local public libraries were limited for the most part to the provision by the public libraries of fairly specialized literature at the request of the prisons. A Danish investigating committee on prison libraries presented a report in 1970 on prison library organization. One aspect of this report proposed that prison libraries should be established as departments of the local public library or central library. As a result, pilot experiments were planned and are being implemented. The present aim of the Danish prison authorities and public librarians is for the libraries in all thirteen prisons in Denmark to become branches of the local public libraries served by a librarian from each public library involved. The plan developed was to establish such a branch in one prison each year. This plan has been carried out so far in the prisons in Horsens, Nyborg, Elsinor and Ringe; the present financial situation is very restrictive of the plan, however. The results within the prisons where the branches have been established are most satisfactory. In each case an agreement or contract is set up between the community and the prison authorities. In Denmark, library service to correctional institutions is not obligatory for the community; when such services are established, the community should be compensated for the services provided. The modern Danish public library recognizes that certain groups of the population are prevented from using libraries in a normal manner. The residents of institutions are included in this population.

Full-scale library service is available to all prisoners in custody in prison and places of detention in Ireland. The service consists of that provided either by special libraries which have been established at some centers or by mobile libraries which visit the centers once a week. The books in both instances are provided by the Public Library Service and are changed at regular intervals during the year.

The prison library service in Sweden is another example of library service to prisons by public libraries with positive results. Experimental library work at the prisons of Kumla and Hall/Häga, sup-
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ported by the Swedish National Board of Education and the Prisons Board, proved the importance of full-scale library service in prisons. This experimentation led to formulation of a five-year plan to develop library service in prisons. The National Prisons Board employs a consultant librarian to supervise and develop library services in prisons. The services themselves are provided by the public library in the community where the prison is located.10

A system of library services has been in operation for some time in the correctional facilities of the Republic of Guyana. These services vary from place to place even though the concept and the goals are the same—that is, to provide prisoners with regular information on developments in Guyana and, in a few cases, to assist them in the pursuit of their individual educational interests.11 The Red Cross Society established the prison libraries in Guyana in 1955 at the request of the Superintendent of Prisons. In 1965 the Red Cross recommended to the Committee of the Public Library that the public libraries take over the operation of the prison libraries. The committee approved the transfer of administration to the Public Free Library; the actual transfer was effected in December 1966. At the present time, the prison libraries are staffed by trained prison officers and are managed as branches of the national library.12

Many other organizational patterns are followed in providing library services to the populations of correctional facilities. While they may vary in effectiveness, all organized libraries have one element in common—the resident populations in each country receive library service to some degree. A description of a few of the patterns indicates clearly that no one organizational setup is followed to achieve that result. Included in the following examples are only those programs which are specifically organized services in contrast to volunteer programs.

In the Netherlands, library services to prisons are under the aegis of the Ministry of Justice and operate separately from public libraries. The prison personnel run the library as an additional assignment. Each prison has its own book collection and a small budget. In some instances there is contact with the local library but mainly for special requests.13

The prison libraries in Belgium are also run by the Ministry of Justice. All Belgian prisons are required to provide a library for their prisoners. These libraries are usually stocked with fiction, e.g., novels and detective stories. The prison of Nivelles has a much larger library
than other prisons, however, and has both recreational and educational books. This prison library serves as a central loan library for all other prison libraries in Belgium.\textsuperscript{14}

The prison department in the Republic of South Africa has the responsibility of developing or instituting prison libraries, an important and integral part of its total rehabilitation program. The department organizes and operates the library services in collaboration with the library consultant of the National Education Section for Library Services. Library services to prisons, provided by the municipal or provincial libraries, include those of supplying books and consultant services. The aim of the department is to ensure that all libraries in prisons conform to the rehabilitative requirements of the inmates.\textsuperscript{15}

The only service provided by the State Library of Queensland (Australia) to inmates of correctional institutions is the facility for enrollment in the extension services which are operated by the state library. Inmates can borrow books for use in study courses and for recreational needs. According to regular procedure, an officer of the Prison Department returns material previously borrowed and collects the requested items. For subject requests, the library staff makes the selections. This service relies primarily on the initiative of departmental officers. The service is available to all correctional institutions in the Brisbane region, but only one institution makes use of it.\textsuperscript{16}

New South Wales is the only state in Australia which has totally separate library service for its inmates. Each institution is different from the others, and an attempt is made to unify the system as much as possible, although this is not feasible for all situations. The Library Services Section of the Department of Corrective Services is divided into two separate areas: (1) the Staff Development Library, and (2) the MacKay Library, which provides both textbooks for inmates studying recognized courses, and recreational reading material to all institutions throughout the state.\textsuperscript{17}

In Switzerland the prisons are not centrally organized but are regionally independent; prison libraries are consequently individually organized also. The libraries are usually served by the personnel of the prison. An exception to this pattern is found in Geneva where the service is provided by a librarian from the public library. The trend is toward cooperation between prison libraries and public libraries.\textsuperscript{18}

The Canadian Penitentiary Service also provides services on a regional basis. The service itself is conducted by one of three agencies in the Department of the Solicitor General. Services in each of the five regions—Pacific, Prairies, Ontario, Quebec and Atlantic—are super-
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vised by a regional librarian. Each regional librarian has the responsibility for library service to the correctional institutions in the assigned region. The institutional librarians are responsible for the prison library in general. Within each region is an institutional library board, composed of the head of social development, the regional librarian (ex officio), the head of the living unit, the institutional librarian, the supervisor of education, and a representative from the inmate committee. These boards have approximately the same duties as public library boards. The responsibilities of the regional librarian in the Canadian Penitentiary Service include the development of improved methods and the achievement of social development objectives through library service.19

While many other organizational patterns for library services to correctional facilities can be reviewed, the true test of organized library service in prisons is whether the program of service which has been developed is effective. Are the people who are denied voluntary availability of public library service now receiving comparable service in correctional institutions? Such a question is difficult to answer, but a few examples of services and use show something of the effectiveness of the services within the correctional facilities.

In Ontario (Canada), library services in prisons have been provided on an organized basis since 1958. Now, both professional and paraprofessional staff are available to provide the service. In the approximately 70 institutions, over 130,000 books are available to the residents.20

The Country Library Service, a division of the National Library of New Zealand, provides the only library service available to prisoners. This program includes a deposit collection of books based on the prison population. Three times a year, each institution is visited by a book van holding about 2,000 titles, and books no longer required can be exchanged. The collection is available to both staff and prisoners, and is usually administered by an inmate under supervision. All users of the library may use the request service, in which a request card may be sent for a particular book or for information about a particular topic to the Country Library System. If this library cannot provide what is required, the request is automatically sent to the National Library in Wellington. Those prisoners who do read take good advantage and appreciate the service.21

In the prison library system in Tasmania, Australia, an effective and well-used request system operates within the library network. Requests are frequently made for specific materials. Often educational
material is requested by inmates for use in correspondence courses and debates. The service is both prompt and comprehensive. Because of the many years of cooperation between the State Library of Tasmania and the Prison Department, this program of library service has had satisfactory results. It is well organized and within the requirements of security. Such cooperation and ease of interaction are conducive to the development of effective and well-used library and information service.22

Within some of the library programs, law library service is specifically included as a part of the availability of library service to people in correctional facilities. In the Pacific and Prairies regions of Canada, all of the prison libraries have the minimum compulsory amount of legal material. The library of the British Columbia Penitentiary, however, has accumulated an extensive legal material reference collection which is heavily used.23 A list of the minimum compulsory legal materials has been compiled by the office of the Canadian Ministry of the Solicitor General.24 While no extensive provision is made for supplying law books and materials to prisoners appealing their sentences or defending their cases in New South Wales, legal assistance is available. In most cases these prisoners are assisted by Legal Aid. If this help is not required or available, the University of New South Wales Law Library is able to provide limited access to a certain amount of legal material.25

The total collection of material in organized prison library service varies from extensive holdings in hardcover and paperback books, to newspapers, and magazines, to a minimum collection of hardcover books only. There appears to be little audiovisual material available with some exceptions. A few examples of prison library service illustrate the variety of the prison library collections.

The correctional system in Japan is centralized into one organization. The administrative problems which relate to control and to securing coordination have been resolved by dividing Japan into eight regions, each with its regional correction headquarters.26 Library service is an important means of correctional education in Japan. Special consideration has been given to the selection and acquisition of books for use by inmates. One manifestation of this concern is the establishment in 1951 of the Advisory Council on Selection of Books for Inmates.27 As of May 31, 1976, the prisons in Japan held a total of 490,607 books in their libraries, with the largest number in the Tokyo section. The individual prison with the largest collection was in Fuchū. The subjects covered include: general works, philosophy,
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history, social science, natural science, engineering, industry, arts, language and literature, with the largest number of books in literature, and the second largest number in philosophy. Approximately 3,000 prisoners are studying in educational and technical training sections within the correctional facilities in Iran. These inmates are mostly between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. A central library with 9,400 volumes is located in the central prison and small collections of 300, 500, and 1,500 volumes are available in other correctional institutions.

