CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Canada

NL 339 (r. 86/09)

CHANGING NATURE OF RIOTS IN KINGSTON PENITENTIARY 1835 TO 1980

Stan Lipinski

A thesis submitted to the
Department of Criminology in
conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

Graduate Studies
University of Ottawa

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express thanks and appreciation to my thesis supervisor, Dr. C.H.S. Jayewardene, for his direction and insight -- both of which were invaluable.

****

ABSTRACT

****

I.

Rioting in Canadian prisons has generated a voluminous literature. This literature is reviewed together with literature on the subject in other countries. The review reveals that the material has contributed little to an understanding that lends itself to the control of the phenomenon. Part of the problem could lie in the possibility that, over the years, the nature of the riots have changed and studies have been sought to explain what is essentially a heterogeneous phenomenon as if it were a homogeneous one. This study will examine the nature of prison riots in Kingston Penitentiary occurring between the years 1835 and 1980, and, if the nature of prison riots have changed, to test the hypothesis that the change reflects the changing nature of society. This study utilizes ten variables -- the date on which the riot started; the manner in which the riot started; the place where the riot originated and to where it spread; the length of time that the riot lasted; whether hostages were taken; the number of inmates involved; the damage that was caused by the riot-both of property and life; the reaction of the staff; the manner that the riot terminated; and what the riot sought to achieve -- to compare and contrast the prison riots that have occurred during a 149 year period to establish their similarity and dissimilarity to one another and related the nature of the riot to the prevailing socio-economic conditions to test the hypothesis being examined.

In total, 18 riots were examined and compared between 1835 and 1980. The first period spanned the years 1835 to 1873 during which disruptions consisted primarily of spontaneous inmate reactions against prison staff. The second period took place between 1873 and 1920 during which the incidents involved inmate escapes. The third period included the years 1920 to 1970 during which prison rioting became increasingly violent. Lastly, 1970 to 1980 witnessed a riot which was of a nature that was unexplainable. During the first period, socio-economic conditions in a developing Canadian society were rural and agricultural. It was this nature of society which affected the nature of inmate reactions and responses. The second period was a time of increasing urban and industrial development. Such a change brought on an increasingly different response by inmates. An emerging cosmopolitan society brought with it changes in outlook and behavior by inmates. A third period covered a segment of time that witnessed changes in the society brought on by world wars, unprecedented economic and social growth, increasing Americanism, unionism, unemployment and growing urban unrest. These changes grew in conjunction with a growing willingness by inmates to demonstrate. Lastly, the riot of the fourth period was found to have no significant associations between the changing nature of the riot during this time frame and the socio-economic conditions of society.

III.

A total of four separate groupings of incidents make up that which is the changing nature of inmate riots. These groupings show the nature of those riots to have been heterogeneous. All four of the phases of rioting show a series of outbreaks among inmates along various points of a continuum. Despite some similarities, the nature of the phases of inmate rioting are distinctively different from one another. For three of the periods of inmate rioting, 1835 to 1970, associations are made between the nature of riots and the nature of the society at that point in time. The period 1970 to 1980 was the exception. No relevant associations could be made between the nature of riots at that time and the nature of society.

INDEX

****

INTRODUCTION

****

Riots In Kingston Penitentiary occurred at different periods of time since its opening in 1835. Those riots have been considered primarily as homogeneous phenomenon. Seldom has one riot been considered different from any other riot which had gone before or after it with little consideration given as to whether they reflect the nature of the society in which they occur. Riots have been viewed primarily on their own merits with little regard to such phenomenon as being complex outbreaks which are usually placed into a category with all other riots of varying sorts. Considering prison riots as homogeneous phenomenon makes is difficult for differing perspectives on such riots to take hold. In the past prison riots have broken out for reasons as diverse as escape attempts, or because of harsh treatment and conditions or for political reasons. There would be similarities among all of these different riots but the grouping of all of these outbreaks into one category would detract from the many differences which exist.

The objective of this study is to present a period of social and institutional history upon a continuum of time, examining 18 outbreaks in Kingston Penitentiary and the periods in which they occurred between 1835 and 1980. A total of ten variables were chosen and applied to each of the outbreaks as they were described in the official

reports of the period and the literature generally. On the basis of these variables the riots were compared to one another and the relationship of each to the nature of the society. Such an approach will be used to test the heterogeneity of the riots in Kingston Penitentiary between 1835 and 1980 and, if heterogeneous, whether such riots reflect the changing nature of the society at that time.

The most commonly used definition of riots are based upon definitions such as those in the Criminal Code of Canada where a riot is defined as "an unlawful assembly that has begun to disturb the peace tumultuously." (Criminal Code of Canada, Section 65, 1981). As well other common interpretations of riots are similar to those put forward by Ellis "the transgressions are against persons and/or property". (Ellis, D. P. 3, 1983). To these basic definitions qualifiers and conditions are added with different studies adhering to different interpretations and elements with which to define a riot for that particular study. For this study an operational definition of riots has been implemented as a means of applying a single definition to different outbreaks which have occurred in one institution at different periods of time. This definition defines a riot as being that which disrupts and threatens the operations of the institution. Such a description does not adhere to the usual definition

of rioting as being a large scale outbreak or causing certain amounts of damage. A more encompassing definition examination and comparison of those riots which are less significant than, perhaps, many other riots have been over different periods of time. A steadfast definition of riot, as the term is most commonly used, does not take into account those outbreaks of earlier times which were of a small scale in nature. It is difficult to state that an outbreak which disrupts and threatens the operation of an institution in 1971 is the same in magnitude as one in 1868 yet, that does not mean that one had a more paralyzing effect upon the institution than the other. Therefore, for each outbreak noted in the literature and included in this study one operational definition of riot was applied with consideration given to the effects each outbreak had upon the institution. Such a definition is intentionallly broad to allow for its use over a long period of time which had undergone numerous changes.

Chapter One of this study provided a literature review of various riots and the theories of riots. A review of the literature provides an overview of the range which could exist in any one riot, providing clues to the reasons for such outbreaks and the many in which they occurred. The literature review provides examples of changes which have taken place in various prisons over

differing periods of time, providing some explanations as to what lay behind the outbreak of those riots. Chapter Two describes the methodological approach chosen for this study. Both a Quasi Experimental and Social-Historical approach were considered for this study. The Social-Historical approach was chosen to allow for the collection of as much data as possible for the purpose of comparing riots and whether they wree heterogeneous over time and reflected the changing nature of the society in which they occurred. In chapter Three all of the outbreaks noted in the insstitutional reports were considered within the context of the operational definition of riots and examined according to 10 variables applied to each outbreak. A total of 18 outbreaks were examined in this study from which four separate periods emerged, each different from the other. Chapter Four places those riots examined in Chapter Three into a social context to determine whether the riots reflect a changing society. For each of the four periods noted, some of the more obvious large-scale changes occurring in Canadian society, at different points in time, were defined and tested against the hypothesis that the changing nature of rioting in Kingston Penitentiary reflected the changing nature of society. The social changes noted in this chapter are not by any means complete, however, they are sufficient enough to provide understanding of the nature of the society.

****

CHAPTER ONE

****

LITERATURE REVIEW

Historically the Penitentiary riot in Canada has been part of its Correctional realities. Gosselin tells us that there have been at least twenty one reported riots of some magnitude in Canada between the years 1868 and 1977. (Gosselin; p. 36; 1982). He goes on to point out that though inquiries have been established after many of those riots, seldom has the public ever concerned itself with the findings as to why they occurred. To the public, a prison riot appears to be the natural concomitant of imprisonment.

Feld (1977) claims there has been a willingness by the public at large to accept prison riots as an integral element of a prison setting. No genuine efforts, consequently, were made to try and diffuse those factors conducive to riots. Their continued existence over time has converted penal institutions into time bombs.