The Service central des bibliothèques de l'Administration pénitentiaire of the Ministère de la Justice in France serves 170 prisons. The individual book collections of these prisons range from 500 to 15,000. Approximately 20,000 books are added annually with 90 percent of the prisoners using their libraries. The variety of materials and their uses are similar to any public library, except that there is a greater use of paperbacks. The security-risk inmates can choose from descriptive catalogs or from the weekly mobile service.

The Department of Corrections in Thailand has its own central library attached to the Correctional Staff Training Centre which is responsible for training correctional personnel at all levels throughout Thailand. This library is described as adequate in the number of books and methods of operation. Every prison throughout the country has its own library for both prisoners and prison staff. Books are available in Thai and in English; the book collections of most libraries are made up of Thai fiction, nonfiction, and textbooks concerning vocational training.

The Helsinki Central Prison in Finland has about 500 prisoners, whose average age is twenty-eight and whose average stay is six months. The library has 12,000 books, one-half of which are fiction. A collection of foreign-language literature is composed of 2,000 volumes. The library is open one hour each day and prisoners are allowed to use it once a week. In 1973, 10,000 books were borrowed. Prisoners who look after the library and the prison teacher select the books. All prisoner-librarians receive a short course in librarianship.

Library service programs instituted for young offenders are similar in nature to those in the adult correctional institutions. The greatest difference is that in the correctional institutions for the younger offender, more emphasis is placed on educational programs.

The Canoone Eslahe Tarbiat Correctional Institute in Iran houses approximately 230 teenagers between the ages of twelve and seventeen, who receive both educational and vocational training. To assist
in this education and training is a library of more than 4,000 volumes. This library is a branch of the Institute for the Intellectual Development of Children and Young Adults.\textsuperscript{53}

The reading plan in the borstals in New Zealand has a goal and a guiding philosophy. The philosophy is the consideration of the trainee primarily as a young adult who needs extended reading and education, and only secondarily as a criminal in need of reform. The goal of the library service is to extend to trainees, as individuals, every type of reading which experience or sound reasoning indicates may be of benefit or interest to them. The hope is that the trainees may thereby develop the ability to live more competently, satisfyingly and cooperatively as members of society.\textsuperscript{54}

In the correctional schools for children in Norway, normal public school education is provided. The institutions for children contain school libraries which receive grants from both local and central authorities, as do school libraries in general. The grants are made on a per pupil basis with a basic minimum grant allotted to small schools.\textsuperscript{55}

Programs of library service for jails in other countries also have their identifying characteristics in comparison with other correctional institutions. In the fifty-one jails in Denmark, a nationwide agreement between the state directory for the prisons and the communities' organization was set up in 1975, assisted by the State Inspection of Public Libraries. The agreement states how many books the local library should place in each jail, how often the books should be exchanged, and the duties the librarians should perform in their field of work. Forty-nine jails have joined the agreement to date. The agreement does not stipulate that the direct lending service be done by the qualified librarian from the local library; this kind of service has been established in only three jails. Presently, financial difficulties prevent the local public librarian from performing this service. This all will be reconsidered when the agreement is revised in a few years. Library service to jails is not obligatory for the community. The community should be paid for the service.\textsuperscript{36}

While correctional institutions in Kuwait do not provide library services, a new library is now being established in the Kuwait Central Jail. This library is scheduled to open in 1977.\textsuperscript{37}

There is wide variation in programs, books per capita and staffing in countries where organized library service makes libraries available to the prisoners. These variations are highlighted in the following examples.\textsuperscript{1061}
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While the Justice Department of Government in New Zealand controls prisons, the National Library makes books available to prisoners on a quota basis through the Country Library Service branches. These books are available to both inmates and staff. The superintendent of the prison usually delegates responsibility for the library to a member of the staff, who is generally assisted by one or more inmates. If prisoners or members of the staff wish to read books on a particular subject, or if a particular title is requested, the Country Library postal request service is used. This service provides a channel through which books are available for permanent libraries to be built up in New Zealand prisons. There are financial problems, however, so there are no qualified librarians exclusively in charge of library service in prisons. In 1976, there were 4,535 books from the Country Library Service in 21 New Zealand prisons and borstals. They had been exchanged three times during the year.38

For many years the Hamburg Public Libraries in West Germany have provided a service to the thirteen prisons in the Hamburg district. Apart from the limitations on certain use of books, the libraries are administered along conventional lines.39

The three main correctional facilities in the Atlantic region in Canada have library services provided by the institutions. The two prerelease centers utilize the public libraries located in their own areas.40

In the USSR the libraries of correctional institutions operate with a centralized book collection of social and political literature. Other materials are supplied as required at the place where the library is located. The holdings of the libraries amount to five books per capita. The libraries function as voluntary libraries.41

While varied types of organized library services are provided in many countries, other countries, some of which are among the developing nations, do not yet have organized prison library service. Political unrest has often been a problem in library service development, and severe funding difficulties represent another problem. Literacy programs may take priority over library service, although in some instances the two are combined, as they are in Botswana. Botswana is a country where a high proportion of the prisoners are illiterate; as a result, the provision of language classes takes priority over library services. The Prison Department is small, and the prisons, which are widely dispersed, have an average population of 1,200. Books are available, however, in the seventeen small prison libraries; books can also be borrowed from the Botswana National Library.
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Service, which has branches in most of the towns where the prisons are located. The officer in charge obtains the material requested from the national library; prisoners also have access to the Botswana Daily News and the monthly magazine Kutlwano, which has articles of national interest.42

Some countries have little or no public library service, and few—if any—schools in these countries have libraries; those schools which do have libraries have few librarians to provide service. Library service for correctional facilities does not exist in these countries, nor is it a future plan or priority. Other problems which stand in the way of public library service and library services in correctional institutions include the fact that there are several languages spoken by only small groups of people. Illiteracy and hence lower readership has made library service difficult. In some instances, a kind of service to prisons has developed in proportion to the donation of books and the availability of interested volunteers and organizations.

Problems also exist in the libraries which provide an organized and developed library service to correctional facilities. Problems which presently exist in prison libraries include: outdated book collections or collections unsuitable to the service, lack of qualified staff, inadequate physical facilities, and overall financial difficulties. The results are reflected in the program of services available. Many programs illustrate the problems which exist in organized library service to prisons.

Although there are libraries in prisons in Venezuela, they are hampered in their activities by a lack of human and financial resources.43 In many instances the space occupied by libraries was not constructed for library services. Serious recruiting problems exist in securing librarians for prison libraries and high levels of indifference often exist concerning the prison library program.44

The goal in Denmark is for the prison libraries to function as ordinary public library branches and for the collections to be an integral part of the collections of the local public libraries. Such a relationship means that the collection is selected according to the rules of Denmark’s Library Act, without censorship or restriction, apart from limitations imposed by the quality criteria. In too many prisons, however, and especially in jails, the collections are not sufficiently up to date.45

The Finnish prison libraries presently have about 100,000 books, but two-thirds of them should be replaced. About two-thirds of the prisoners use the library. The library law in relation to prison library
service urgently requires reform. The many problems of providing library services to prisoners in Australia include: lack of adequate finance, mobility of inmates, supply of educational material, and lack of staff.

Many encouraging trends in the provision of library services to correctional facilities are evident in other countries. In Norway, for example, a main characteristic of the prisons is that they are small. This fact, of course, has a certain impact on the size of the libraries and on the solution to the problems related to providing inmates with library service. Currently, experts in public library service are examining the present system and working with prison authorities to find methods and practices to improve library services to inmates.

A doctoral dissertation is in progress in Poland which is concerned with reading in prisons. Early findings indicate that 90 percent of the inmates read newspapers, 75 percent read books, and 25 percent of the respondents read no books at all. On the basis of the early findings, the study has moved on with a view to ascertaining the role of books in the rehabilitation of inmates.

The library committee of the Department of Justice in New Zealand agreed in principle in 1974 that there should be established a separate post of prison librarian. It was envisioned that the person employed would be a professional librarian who would travel around the institutions regularly and coordinate the efforts to get the libraries established on a better basis. The prison librarian would cooperate with the national library, whose book-van loan collection and request service would still be vital in the provision of library service to prisons and borstals. This plan has had to be deferred for the present because of economic difficulties.

The Public Libraries Act, which went into effect in 1962, was an important turning point in the development of the Finnish public library system. The Prison Library Committee, appointed by the Finnish Library Association, completed its report in 1969. The committee proposed that prison libraries, which operate at present on a very restricted scale, should be placed under the control of municipal libraries, as are other institutional libraries in social welfare agencies and hospitals. The change requires a revision of the Public Libraries Act in Finland.