Attempts to identify factors which cause inmates to riot have been made. Zeeman and his colleagues tried to comprehend the potential for rioting through a "catastrophe model". Assuming that "tension", "disorder" and "alienation" were a part of a prison setting, they constructed a model which they felt would forecast the "oscillation" of the three variables in the prison setting. Their hypothesis was that the riots were dependent on the level of these elements in the prison setting (Zeeman, Hall, Harrison, Marriage, Shapland, Smith; 1977).

Smith (1980)) has claimed that such a model is limited in its use because it is difficult to actually define the three variables used by Zeeman and his associates. As each prison is different, it becomes impossible to place tangible boundaries on intangible elements of an environment. Whitehead (1979) deals with this aspect of the prison environment in his analysis of the problems one confronts in trying to measure whether any progress has been achieved in general improvements of institutions such as prisons. He points out the difficulties one encounters in trying to define the part that variables, which are vital in determining the environment, play as a stimulus to riot.

McCleery places much of the blame for numerous riots on penal administrators because of their failure to "provide an effective blueprint for institutional change". The times have changed, inmates have changed, yet all too often correctional administrators lag behind. Prisons are filled with human emotion which McCleery accuses penal administrators of failing to come to grips with (McCleery, p. 149; 1961).

Mckay and his colleagues also argue that prisgn administrators often play a role in the riot potential of inmates. This potential, they claim, is dependent on the

uncertainty and ambiguity of institutional direction, rules or regulations as these conditions lead to a state the authors have likened to "anomie". Many inmates feel oppressed if management is not decisive; inmates fail to receive a clear idea of what is and is not allowed. The authors felt that if all inmates know where they stand with management tension and uncertainty could be countered (Mckay, McKay-Krug, Jayewardene; 1977). According to them, it was not the absence of a blueprint for change that caused the problem but the absence of a blueprint for administration.

Fox (1956) agrees that administrative ambiguity could lead to inmate unrest. In the administration of a prison there can be no ambiguities in philosophy or management policies. Yet a strong administration is not, writes Fox, a sure cure against riots. However, it is a step in the right direction. As "total" institutions, prisons deal with large groups of people through the bureaucratic form. A breakdown in the bureaucratic operation, claims Stolz, creates a situation in which those who manage no longer control those they manage. The traditional systemization of rewards, punishments and behavior no longer applies (Stolz; 1978). As a result no part of the system knows what is taking place or where any one group stands. It is exactly this type of situation

that McKay and his colleagues envisage as giving rise to riots (McKay et al; 1977).

The administrative contribution to riots has also been identified as conflict among staff members. (Flynn (1980) claims that conflict among staff leads to conflict among inmates and between inmates and staff. Such a breakdown in communications and cooperation could be a contributing factor in institutional disruption. It is stated that a line of retaliatory reactions take place to the extent that the whole "infrastructure" will breakdown. Severe upheaval, then, seems imminent. With such a breakdown in the effectiveness of staff there no longer continues the conducive element that is necessary to maintain a tolerable prison environment.

An example of disruption among staff, and its contribution to a riot, is provided by Zellick (1978) in his study of the Hull Riots of 1976. Prior to those riots the London Home Office received numerous complaints from inmates at Hull that disciplinary measures by guards were in excess of what was warranted. As well, inmates claimed that guards encouraged inmates to be disruptive as a means of convincing the administration that overtime should be reinstated for guards. Zellick provides a number of examples of management/staff/inmate discrepancies and how they contribute to the growth of a riot environment.

In a study of Illinois' largest penitentiary, Jacobs (1977) concluded that a prison is shaped by its environment. However, as a prison is basically the controlling arm of the State, a certain environment must prevail. This atmosphere is one of oppression. It is an atmosphere that must prevail so long as individuals are placed in institutions which they prefer not to be in no matter what improvements are made.