In Victoria, Australia, there is the hope that in the foreseeable future, one of the major local public libraries will provide library service to correctional institutions on a contract basis with the State Library of Victoria. In Denmark, the prison authorities themselves
issued a report in 1970, in which they stated that the aim of the prison libraries in the future will be their establishment as an integral part of the public library network. The plan is to integrate one prison each year into the network.\(^{54}\)

The Ontario region of the Canadian Penitentiary Service has appointed two professional librarians to serve in correctional institution libraries. Thus, two “firsts” were achieved—the first professional librarians to be employed in federal prison libraries in Canada, and the first female to be employed as a librarian in a male institution in Canada.\(^{55}\) Singapore has not yet begun to operate a formal library service to correctional facilities, but is now providing bulk loans to six of the twelve institutions at their request. The book van visits these institutions once every three months; the staff can select up to 400 books per visit.\(^{56}\)

An increased amount of legal information available in prison libraries is urged in Canada, because those in prison have a great need for this information. The development of standards for prison libraries in Canada is also recognized as being of urgent concern.\(^{57}\) The librarian of the Queensland Department of Community and Welfare Services, which administers the Prison Service in Queensland, Australia, is at present undertaking a study concerning library service to inmates. It is anticipated that if the department sets up a library collection or extends usage by relying on the state library extension service, all institutions will be able to participate.\(^{58}\) Library service in prisons in the Atlantic region in Canada is on the upswing, with all institutions showing a greater understanding of the importance of the services which a library can provide. These institutions are in the early stages of developing libraries from a regional standpoint, but already a great deal of reader interest has been generated. Diversified selections of material, as well as library programs, have been developed.\(^{59}\) In the Federal Republic of Germany, closer cooperation is proposed between the public libraries and the prison libraries.\(^{60}\) Each prison in Thailand has a small reading room provided for prisoners, but books are not allowed to be taken out. There is no professional staff in the library; the library is staffed by the prison clerk who is in charge of the book collection. Most books were donated by inmates. This service is new in Thailand and is an experimental step.\(^{61}\) In the Prison of Trent in Italy, a library was set up after finding a suitable room. All of the Italian penal institutions have elementary school education programs for the illiterate and the semi-illiterate.\(^{62}\)

The accepted concept of the Canadian Penitentiary Service is to
return the inmate to society as a law-abiding citizen by creating
conditions within the institution which are as similar as possible to
those of the society outside the prison. While the chief responsibility
remains security, the main objective is to rehabilitate the inmate and
prepare him for successful reentry into society. The traditional tools
formerly used in rehabilitation were not entirely effective, and a large
number of the former inmates returned to crime. In 1973 the Social
Development for Inmate Programs were organized. One aim of these
programs is to adjust programs and activities to individual needs
rather than to organize activities according to operational needs. In
these development programs, all institutional staff work together as a
team directed toward the improvement of the inmate. The libraries in
the institutions are part of the Inmate Programs Division. Under the
South African Department of Prisons regulations, suitable libraries
must be available, as far as possible, for prisons. In the extension of
this service, the facilities of public and other libraries must be incor-
porated.

The chief aims of the penal system in the United Kingdom are to
deter the potential lawbreaker and to reform the convicted offender.
Prisoners may use the prison libraries which depend largely on the
local public libraries for their holdings. Experiments with “open
university” studies, full-time education, and day-release for study are
being carried out. The Prison Department in the United Kingdom is
responsible for providing the accommodations and furnishings, and
the local library provides the bookstock, which is changed periodic-
ally. The Prison Department then reimburses the local library on a
per capita basis determined by the average daily population. In this
way, inmates have access to the total services provided by the local
libraries, such as the request services. Professional library assistance is
provided by the local library, and in some cases this includes the
occasional presence of a librarian at the prison libraries. The library
service is currently under review and a policy statement is in prepa-
ration. There will be an endeavor to standardize the provision of
library service and to overcome present variations.

The Prison Service Staff College serves tutors and students at the
college and the staff at prisons in England, Wales, and in certain
circumstances, Scotland. The range of prisons and their staffs is
diverse and the library provides service for a wide spectrum of
subjects as a result. A computer-produced microform catalog is being
considered. The Hall and Hága prisons, located south of Stockholm
in Sweden, have a high number of volumes issued. They have, in
addition to the regular library service, cultural activities available, such as exhibitions, film shows, dramatic performances and discussion groups. The prison libraries in Finland are under the prison administration division of the Ministry of Justice. They presently have no connection with the library services of the Ministry of Education. It has recently been proposed, however, in two committee reports—the report of the Prison Library Committee and the 1975 report of the Library Committee—that the libraries be run by the local general libraries. In Geneva, Switzerland, the hospital librarian visits the hospital prisoners who want to read. Visits are made to the separated area of the hospital where the sick prisoners are attended. The service is provided by a book trolley with a wide selection of library materials. Usually the hospital prisoners are served individually by the librarian. Central Prisons, which is the only correctional institution in Cyprus, has an average population of 100-200 inmates yearly. The central library in the prison contains 1,000 books of general interest, as well as information and reference materials. The inmates can use the materials in the library and borrow the books, as well as bring their own books from home. The governor of the prisons encourages the development of the library and reports that it is well used.

The penal system exists in many countries to protect the community from those who would break the laws which enable citizens to live together harmoniously and which promote the common good. The purpose is achieved primarily through the process of deterrence and reformation. As much as possible is done in these countries during the sentence to rehabilitate the offender and to bridge the gap between the institution and free society. The interests of the community and of the offender both promote libraries as a part of the process of rehabilitation. The all-important aspects of finance and staff resources vitally affect the development of library service in penal institutions. Some of the countries consider library service a positive factor in prisons because the prisoners can thus utilize spare time during the period of their confinement in an enjoyable and productive way. The inmates of correctional facilities are part of a community, and for the most part, they need and want library services. Because few librarians are available to work with prisoners, more librarians need to be motivated to work with prison inmates. They can actively use their specialized knowledge to help people in correctional institutions to satisfy their recreational, educational and information needs.

Many restrictions do exist in providing library service to prisoners,
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primarily because of the security factor. The restrictions are rigid in a maximum-security institution, but in a well-planned, well-programmed library, such restrictions need not straightjacket the library services offered. The provision of library services is accomplished by cooperation between prison officials and the librarians. Libraries in all correctional institutions can be resource centers—and are in many countries. They are developed with the view that they will compare favorably with good community library service. Prisons are becoming more a part of community life through library services and educational and vocational training programs. Throughout the study of library services in other countries, there is an emphasis on increased research in the field. The subjects include: reading preference of prisoners, availability of legal materials, research into library and information needs of prisons, and general reviews of the present situation with a thought toward the improvement of the library service to prisoners.

A definite need is emphasized for increasing public awareness of the necessity for and the value of library service in correctional institutions. There must first be the recognition that: (1) such a service is needed; (2) provision of reading materials by friends and relatives is not sufficient; (3) handicraft and other such activities do not replace the need for library services; (4) donated books and volunteers by themselves do not comprise a library service; (5) each organized service must constantly be reviewed and evaluated; (6) a higher priority must be given to library service; and (7) this priority must be given both by authorities in the field of corrections and by librarians.

Laws relating to library service in correctional facilities are often enacted but not implemented, or else the library service established under the law is rudimentary. The provision of library service may be dependent on the wishes of the administrative official in an individual institution. The need for the formulation and implementation of standards for library service to correctional institutions emerges as a priority. This need is especially evident in countries where library service is now being provided on an organized basis. The various nations should cooperate in an exchange of information, methods, legal provisions, use, staffing, book collections and programs. Such an exchange of information within the political jurisdiction of a single country improves the effectiveness of the service. Continuing evaluation of the effectiveness of the services provided, however, generally appears to be lacking in the countries with organized services.

Those countries without any service or with only the beginning of
such service can benefit by some of the work which has been accomplished in other countries. European practice offers a good deal of experience, which can give perspective and informed judgments to those who are trying to make correctional institutions and practices effective and rational.\textsuperscript{72} Library service should be among the services which correctional institutions provide especially well. The services provided for inmates should not duplicate those existing in the community, because those services should be available to prisoners. Attention should be paid to the bookstocks so that they include recreational books, books on trades and professions, on living in society, and on law and human rights.\textsuperscript{73}

This consideration of library services to correctional facilities in other countries provides an overall review with specific examples of services. The programs of library services which have been developed in countries with organized library services can provide alternative patterns for those countries which are reviewing their programs, and for countries which have not yet developed service. By studying the current state of library service to correctional institutions in other countries, all countries can ensure that library service of high quality will be developed in a manner best suited to the needs of the populations of their own correctional institutions. A review of the programs provides a description which reflects only a specific time period. Changes are constant in the area of criminal justice; changes are a fact of library services. As standards are developed, revised, and implemented in all areas of correctional services, including library services, progress will be made toward provision of adequate library service to each individual held within a correctional facility, regardless of the country or political jurisdiction in which the institution is located.
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The Correctional Facility Library: History and Standards

BARRATT WILKINS

In a recent survey by the U.S. Office of Education, correctional library programs were assessed overall as poor. Of course, there were a few exceptions. Most correctional libraries surveyed were not making a significant contribution toward the achievement of the institutional goal for inmates of reentry into the community. Governing factors for this situation were: unreliable funding—most correctional libraries do not have a line item in their governing agency’s budget; the lack of library knowledge at decision-making levels; the lack of long-range planning; staffing problems which resulted in no weekend hours (when the inmates were most free to utilize library services); problems of communication and cooperation; and lack of good library services for staff, for it was found that when there was good library service for staff, there would be good library services for inmates.¹

One of the most disturbing findings of this survey was the great difference in the perception of institutional goals between correctional administrators and librarians employed in correctional institutions. For administrators, the primary objective was to provide custody for persons sent to the prisons by the courts. Administrators also hoped to achieve sufficient change in the offender to allow the person a chance to secure a productive place in the community after release. “Reentry” was the catchword. For librarians, “rehabilitation” was the principal institutional goal. This term was frequently used to impart a sense of humanitarianism. It was found that there was little realization given by librarians of this direction in correctional objectives (i.e. reentry), resulting in the paucity of practical, current, detailed reentry information in the correctional library.²

While the results of this 1974 survey are not particularly encouraging, it should be remembered that the development and philosophy
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behind library service in correctional facilities has been cyclic. In the
nineteenth century books were provided to prisons to evangelize
prisoners and make them good Christians. Largely, these books were
religious tracts. By the early 1900s, at least one state (Minnesota) had
recognized the therapeutic value of books in prisons, and by 1905 a
state supervisor was appointed for correctional library programs.
Other states which pioneered in this early development were Iowa,
Illinois, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, and Massachusetts. During the
early twentieth century, the American Prison Association and the
American Library Association worked cooperatively to develop bet-
ter libraries in federal prisons. In the 1930s, encouraged by the strong
advocacy of correctional officials such as Austin MacGormick in New
York and Richard McGee in California, correctional library programs
received a new status in the development and delivery of correctional
services. This encouragement by correctional officials led to the
establishment of the American Prison Association's Committee on
Institution Libraries in 1938. Since that time, this committee has
provided the focus and leadership in the development and publica-
tion of numerous informational, bibliographical, and promotional
items.

In the five years since progress in development and implementa-
tion of correctional library services was last reviewed, there have been
several trends identified which are having a profound impact on the
further development of prison library programs. These include: the
perceived dichotomy between correctional administrators and librar-
ians of the goals of correctional programs; the revision and develop-
ment of library standards to recognize and incorporate new philo-
sophical goals; the accreditation process now being developed by the
American Correctional Association; and the development of court-
mandated provision of law library services to inmates.

Since 1972, the first "Library Standards for Juvenile Correctional
Institutions" has been published; the final draft of the "Library
Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions" has been completed;
the first national "Library Standards for Jails" has been developed;
and Guidelines for Legal Reference Service in Correctional Institutions
has been published. These documents will eventually form a package of
correctional library standards and guidelines to meet most situations
in correctional service programming.

The primary movement for development of new correctional li-
brary standards came from the recognition by the library profession
and corrections officials of the inadequacy of existing standards—i.e.
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the absence of measurement criteria in these areas of library service. This movement has been closely aligned with the widespread interest in applying standards for improving correctional programs by judicial courts, governmental agencies, professional associations, and correctional officials. The result has been development of standards for all areas of corrections, without a systematic and uniform application and evaluation.8

To remedy this situation, the American Correctional Association in 1974 received a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to establish a Commission on Accreditation for Corrections. This committee was charged with developing a voluntary accreditation program for correctional agencies of all types—adult and juvenile correctional institutions, jails, community residential facilities, halfway houses, and probation and parole agencies and programs which include foster and group homes.

Because elements of the new correctional library standards will be incorporated into the accreditation documents, it is important to understand the steps which must be taken in accrediting a correctional agency. First, the correctional agency administrator must apply to the commission to initiate the accreditation process. Upon acceptance by the commission, correspondent status will be conferred on the correctional agency. The agency must then prepare a self-evaluation report utilizing the accreditation document of standards. Assistance from the commission and the American Correctional Association may be utilized in strengthening performance for compliance with standards. After this has been accomplished, a visitation committee appointed by the commission is sent to the correctional agency to verify the self-evaluation report, and another report is submitted. The commission may then award accreditation for a specified period of time, subject to periodic review.9 This process is very similar to accreditation programs in other professional educational, health, and library organizations, and it represents a significant trend in the correctional field which is seeking to be accountable to the community for the public monies it receives and for the programs it administers.

One of the basic assumptions in the development of the new correctional library standards documents has been that the library must be an integral part of the institution's program, and that the library program must play an important part in the preparation for reentry of the offender into the community. This assumption or premise has allowed the library to remove itself from the current debate in the correctional field between those who believe that reha-
bilitation as a concept is a failure and those who believe that rehabilitation is still a viable program. While a majority of correctional officials believe that rehabilitation is a viable objective, the concept has come under increasing criticism by many responsible individuals involved in the correctional field. What remains, however, is that correctional library programs should be based on the provision of quality public library service. Regardless of the outcome of the debate, the correctional library has an opportunity to become a strong ally in any program designed to foster the successful reentry of offenders into the community. Successful reentry means successful rehabilitation.

This dichotomy of program philosophies may be partially resolved by placing stronger emphasis on another major assumption in the new correctional library standards, i.e. that services available to communities, including library services, must be available in correctional residential facilities. Indeed, the federal courts have repeatedly affirmed in the last five years the rights of inmates to read and to have access to books and other information materials. It has been suggested that by removing libraries from the debate on rehabilitation effectiveness, library programs will be strengthened by emphasis on an inmate's right to read as affirmed by the courts and by the accreditation process which will strengthen all correctional programs.

Another trend which has influenced the development of correctional library programs has been the mandating by federal and state courts of a prisoner's right to have access to law library services. This development, based on the famous Gilmore v. Lynch (1970) decision, has created many problems for correctional administrators, as well as for librarians. Guidelines for the provision of legal reference services have been published by the American Correctional Association, and there have been numerous publications addressing the need for development of such services. It is one more trend in ensuring that the same basic services provided in the community are also available to those incarcerated in correctional institutions. To incarcerate a person and sterilize an environment will not prepare that person for reentry into the complex community life and society prevalent in the United States.

It is expected that these trends will influence correctional library programs throughout the United States and that the result will be the provision of quality library service in correctional facilities comparable to those services available to the public.
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Library Services to Young People and Children in Correctional Facilities

MARGARET CHEESEMAN

On any given day there are approximately 46,000 persons under 17 years of age in about 800 correctional facilities for juveniles. These young people may be under six years, although most will be between ten and fifteen; a relatively small number of residents will be between seventeen and twenty-one. Less than 25 percent of the residents will be female. They will stay in the institution an average of nine months.¹

Not included in the above figures are youth who are court-committed to privately operated institutions, nonjuvenile institutions (such as local jails for lack of proper facilities), and special care units for addicts, alcoholics, the mentally ill, the mentally retarded, etc. For purposes of this paper, the term youth will be used regardless of age. Comments will concern chiefly those facilities planned exclusively for the housing of persons under twenty-one years of age who are under court jurisdiction or have been committed by court action. The number of such facilities rose from 722 in 1971 to 794 in 1973.²

Of the 794 facilities in 1973, 367 were operated by state governments and 427 by local governments. Of the 45,694 youth in the 794 facilities on June 30, 1973, 33,385 had been adjudicated delinquent; 4,551 had been declared in need of supervision; 6,397 were being held for court action. The remaining 1,361 youth were in categories such as neglected and dependent youth.³

Librarians planning services for youth in correctional facilities and/or planning to be librarians in such institutions face a variety of factors which are not usually considered in library school classes. This paper will attempt to identify some of those factors and their relevance to library services, as well as to provide a limited description of what is happening in this area of librarianship. It is to be hoped that

Margaret Cheeseman is Library Advisor, Special Library Services Division, State Library of Pennsylvania.
the paper will assist and add to the perspective of librarians by providing a little more information for consideration.

Librarians may approach an institution with preconceptions about its programs and staff which are just as false as the stereotypes of librarians to which we object. Some of those horrible expectations may prove to be correct; many will not. A librarian with an open mind, not expecting the worst, but not playing Pollyanna either, is making a positive approach to the institution environment.

A library in an institution has several unique qualities which strengthen its role as a library. It is usually the only part of an institution which really resembles its community counterpart, and it is almost always the only correctional facility program or activity with direct carryover to the community. The library is also frequently the only activity which is involved with the total institution—or at least, which should be involved with the total institution.

Frequently, the institution is the first situation in which youth have felt that reading was an acceptable or even a desirable activity. "Reading" in this context refers to the use of library materials, not to the format of printed materials. Information, recreation and education can be acquired from records, cassettes, films, etc., as well as from books and magazines. Library materials may offer the only opportunity available to residents for a real exercise of independent choice. Using library materials may be the only privacy which residents have in the institution. From the library, youth can journey out of the facility to distant lands, to happier times with imaginary friends and entirely new personalities.

A good librarian will achieve strength in some or all of these unique features of the library. One girl at a Pennsylvania Institution commented, "The library is a place that you can read and be quiet for 40 minutes and think about anything." Any visitor to this library would agree, however, that the term quiet is relative. It is not a "shhh" kind of library at all.

The librarian who uses the library as a substitute for a nonexistent recreation center at an institution not only fails to use the library for its proper purpose, but also probably retards the development of adequate recreation facilities at the institution by providing an inadequate substitute. The librarian who personally attempts to meet the needs of youth for a friend and confidant, however badly needed, may find the relationship undermining the library's role in the institution as a library. The librarian who ignores institution rules
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with which he/she is not in agreement, instead of working to change them, may find big trouble.

The most difficult part of the librarian's job in an institution is the identification of both the library's role and the function of the librarian. The library's and the librarian's functions must relate to the institution's program and to the residents whom the library serves. These functions may be much more difficult to define than the statement indicates, particularly for the library in a facility where library services have previously been nonexistent and the librarian is starting from scratch. Institutions frequently show considerable divergence between the stated goals of activities and programs and the actual activities and operation, at least in the eye of the beholder. This credibility gap is both confusing and frustrating. For most librarians the special environment of the institution—its organization, restrictions, and other aspects affecting the library—is a rude awakening.