Wilsnack (1976), however, claims that the atmosphere tends to vary and that the environment that exists transmits certain "cues" to the inmate population. Hence the riot process could be the result of cues which are received by the inmates from the environment. McKay and his colleagues agree with both Jacobs and Wilsnack. They describe four distinct environments which they found could exist in a prison setting: deprivation, blatant oppression, impending disaster and eruption (McKay et al; 1977). Since a prison setting is not static an institution is not characterized by any single environment. The atmosphere of Deprivation is the basic one. This alters reversibly to an atmostphere of blatant oppression, then to an atmosphere of impending disaster and irreversibly to one of eruption depending on the actions and reactions of inmates and staff.

Penitentiaries run as smoothly as they do, argues Flynn (1980), because the inmates allow them to do so. It is argued that a "symbiotic social relationship" develops in the prison and that this relationship is the key to peace or disruption within an institution. Such relationships develop from informal control mechanisms. When these mechanisms are made inoperable, through alterations in the formal control mechanism, the balance established by those relationships is upset and the population becomes susceptible to upheaval.

Individuals who enter penitentiaries have to live in them. That is a point stressed by Cressey (1961). What this means, however, is that for varying periods of time all inmates have to involve themselves in complex social relationships which embrace all segments of the institution. Wolf (1978) states that to understand prison riots it is imperative to understand inmate socialization because the socialization process can suppress certain types of behavior while encouraging other traits. Existing in the prison are many spoken and unspoken rules of behavior. It is these that, Cressey argues, an inmate has to come to grips with. Adaptation to these rules and regulations come to have an effect upon the behavior of the inmates as well as upon the nature of the institution. Living in an inmate society becomes a process of "acculturation", adjusting to norms which must become

internalized for them to face the situations as they arise (McKay et al; 1977).

Unofficial rules, states Banister (1973), become the basis for the development of "personality characteristics". Prisoner personality characteristics develop as a result of their internalizing norms of the institution. In a study involving 175 subjects, Banister found that prisoners adapt to the norms of their respective institutions so thoroughly that, once released, difficulties arise regarding adjustment to norms in the community (Banister; 1973). The relationships between inmates, like the relationships of members of any group with the least bit in common, are the result of the interaction process. This process, Clemmer (1958) points out, is based upon a number of "psycho-social Items" such as reputation before imprisonment, behavior while in prison, attitudes towards the authorities and other similar traits (Clemmer; 1958).

Kirkpatrick (1970) points out that the norms and the code of ethics that inmates must internalize and live by are those which have existed in our prisons and were formed in harsher times. He goes on to say that those norms and ethics would constitute a large factor in the institutional backgrounds of the inmates. All prisons, claims Kirkpatrick, are housing similar "cultural

attributes". Yet each of the institutions differ in which of the attributes are chosen by the inmate body. That, in turn, will come to determine the environment within a prison, determining its volatility. However, the most important feature, Galtung (1961) claims, is that the penitentiary has certain characteristics which force inmates to face "Value Deprivation". What results is a situation where the members of such an institution are no longer able to change their fate in a major sense through any action of their own. The socialization process depends on the environment, therefore, the nature of the prison determines the characteristics of the incarcerated and these characteristics could be those that lead to inmate rioting (Wolf; 1978). Wolf has observed that it is very difficult to determine the extent to which a prison setting communicates the threats and the authority of the administration to those detained.

Goffman studied inmate society and argued that it is a society subject to a deliberate fabrication of tension as a means of controlling inmates. When a new inmate enters prison an indoctrination process takes place. This indoctrination involves debasements, degredation, humiliation, and an assault upon the "Self" (Goffman; p. 23; 1961). After such a ritual the inmate becomes a person entirely different from the one that came

in. The prison environment allows for no escape from its effects. Once the change has been initiated tension is maintained until it becomes completely "encompassing", creating a volatile situation. The prison environment and the inmate culture generates what Goffman labelled a "prison code" which gives the inmates what little cohesion exists.