Finding ways to implement normal library procedures may be a constant problem. Deviating too much from normal library procedures as they will be experienced in public and school libraries can be a real disservice to the resident. Youth who are not introduced to the responsibilities of library use, but only to its pleasures, may through ignorance cause problems in school and public libraries later. In extreme cases, this has resulted in youth being recommitted to correctional facilities because of delinquent behavior committed on library premises.5

The first factor which the librarian in most institutions must confront is role identification. Staff, administration, residents, and the librarian may all have different views of the role of the librarian based on experience and stereotypes.

Staff may view the librarian as a person with nothing to do but stamp out books, an obvious babysitter for problem children or for classes when a teacher wants a free hour. Yet, on the other side of the coin, staff may expect miracles from limited resources and librarian's time. Neither convincing the staff of the library's value nor performing miracles is an easy task, especially in the average library where the librarian must perform clerical tasks without assistance, as well as try to provide library services with a very inadequate collection. Both can be done.

An Arkansas librarian has developed the kind of rapport which results in staff support. One visible aspect of that library program is the depositing of books in cottages and at the hospital, so that they are
available to the residents when summer work on the farm, grounds,
dairy, laundry and cafeteria makes it difficult for them to get to the
library. A sure sign of success of that service is the number of
unsolicited comments of appreciation for the books by the residents.\footnote{6}
The cooperation of the staff in the cottages can make or break this
type of service. Materials must be out in sight, and their use must be
encouraged. The librarian must also rotate the small collections
regularly to ensure variety. Many librarians have successfully devel-
oped services of this kind. Where this kind of service is not successful,
it is frequently a symptom of a poor relationship between staff and
librarian.

Librarians may anticipate that because they are working with
school-age persons, they will receive support for library development
from the educators working with the clientele. This may or may not
be the case. Education staff members are frequently new graduates
without experience, and thus may not know how to use library
materials in classroom teaching. Other education staff may have
worked in the situation so long that they have become totally pes-
simistic about the institution, the residents, and probably about edu-
cation in general. This frustration must be met with persistence and
imagination. The librarian may suggest titles which appear to be
relevant to a particular teacher and frequently not only the titles, but
ways in which the titles may be used in the classroom. This kind of
assistance to teachers, which is normally expected of a school librar-
ian, is not the normal experience of teachers in a correctional institu-
tion.

An Ohio librarian both supported curriculum and was successful in
removing the stigma of “baby books” from the children’s titles se-
lected for easy reading by involving the books in home economics and
family-related studies.\footnote{7} Most of the girls would have children if they
did not already have them. A Pennsylvania librarian had a similar
experience using materials with girls who were working at a local
nursery school.\footnote{8}

Administration may view the library as an adjunct of the classroom
with no relevance to the rest of the facility, as a decorative feature to
be kept clean and tidy for tourists, as an available babysitter, or as a
meeting room. On the other hand, the administrator may anticipate
unrealistic immediate benefits from a new library or librarian com-
mensurate with the efforts made to budget and find space for the
library. The librarian must communicate to the administration in a
positive manner what the library is in relationship to the institution’s
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purpose—and that, of course, is much easier said than done. It is important, however, that communication be established both to gain library support and to give the administrator the ammunition needed to justify that support. At one Pennsylvania facility, three legislators were shocked during a surprise inspection visit when a large number of the young men in the institution were found to be reading library books in the cottage units. A librarian’s visit once every two weeks and a small collection supplemented from the public library resulted in a great deal of reading at the location.

A regular schedule of reports with basic data on use is one way to communicate to administration and staff. Such a report should be succinct. Reports should include anecdotal notes on library use, comments by readers, what teachers are using, what kind of material is needed, efforts to identify appropriate material, etc. One librarian regretted not having a camera with her when some boys took their books outside during her biweekly library session. She reported seeing two boys leaning against a wall, surrounded by books and reading to each other. A third boy lay with his head against a tree, reading a book propped on his chest; and a fourth young man worked at a picnic table, practicing from his borrowed book, How to Draw.9

Reports should be fairly formal, but not so repetitive that they become boring. The number and length of reports depends on many circumstances, but should never be less than two per year. Reports should be distributed to as many of the staff members as possible and sometimes to residents. Writing such a report should not be put off because the facilities are not available for a really professional job. Reports should be typed and spaced for readability (a little paper may be wasted in the interests of communication).

The relationship of the librarian to the youth in the institution is a difficult one for many librarians to identify and to maintain. The librarian faces the emotional pull of working with youth who need affection and guidance; the temptation to try to be parent, pal and God is great. Maintaining one’s composure when faced by youth whose only behavior pattern is aggression, however, may present personal problems to a librarian who is, after all, a human being with feelings, temper and temperament. Finding a good balance is not easy, and what constitutes a good balance will vary with every situation. At the same time, youth needs a stable environment, so the librarian must establish rules and maintain them.

Librarians frequently discover that the youth in the facility have
values, vocabulary and behavior patterns which are at considerable variance from the librarian's personal concepts. Youth from urban areas may have somewhat more sophisticated—or at least different—experiences than do youth from rural and suburban areas. There are, then, two cultural shocks to be weathered: (1) the shock of the institution environment, and (2) the secondhand contact with the resident's former environment. Unfortunately, in an effort to approach the residents with an open mind or as a result of a biased interpretation of the institution situation, the new librarian may have personal expectations about residents which color the relationship in advance and result in reactions from both resident and librarian which are based on stereotypes, not reality.

There are very few generalizations which can be made about youth in correctional facilities, although there are many generalizations which “everyone knows” about those youth. Some common understandings may be true of most residents, but there are exceptions to every rule. The youth in juvenile institutions are individuals and, despite common characteristics, should be seen by the librarian as persons, not stereotypes. There are several of these stereotyped ideas which a librarian will hear as “common knowledge” about the resident and the library.

Aside from the age ranges and percentage of male/female residents given earlier, it is true that residents are more likely to come from urban environments than from rural settings. Urban areas have a larger proportion of the population in most states than do rural or suburban areas; on percentage alone, therefore, the number is potentially greater. In addition, the proximity of persons in urban areas tends to create situations which lead to crime and antisocial behavior. Another common factor among residents is likely to be a negative attitude toward society and adults. Youth in institutions have often never had a satisfactory relationship with an adult. Generally, society's representatives, i.e. teachers, police, social workers, and librarians, are viewed as enemies to be outwitted. School performance is likely to have been poor and skill levels are usually low in relation to age. Residents may, however, tackle and read books which appear to be far above their tested skill level. As one California librarian said, “Perhaps the most enlightening observation is that “slow readers CAN and DO read when they are sufficiently motivated with materials relevant to their experiences.” She describes a young woman with a fourth-grade reading ability who worked for two months to read *Down These Mean Streets* because she found it relevant to her past experience."
is not true that youth in correctional facilities will not read or will only read pornography. It is true that the experience of reading for pleasure may be a new one. Furthermore, it is true that youth may have a stereotyped and false picture of the library and the librarian.

A common attitude toward libraries was expressed in Seattle: "I've seen libraries before. You got nothing I want to read." The girl who made this comment was surprised to discover a book to read when *Pimp* was pointed out on the library shelf. The novel *Pimp*, with its realistic picture of street life, is a popular title at the Seattle institution. One girl who had been a frequent resident of the institution over a five-year period told the librarian that the book led to her decision never to join a stable and to curb her own prostitution activities.11

Another misconception about popular titles has been proven false by many librarians. One New Jersey librarian has commented that nonfiction is generally more popular than fiction because youth can more easily relate to real-life situations. Her identification of the most popular subject areas differs somewhat from "poetry, psychology and philosophy," the three *p*'s which are usually cited by institution librarians. In this New Jersey institution for boys, the most popular topics are science, philosophy and self-understanding.12

Stereotypes of correctional institutions may lead to a concern about the danger of working in such facilities. It is not true that the librarian in a correctional institution is in constant physical danger; however, the librarian must be aware of potential security problems. Behavior standards for the library must be established and maintained. Part of the librarian's responsibility is to create a situation which supports acceptable behavior and to require persons in the library to conform to acceptable behavior patterns. The librarian does not want to revert to the stereotype of the person who frowns and hushes, but neither can he or she permit the library to become the site of daily riots and/or a mere nursery.

Most youth are not placed in institutions as a result of their violent behavior. More than one-third of the youth in juvenile institutions are held for offenses such as truancy and curfew violations. Approximately 6 percent are committed for drug-related offenses. Reports on the offenses leading to commitment were made for approximately 65 percent of the youth in custody June 30, 1971. Of those reports, approximately 20 percent of the youth were committed because of misdemeanors, and only 40 percent because of felonies.13 In 1971, the greatest number of commitments at one western institution resulted from burglary/unlawful entry. Liquor use/possession, auto theft, and
shoplifting followed in that order. Only liquor use/possession is truly a juvenile crime, i.e. one for which an adult would not be charged.¹⁴

Librarians are familiar with the misconception which most members of the public have that anyone who works in a library is a librarian. Most librarians, however, have not experienced the misconception that any collection of old, torn, outdated and inappropriate materials constitutes a library. The first librarian in a correctional institution frequently finds that the “library” is a collection of titles more than ten years old, with an encyclopedia dated 1940 or earlier as the respected focal point of the reference collection. The librarian who condemns such a collection in the terms it deserves may alienate persons who have worked very hard to create what they feel is a library. Similarly, the librarian who constantly lobbies for the much-needed clerical assistant may alienate both the staff who feel a major achievement was made when a librarian was hired and the staff who see the librarian’s job as an easy way to earn an exorbitant salary.

The institution librarian, having identified his/her role and how that role will be related to the function of the library as a school, public and special library within the particular institution, will be hampered by a variety of rules, regulations, and other factors which are part of institution life. The realities of institution life almost always result in a library staff of one librarian, perhaps augmented by some residents. If residents work in the library for training, the librarian must plan and supervise a training program, which is time-consuming. If successful, the program will result in a frequent turnover of the aides—which reduces the aide’s usefulness to library operations. Institution residents are at best a poor answer to the staff needs of juvenile correctional facilities.

Institution rules and regulations impose many restrictions. One problem which is frequently encountered is purchasing library materials within the regulations developed for purchasing large quantities of materials by government units. Another problem may be the retrieval of material from youth who are released. Still another difficulty may be determining how to get youth to the library in groups small enough to communicate and browse, and at the same time to comply with security restrictions.

Facilities for a library in a correctional institution for youth are almost always too small for adequate service. The collection in the library must frequently be disproportionate to the size of the population, because it must serve a wider age range than the average
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school library and does not have the resources of a public library with
children, young adult and adult collections to draw on. One-third of
the facilities in the 1971 report had fewer than 25 residents; approx-
imately 70 percent house fewer than 100 persons. Nevertheless, the
library must be prepared to serve youth in an age range from six or
younger to seventeen or older. The minimum collection of 4,000
volumes recommended by "Library Standards for Juvenile Correc-
tional Institutions" must indeed be well chosen to meet the needs of
that variety of individuals for recreation, information and education
materials. Almost none of the juvenile facilities has space for a
collection of that size even if the collection is totally print-oriented.

In terms of facilities, an even greater problem than size is that of
location. If the library is located internally in a school building, it may
be inaccessible to residents who are in vocational classes outside the
building and to all residents outside of school hours. Many residents
need the library most during evenings, weekends and holidays when
their television programs are not shown, they have no visitors, or they
just want to be alone and quiet. If the library is not located in the
building where classes are held, however, much greater effort is
needed to get teachers actively to use library materials in their
teaching. The library advisory committee of one institution which has
had major renovation and expansion identified its biggest mistake as
the failure to assign responsibility to one committee member to
monitor the detail work done after approval had been given for
library space. Problems which could have been avoided included a
large office and small workroom, too many windows, and shelving
which did not meet library specifications.

There is a very real problem for the librarian planning the content
of a collection. No library that I have used had all the materials the
librarian thought were needed. This is certainly true in the library
serving youth in a correctional setting. Furthermore, it should go
without saying that the library is not just a "book place." Selection of
materials in this situation may present some new problems for the
librarian—not selecting the best of several titles, but finding a single
good title. For instance, participation in sexual activity does not
necessarily mean that the individual has any knowledge of the biology
of sex. What is appropriate information? What format is most effec-
tive? How much money can be used for the material? Will the
material offend staff to the extent that it will not be used, and may
even cause serious adverse effects for the library? Is material available
which has the level of interest needed by the population, with an appropriate level of reading and vocabulary? Is any material, however unsatisfactory, better than nothing?

Reading patterns of youth in institutions are often very interesting, reflecting their home background, current interests of the public and titles available in the library. For instance, one girl went through the following material in roughly the order given: animal stories; series of stories about a family in which the father had died; stories about coping with alcoholics; titles by Cavanna, du Jardin, and Mary Stolz; filmstrips on family living and sex education; books on sex; and books on nursing. Another girl read books from the professional library; titles by Rod McKuen, Ferlinghetti, Camus and Gibran; drug books; *The Hobbit; Wind in the Willows*; and *Charlotte’s Web*—in no particular order.18

The very normal desire to find a better approach has led many librarians to develop library service to institution residents, particularly youth, with exclusively nonprint materials. An overemphasis on nonprint software can result in the materials being used as an opportunity to play with the equipment. Selection for a facility must take into account the available hardware, available materials, depth of coverage needed, and the proportion of expenditures among various formats. Print is not an inferior medium, nor is it the only medium. Identifying the perfect proportion of subjects and formats in terms of needs, budget and facilities could use all the capabilities of an IBM computer.

Most institutions do not have library budgets. Institution libraries are supported by gifts (old books and magazines), federal funds (ESEA, LSCA and LEAA grants), and odd amounts which the business office finds unused in some category. Real planning for library development seems impossible at times—and is impossible at others.

Many institutions are not located within easy reach of a good public or school library; moreover, many librarians in public and school libraries resist lending materials to correctional institutions. This situation naturally reduces the interlibrary loan resources of the librarian. The attitude that the institution will lose or destroy all interlibrary loan books is based on a false premise. Institution libraries probably have more control and less loss than noninstitution libraries. The institution librarian may have to develop statistics to prove this to librarians in the institution’s local area.

What are the positive aspects of library services to youth in correctional facilities? Librarians working with youth report that the satis-
faction of achievement is an outstanding strength of this aspect of librarianship. Susan Madden reports the ultimate compliment by one resident to the collection of a youth institution: "Far out. Even the reference books are far out." A teacher at the same institution, the King County, Youth Service Center in Seattle, reported that one girl's repeated comment, "I hate to read," seemed perfectly logical to the girl, despite the fact that she had been at the center for only five days and had read two books. Those books didn't count: "But that's different. You let me read what I want to read."19

Marjorie Foley reported similar experiences with many older youthful offenders at a youth forestry camp in western Pennsylvania. One memorable experience was a young man who, although initially negative toward the library and reading, eventually read a wide variety of titles as different enthusiasms took hold. For a time he identified with Hercule Poirot, Agatha Christie's dapper Belgian detective with a carefully waxed mustache, which is surely not a predictable identification for a center city youth.20

One public librarian who provides a weekly library program at a youth forestry camp for older male offenders noted a very gratifying improvement in the manners and behavior of her patrons as they found her programs responsive to their interests.21 Furthermore, she has seen the attitudes of staff at that institution change from pessimistic to very supportive of the library services.

Where can the librarian in a correctional facility get help? Most state library agencies have an institutional consultant who may be able to assist with some problems. The amount and type of assistance will depend upon the structure of government in the state and the number of responsibilities which the consultant has. The Health and Rehabilitative Library Services Division of ALA is the most active professional group concerned in this area. In addition, there are library units in both the American Correctional Association and the Correctional Education Association. To obtain information about membership and activities of these groups, the executive secretary of the ALA, ACA or CEA should be contacted.

Many school and public librarians are willing and able to provide some kinds of aid. The two kinds of aid most often available from these resources are interlibrary loan and the opportunity to preview materials before purchase. Some consultant aid and program help may also be available.

There is a very limited literature to provide assistance. Some titles related to general library services in institutional settings have value
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for librarians in every kind of institution. There are some articles concerned only with library services to youth in correctional institutions. A review of the literature in that specific area since 1974 resulted in the bibliography at the end of this article, which is limited to titles identified as having content of value for practical application. There is considerable literature on the correctional facility, case studies of residents, and theory and practice.

In using the literature, there are two factors which must be considered even more carefully in this subject area than in most. Evaluation of literature describing institutions and residents indicates too frequently a subliminal bias based on the particular author's experience which can result in total false inferences by the inexperienced. Literature describing the libraries in institutions is frequently highly philosophical and theoretical, announcing projects not yet implemented with no additional reports of actual experiences to prevent duplication of error. Many efforts like this issue of Library Trends are being made to correct this situation. Library service to the youth in correctional facilities is very much needed. It is a very rewarding service to offer. Librarians must, however, expect aggravation and frustration, as well as a sense of achievement, for their efforts.
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Public Library Services to Correctional Facilities

JANE POOL

A survey of recent literature concerning libraries in correctional facilities leads to an important conclusion. It is that, during the 1970s, one of the most significant trends has been the accelerated growth of services to institutions by public library systems and local public libraries. Stout and Turitz label this relationship "the public library connection." LeDonne discusses the trend in her article in this issue of Library Trends. Gruensfelder, director of operations for the Chicago Regional Office of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, agrees that correctional institutions should receive their library services from public library systems and states that community safety may be improved through the relationships formed between public libraries and the correctional systems.

A recent study prepared for the State Library of Ohio, entitled Trend Toward Partnership; A Study of State Institution and Public Library Cooperation in Ohio, is representative of reports funded by LSCA grants which outline advances and suggest further goals in the integration of library services between institutions, including correctional facilities and public libraries. In his introduction to this report, the State Librarian chronicles a typical relationship: in 1940, library services to institutions was one of the ten programs of the Ohio State Library; in 1967, a Library Consultant for Institution Libraries was appointed; during the years of 1968-75, the State Library Board approved fifty-seven grants, totaling almost $500,000 for library services in state institutions; and in 1975, the State Library Board funded a study of accomplishments and future goals of public library services to state facilities.