McCleery (1961) expanded upon the idea that inmates would receive respect and status if they were able to exercise power and negotiate through the channels of authority, willing to face any situation regardless of the consequences: "Anarchy is its own best answer, and the tension generated by anomie can make even the prison inmate and his keeper into political animals." (McCleery, 1961; p. 181). McCleery concluded that, as a consequence, the development of inmate subculture has reached a stage where inmate society is more explosive than ever before.

Cohen (1976) claims that there are a number of means for inmates to express their frustrations. According to Cohen, the course of action chosen depends on which social arrangements are adherred to. These social arrangements will, in turn, be determined by what is available in the institution and what the acceptable paths of action are as dictated by the inmate code. Following

this idea is the claim by Clemmer (1958) that it is often the inmate leader who would control whether a riot occurs or not. In many cases riots are started as a means to establish power. Since the inmate population is often varied, it takes a drastic act like rioting to unify them enough to gain leadership.

Desroches (1) (1974) gave an example of power struggles which can arise between inmates. His example involved the riot at Kingston Penitentiary in 1971. Desroches placed the scenario of the riot in the context of tension between violent and non-violent inmate factions. The violent faction wished to direct the riot towards more destructive goals, while the non-violent faction wished to pursue negotiations. Both factions were seen by Desroches as trying to either maintain or establish leadership over the rest of the inmates.

According to Smith and Hepburn (1979) what is most pertinent is the process of "prisonization" which results in alienation, making inmates susceptible to illogical beliefs: The process sets in upon inmates in maximum security settings. The more coercive the environment the more complete is the process. The quality and quantity of the beliefs the process generates, however, depends on the degree of integration within the inmate subculture.

In developing a model for understanding prison riots Flynn (1980) claims that inmate beliefs is a variable that has to be considered: "Mutually reinforcing emotional stimulation heightens suggestibility." (Flynn; p. 764; 1980). As a result, when generalized beliefs circulate through the institution it can be speculated that an inordinate level of stress and tension exists which could easily trigger a riot. For such beliefs to be in circulation there has to exist a common definition of, and deviation from, the standard norms in the prison. Flynn qualifies this statement by pointing to the need for precipitating factors to exist as a means of confirmation that such beliefs do have some basis in fact for the inmates. The dangerousness of such beliefs, then, lies in the ability or inability of an institution to counter them before they become adopted as fact. Studies undertaken by Firestone (1972) seem to indicate that before the beliefs have any riot consequence group interaction, which enables the beliefs to become "factual" in the minds of inmates, is imperative.

Fox (1956) put forward the idea of riots resulting from inmate beliefs -- be they right or wrong. Such beliefs create a flood of demands and grievances which are usually basic in nature. In turn, these grievances reach a point where it becomes intolerable. Fox presents a number

of examples where inmates continually present a series of complex demands even though they happen to have the best of prison facilities and opportunities.

Morris (1974) assessed the irrational beliefs in a group of fifty-three inmates doing more than ten years in an institution. In some instances Morris found that a number of subjects had a need to maintain certain unfounded beliefs and act upon them as a means of dealing with their immediate surroundings. It made prison life more tolerable. He concluded that maintaining an "illogical belief system" was a means to alter levels of tolerance.

Another study which touched upon inmate beliefs was that undertaken by Haney (1973). A prison setting was established with subjects acting as inmates. The results were that inmates were quick to adapt to a common belief about themselves and others. A host of beliefs were quickly adopted by inmates and those were the ones they came to believe in -- be they true or not.

Scott (1982), in his study of the Kingston Riot of 1971, concluded that there was an undercurrent of misleading beliefs among the inmate population which, he feels, was a prime factor in the turning of the whole incident into a bizarre exhibition of inmate violence. For

inmates, argues Kidman (1947), what at one point is a minor grievance can easily be turned into a reason for a riot. Kidman used as an example the St. Vincent de Paul Riot of 1932 which he claims started from a small grievance regarding unfounded beliefs among inmates that there was to be a cancellation of papers for rolling cigarettes.