This final article in an issue of Library Trends concerned with library services to correctional facilities is an analysis of the factors which have influenced the extension of public library services into correc-
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FACTORS PROMOTING PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES TO CORRECTIONAL LIBRARIES

From the literature and through informal communications with librarians, this writer has identified seven factors which have influenced this acceleration of public library services to correctional facilities. They are:

1. Growing awareness of the need for public libraries to serve the disadvantaged;
2. Inclusion of recommendations for services by public libraries in library standards for correctional facilities, public library systems, and state library agencies;
3. Accelerating trend toward cooperation among all libraries into organized systems and networks;
4. Recent court rulings on prisoners' rights to read and to have access to legal materials;
5. Declarations by prisoners of a desire to have access to public library materials and information;
6. Realization by correctional sociologists of the necessity for the incarcerated to maintain contacts with society and to have reentry briefings; and
7. Appropriation of federal, state, and local funds for correctional library services.

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES TO THE DISADVANTAGED

During the 1960s, public libraries in the United States began vigorous programs to extend services to the disadvantaged: those citizens in the population who, because of lack of education, economic circumstances, or geographical location, were not participating in the benefits of public library services. In addition, the members of society confined to institutions—correctional facilities, hospitals, nursing homes—were included in the library's larger public. A realization by public librarians of the need to serve the disadvantaged was one of the first factors to encourage public library services to correctional facilities. Brown, in introducing a section on the institutionalized in her book about library services to the disadvantaged, explains that inmates of correctional institutions are twice disadvantaged: they are
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alienated both from society and from the educational and recreational facilities of society.5

Of all the possible relationships which may exist between correctional facilities and public libraries, no relationship appears more logical, more feasible, than that between public libraries and county and city jails. Some public libraries have served local jails for many years,6 but the availability of federal funds for pilot programs has increased the linkages between public libraries and those disadvantaged adults and children who are residents of local detention facilities.

During the American Library Association 1976 Midwinter Meeting, the ALA council passed a resolution affirming support of public library services to inmates of local jails and detention centers.7 In the resolution, ALA went on record in encouraging public libraries to provide service to everyone within their "taxing districts," including adults and youth in local correctional facilities.8

In 1974, staff members of the Maine State Library conducted a national survey of county jail libraries. In the survey, thirty-six states reported jail libraries, at least in some county facilities. To the question: "Are any of the jails served by public libraries in the community?" thirty-two respondents indicated that library services to jails in their states had been initiated by public, county, or regional libraries.9 A year earlier, the ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table Task Force on Service to Prisoners had compiled a list of sixty-seven jail library service programs.10 State surveys of jail libraries also have been taken in Arkansas11 and in California.12

Descriptions of public library services to jails indicate varied programs. Stout and Turitz report on several jail libraries in their Wilson Library Bulletin article.13 In a discussion of national and Texas jail library development, Mounce describes four Texas public library programs, outlines problems in establishing jail services, and makes recommendations of professional responsibilities toward jail library services.14 Additional descriptions of public library services to jails are available in issues of the publication Inside/Outside15 and in a bibliography of materials concerning jail library services, compiled in 1976 by the outreach consultant of the Texas State Library.16

One of the earliest examples of public library programs to jails is provided by the Los Angeles County Public Library. In 1912, the county library began service to jails under contract with the sheriff's department. All Los Angeles County jails and selected "Juvenile Halls" receive public library branch services. In 1975, the library
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began audiovisual services to ten county correctional institutions. The program, funded by an LSCA grant, provided cassette players and super-8mm film projectors, tapes and cartridges for individual inmate use in facility libraries, as well as 16mm film projectors and sound filmstrip projectors. At the end of the project year, it was anticipated that full audiovisual services would continue in six of the ten institutions. Funds for the audiovisual program will come from the sheriff's department and the probation department, contractors for other library services.17

LIBRARY STANDARDS RECOMMEND PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES

The realization of the propriety to serve correctional facilities from public libraries is evident in the current library standards. A second causal factor which has promoted a relationship between correctional facilities and public libraries is the inclusion in library standards of suggestions of cooperation. In all of the library standards written during the 1960s and 1970s, recommendations are included for public library cooperation in services to correctional institutions. In the Minimum Standards for Public Library Systems, published by the American Library Association in 1967, specific mention is made of a library system's responsibility to serve, among others, "inmates of hospitals and institutions." The standards include an outline of service requirements: "Ease of access, new techniques of service, specialized materials, staff with special competence, and financial support within or in addition to the annual budget." The standards further suggest that services may be given either in the institution or in the public library, sponsored by the library acting independently, or in conjunction with other agencies.

The American Association of State Libraries' Standards for Library Functions at the State Level, published in 1970, emphasizes the role of the state library agency in the integration of institutional libraries into the total state library community. These standards suggest that it may be necessary for public libraries or state libraries to assume complete responsibility for library services within institutions on a contractual basis (although at that date, the writers emphasized permanent responsibility should be assumed by the individual institution) and strongly urge that public libraries or other adjacent libraries function as sources for special services and for materials.

In a recent draft of the "Library Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions," formulated by the American Correctional Association's Committee on Institution Libraries, the authors include among the
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reasons for new standards a trend toward "more emphasis upon community involvement with the correctional institution and its programs." In Section 2.6 of the standards, the agency responsible for library service is defined as "public libraries, public library systems, departments of corrections, correctional institutions, state libraries, etc." In the "Library Standards for Juvenile Correctional Institutions," an almost identical definition appears for "agency responsible for library service." It is: "the public library, public library system, department of corrections, state libraries, etc." Two useful compilations of guidelines exist for jail libraries. These include suggestions for relationships between public libraries and local correctional facilities. The first, entitled "Jails Need Libraries, Too; Guidelines for Library Service Programs to Jails," was written by an AHIL committee. The guidelines suggest that: "Public libraries have a responsibility to serve all the residents of the community. About 75 per cent of jail inmates are residents... and will ultimately return to life in that county." The second compilation of guidelines, written for county jail standards, was developed by the Ad Hoc Committee on County Jail Library Standards of the Illinois State Library. These guidelines include the statement: "Public libraries are responsible for providing library service to all persons living within their taxing areas, including residents of jails." The authors of the guidelines suggest an arrangement by which the local public library will provide general services and materials, while the jail may provide funding for legal materials.

LIBRARIES COOPERATE IN SYSTEMS AND NETWORKS

The trend to organize all libraries into systems and networks is another factor which has promoted cooperation between public libraries and correctional institutions. In 1934, Theodora Kellogg described how the Seymour Library (Auburn, N.Y.) supplied duplicate copies of fiction titles to the library of Auburn Prison. By June 1933, she wrote, the number of books in the Auburn Prison collection had increased to 175. In contrast, the 1965 survey of libraries in state-supported and federal correctional facilities for adults noted that collections in all state correctional libraries in eight states and in all federal institutions contained at least ten volumes per resident, the standard for correctional libraries. While the numbers of volumes had increased by a large ratio during these intervening thirty years,
most of the collections which were examined in the 1964 survey were found to be from "50 to 90 per cent substandard or obsolete." 

In order to improve the quality of existing collections and to provide current services to facilities without collections, state library agencies have turned increasingly to public library systems; many of these systems may now provide such services as rotating collections, branch libraries, interlibrary loan, and special services such as discussion groups, storytelling, and film series.

The draft standards of service to adult correctional institutions contain a concise summary of the role of the system in correctional services:

The institution library should have cooperative interlibrary affiliations with the various segments of the library community. It is impossible for the institution library to have a collection broad enough to meet all requests. By utilizing the collections of libraries participating in a cooperative library network, the correctional library can provide the same access to materials for its users as the free citizen finds through his public library.

The plan for library services to correctional institutions in Illinois may serve to illustrate how public library systems, coordinated into a statewide network, may serve residents. In Illinois, planning for service to institutions began in 1965, funded by an LSCA grant. First, the State Library Institutional Consultant worked with a library consultant for the newly reorganized Department of Corrections. In turn, the Department of Corrections requested state general revenue funding to support institutional library services, contracted by the state library with the various Illinois public library systems. From 1971 until 1975, the beginnings of programs were supported by LSCA, the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, the Illinois Department of Corrections, and individual public library system funds. Beginning in fiscal year 1975, the programs have been supported by state revenue funds as well as by LSCA funds. For the fiscal year 1976, a total of $647,214 was provided by the state in supplemental grants to public library systems to serve correctional facilities.