Trying to explain prison riots in terms of Anomie Theory, Desroches (1983) states that inmate beliefs in the existence of barriers to achieving legitimate goals increases the dissatisfaction of the inmates to the point that they will direct their rage and frustration, for having failed, towards the group they believe was responsible for those barriers. In addition, inmates, Bates (1936) claims, are not immune from the world. They are aware of the changes taking place around them. Many of the inmates have access to the media and they have some understanding of what is going on. From that information they draw their own conclusions which, Bates states, can often be warped. Inmates can also receive information in a number of forms which may contain just enough truth to incite feelings of injustice and persecution. Issues such as justice for the rich and disparity of sentencing could increase the reform or political concerns of inmates, especially if they personally feel a miscarriage of justice had taken place with regards to themselves. In fact there

are many inmates who maintain a belief that they had not been treated fairly.

Dandurand (1977), commenting on a report on Canadian Penitentiaries, dealt with the problems resulting from promises made -- be it by public or private groups -- and not kept. When this happens one is contributing a variable which could easily be integrated by inmates into justification for rioting. These promises could be implicit or explicit. Especially since World War Two, Jacobs (1977) claims that the prison situation has been one in which the total inmate population experienced an overall increase in expectations. As a result, inmates increasingly maintain beliefs regarding what is rightfully theirs, yet time and again it is much different from what they receive and it is often far from what the ruling bodies are willing to give. Desroches (1983) makes the same point. He argues that over time inmates take for granted certain privileges and they easily become embittered if those privileges are taken away -- no matter what the reason. Added to that is the situation where inmates are promised change and the resulting product is less than they expected.

McNeil (1978) believes that a riot becomes a means of expressing discontent. He describes it as the result of

inmates unable to express their frustrations constructively. He sees riots as the only means some inmates have to deal with the system. Else and Stephenson (1974) also see riots as the venting of frustration. But they claim inmate riots are seldom consciously directed towards reform. Instead they say the riots are just a general rebellion.

More and more prisoners, in the estimation of Brody (1974), are defining themselves as political prisoners. Such a trend became more implicite in the 1960's. This author explains that the traditional boundaries of the definition, however, are not being applied. For many, the term has been adopted as a means to rationalize criminal behavior, pointing an accusing finger at a "corrupt economic system" that oppresses the poor. This makes it easier for them to blame others for the confinement and look upon themselves as victims. Reform movements in prison take the form of a minority group movement which gains momentum from media coverage, placing blame upon the society as a whole.

The notion that riots are a reflection of the instability of the society is expressed by a number of authors such as Kirkpatrick, Conrad and Whitehead. These authors put forward the idea that prison riots stem from

the fact that inmates are a product of the society from which they had come. The riots can be seen as protesting the failures of society and symptomatic of the violence on the streets. The political nature of present day man is such that a number of acts of riot on the part of the inmate may be regarded, in a limited form, as being attempts at reform.

Reform content in prison riots is viewed by Atkins and Glick (1972) as aiding riots to take on new forms. They believe that reform in prisons is historically founded. Riots, then, are a political resource used as leverage. In this context inmates must adapt to their environment using whatever techniques that are available, which in the present day means hostages, media coverage, and negotiations.

Gosselin (1982) sees inmate rioting as a reaction of those who are oppressed, using whatever action is available to them. Rioting, thus, is a very conscious tool of rebellion which the inmates could and will use. Pallas and Barber (1972) have portrayed prisons as tools of the State. In consequence these authors believe that inmates have always rioted as a means of rebellion. Yet, they claim that riots have been political more in essence than in conscious form. An example of what has been considered

the political aspect of a riot has been presented in the description of the British Columbia Penitentiary Riot of 1976. During this riot inmates released statements to the effect that they were being politically boycotted by the then Solicitor General. This press release was an appeal to the public and politicians which was definitely political in nature. The riot has been so described as to present the inmates as having undertaken a very organized political protest through which they sought to bring about change (Culhane. 1979).