A summary of services for correctional facilities in two public library systems for 1976 illustrates the Illinois plan. In the Corn Belt Library System, services for two facilities included the following activities: acquisition of books, periodicals and sound recordings for residents and staff; photocopying of legal materials; publication of a monthly newsletter for one facility; and a film series.
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Library System serves the Marion Federal Penitentiary and four state correctional institutions. Services to the facilities included general public library services, assistance with educational programs, and access to legal materials (within the facilities and from the Southern Illinois University School of Law Library).34

PRISONERS' "RIGHT TO READ" AND LAW COLLECTIONS

A fourth factor in the development of public library services to correctional institutions has been the rulings on recent court cases concerning the provision of library services to prisoners. At least four cases have provided rulings which support adequate library collections and services in prisons and jails—collections and services unlikely to be available without the cooperation of public libraries. In the first case, *Cofin v. Reichard*, the court ruled that prisoners retained all the rights of free citizens, except all the rights taken from them by law. The other three cases relate specifically to county jails. The decision in *Brenneman v. Madigan* stated that persons in pretrial detention must have access to the same tax-supported community services as did those persons free on bail. Library services and reading materials are mentioned. In *Collins v. Schoonfield*, the court ruled that the jail library collection was inadequate for indigent inmate readers. It further directed the jail officials to study the matter, according to a constitutional need. Finally, in *Jones v. Wittenberg*, the court ruled that the sheriff must provide library services to prisoners.35

In his article in this issue of *Library Trends*, Werner discusses court cases which have provided legal bases for the provision of legal reference services and materials in correctional institutions. As early as 1972, the San Francisco Public Library budgeted $10,000 for legal materials in the city and county jails.36 The Cook County Jail project is another example of public library legal services to jails.37

If, as LeDonne and Werner suggest, the basic legal resources in individual institutions may be provided by microfiche collections, additional legal resources may be obtained through systems of interlibrary loan. Libraries in Illinois are presently members of a statewide interlibrary loan network through their relationships with public library systems.38

PRISONERS RECOMMEND PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES

Another factor which has promoted the partnership of public libraries and correctional libraries has been the expressions of sup-
port from prisoners. An example of this support is a letter written to Publishers Weekly editors. In it, the writer, a prisoner at the Federal Correctional Institution in Lompoc, California, presents an articulate appeal for local public library service. He urges that all prison library services be provided by public libraries; through these services he foresees increased communication with society.39

Other prison writers suggest similar services. Clontz advises state or public library agencies to assign staff members to coordinate library activities in institutional libraries, and to assist inmate committees in book selection.40 In an article in the recent Wilson Library Bulletin issue on prison library services, members of the Inmate Library Committee of the California Training Facility at Soledad describe branch libraries which they established in addition to a central library, with the aid of LSCA funds. For special requests, they rely on items available through loans from the local public library and the California State Library.41

INMATE NEEDS TO REMAIN IN CONTACT WITH SOCIETY

One of the more recent trends in the sociology of corrections is to provide prisoners with access to society, both during incarceration and upon reentry into the community. This goal is reflected in standards for libraries, in surveys of prisoner information needs, and in conferences. It is an important factor in promoting the growing alliance between public libraries and correctional facilities. The public library, with its community relationships and, in recent years, its efforts to provide community information and referral services, is the logical agency to provide in-prison information and reentry information, in addition to recreational, educational, and legal materials. In section 2.3.4.4 of the draft “Library Standards for Adult Correctional Institutions” appears the following statement: “The Collection shall include materials helpful in preparing inmates for reintegration into the community. Such materials should include information on community resources, job opportunities, educational and vocational training opportunities, general information, reference works, etc.”42 In a brochure entitled “Jails Need Libraries, Too; Guidelines for Library Service Programs to Jails,” information needs of prisoners are listed. Among these needs are those concerning family problems, such as divorce or adoption of children, and care of other dependents.43

In a Workshop on Jail Library Service prepared by consultants from the California State Library during the Second National Jail
Manager's Seminar in 1974, an attorney who works with corrections identified difficult civil problems of inmates as: landlord-tenant problems, job separation problems, income tax problems.\footnote{44}

In an answer to the attorney, LeDonne has described a second type of information which the correctional library should supply. It may be described as re-entry information:

There are all kinds of information that should be provided for people in jail. . . . They need to have information about community resources, about job markets, about educational opportunities . . . . They can also be informed about places where they can get satisfactory recreational and social contact.\footnote{45}

From a survey of a sample of inmates from the Maryland State Division of Correction, Vogel identified four categories of prisoner information needs. These needs were: sources of prison rules and regulations, channels for communication with families and with agencies to provide family support services, legal materials, and materials and assistance for educational and vocational planning and training.\footnote{46} In her conclusion to a report of the survey, Vogel writes:

The needs of inmates described above could suggest a number of ways that libraries can expand their services beyond the casual reading collection level and even beyond the increases in accessibility that many inmates desired[. . .] . . . special displays and topical bibliographies . . . greater depth and breath of collections . . . special files on job opportunities, community resources, GI benefits and family services.\footnote{47}

In August 1976, Vogel and an inmate group from the Maryland Penitentiary hosted a conference entitled "Exploring Information and Communication Needs of Inmates." Among the suggestions to improve communication inside the prison was an information and referral service in the library.\footnote{48}

One example of public library service in re-entry information is the service established between the Napa County (California) Library and the county jail, which is located across the street from the library. Library and Correctional Department staff cooperate in providing reentry services.\footnote{49} Finally, in the "Library Recommendations for County Jail Standards," there is a statement which succinctly describes the public library's continuing role in the reentry process: "Referral services to the public library most convenient to place of residence or employment when the resident leaves the jail."\footnote{50}
INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR CORRECTIONAL LIBRARIES

Of all the factors which have encouraged a growing relationship between correctional facilities and public libraries, none has had a greater influence than the federal funds, which since the late 1960s have been available. The histories of prison library services written by MacCormick and by Rubin, the analysis of citations on prison libraries by Gillespie, and the special section on institutional libraries which appeared in the spring 1966 issue of the *AHIL Quarterly* all emphasize the lack of adequate library services before the availability of federal grant funds.

During the following ten years, 1966-77, federal funds, which have been made available through several programs, have made it possible for state libraries to hire institutional consultants, to write statewide plans for service to institutions, to finance pilot programs (increasingly through public libraries), and to encourage the state and local funding of correctional library services.

In a recent *Bowker Annual*, Hughey explains the present Library Services and Construction Act titles. Into Title I, Library Services, the early Title IV-A, State Institutional Library Services and Title IV-B, Library Services to the Physically Handicapped, have been combined with other public library services since 1971. During fiscal year 1973, LSCA funds provided slightly over $2,000,000 for the funding of state institutional library services; in fiscal year 1974, the total was over $2,500,000.

Appropriations have been used for state library consultant salaries; for the establishment and improvement of library services; for library personnel; for equipment and materials; for workshops, in-service training, and institutes; for public library services; and for the organization of library systems among all types of libraries and institutional libraries. In addition, Title III, Interlibrary Cooperation, provides for union lists of resources, networks for acquisitions, reference and interlibrary loan, and increased coordination among libraries of all types within a geographic region.

A second source of federal funding for correctional libraries is LEAA, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, which has been involved in ninety projects during the years 1971-76 and has awarded more than $4,500,000 in grants for four types of library projects: prison law libraries; library services to aid reentry for prisoners, often to improve educational standards; general library materials and services, including statewide programs; and library services and materials for correctional personnel.
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In addition to LSCA and LEAA funds, other federal sources have been available. In some states, Elementary and Secondary School Act funds have been appropriated for use in juvenile institutions and for educational materials in adult facilities. To a smaller degree, Social Security Act grants and CETA funds have also been used for libraries.

The result of federal funding, uncertain though it is from year to year, has been to provide money for state consultants for institutions, for state surveys, and for pilot programs. In addition (and probably more important), it has enabled state library agencies, librarians, and volunteers to demonstrate the value of library services for correctional facilities. In several states, and, it is to be anticipated, in more states, the demonstration projects have aided in the passage of state legislation to provide for correctional libraries. State support of public library services to correctional institutions in Illinois was based upon programs which were planned and begun with federal funds.

Because it may be necessary in many states to write LSCA grant proposals to the state library through public library systems, correctional institutions and public libraries cooperate in grant applications. The Texas State Library has received an LSCA Title I grant for $375,000 to be used for library services in institutions. To receive funds, proposals must be written jointly by public libraries and state or local institutions; grants may be awarded only to the public libraries. Prisons, jails, and halfway houses are three of the acceptable facilities included in the list of institutions eligible for funds.59

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This article has been a survey of factors which have influenced the growing relationship and cooperation between public libraries and correctional facilities: (1) a growing awareness of the need for public libraries to serve the disadvantaged; (2) the inclusion of recommendations for services by public libraries in library standards for correctional facilities, public library systems, and state library agencies; (3) an accelerating trend toward cooperation among all libraries into organized systems and networks; (4) several recent court rulings on prisoners' rights to read and to have access to legal materials; (5) declarations by prisoners of a desire to have access to public library materials and information; (6) the growing realization by correctional sociologists of the necessity for the incarcerated to maintain contacts with society and to have reentry briefings; and, finally, (7) appropriation of federal, state, and local funds for correctional library services.
The future relationship between public libraries and correctional facilities appears promising. The public library can be the agent through which all of the nation's library resources are available to the residents and staff of detention institutions. Librarians who are assigned to correctional facilities can maintain contacts with other public librarians and may draw upon the special skills of all the public library staff.

In correctional facilities, public librarians have a captive audience—a segment of society probably unfamiliar with library services. It is an opportunity to learn of the interests of the residents and to introduce public library services to them. In addition, public librarians can learn to recognize the special informational needs of the residents and be prepared to contribute to their successful reorientation into society. Finally, the residents themselves may preserve and enhance their integrity as individuals through a stable relationship with an agency of society.
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