A historical study of prison riots has been undertaken by Garson (1)(1972) in an attempt to determine whether there is, or has been, any connection between prisoner reform and riots. The period covered was from 1868 to 1970. From the study the author concluded that there was a weak link between riots and inmate concerns for reform. Nevertheless, there was the suggestion that some of the riots were the result of reformist notions of wanting change without it actually having been expressed as such. In the cases of riots involving certain racial groups in American Prisons, especially Black Muslims, the association between rioting and reform was a little clearer.

Ellis and his colleagues (1974) do not see prison riots as political statements for reform. Rather, they believe them to be the result of certain inmates seeing riots as an avenue to getting something they want. For these authors it is a basic emotion to which one need not add complicating scenarios. Nevertheless, in the Canadian context, Ellis (1)(1982) observed that riots between 1971 and 1980 were "political forms of behavior". He based his decision on what he saw as attempts by inmates to manipulate and mobilize whatever resources were available to them, doing so against the wishes of the administration.

Fox (1956) does not see riots as political because most riots are not planned. According to his observations the "militant political prisoner" is little more than an inmate who achieves more publicity. Woolpert (1978) adheres to the same idea. In an analysis of inmate unionization, he expressed some serious doubts as to the validity of prisoner political reform. "Militant political activism", of the scope which is needed to bring change within prison walls, he believes, is probably non-existant. He went on to say that there will always be small pockets of activism among inmates. Still, the majority of inmates will shy away from any reform-oriented reaction against the system.

An institution which is too strongly geared towards discipline, according to Cohen (1976), creates a categorization of inmates and situations that encourages a "we-they" attitude. As a result, groupings of inmates may develop because of feelings of domination. What could develop, then, is mistrust and hostility between staff and inmates. According to Cohen the elimination of the "treatment/custody dichotomy" from the prison setting will alleviate some aggressive inmate behavior. He argues that staff who oppose a treatment approach must be removed because they will continue creating an atmosphere of aggression. Flynn (1980) contributed to this line of thinking with the claim that emphasis on security can encourage a negative environment to grow, which, in turn will increase the emotional stress that is felt by inmates in prison settings.

Whitehead (1975)(1979) believes that for a discipline approach to work in modern prison settings it must be harsh and complete. But, he points out, the penal system of North America and Europe can only maintain a degree of discipline. Therefore, he argued, the best way to approach incarceration is through less stringent tactics. This he believes would ease some of the tension and aggression that exist in penal institutions. Scott (1982) also concurs, using the findings of the

investigation of the Kingston Riot of 1971, that many of the problems that existed in that prison may have been eased if a more intensive treatment program existed. He goes on to argue that an inmate must be given self-respect, self-worth and dehumanization must be kept to a minimum. Without a rehabilitation program these ends cannot be reached. Also, Scott states that without an emphasis on rehabilitation inmates rely extensively on the inmate subculture for support and direction. As a result a "maximum security psychosis" sets in, creating a situation where security and order become jeopardized "and insurrection and revolt become real threats." (Scott; P. 20; 1982).

Dauber (1979) and his colleagues have explained the differing concepts behind the administration of prisons -- treatment and detention. Two different approaches are involved -- isolation and resocialization. They argue that the two concepts are contradictory. To make their point they compare Ramle prison in Israel, leaning towards the resocialization approach, with Rhode Island Adult Correctional Centre, which was more in keeping with the isolation concept. In Ramle discipline was assured but left to the discretion of the staff which maintained a close association with the inmates. Concern was expressed for the welfare of the inmates. On the other hand, in the Rhode Island example, the rigid and formal approach created

an atmosphere of tension and alienation which was less obvious in Ramle.

A report by the Task Force On The Creation Of An Integrated Canadian Corrections System presents a cautionary note on rehabilitation. Their report stated that too much emphasis on rehabilitation misleads the public and the inmate as well who comes to believe, falsely, in the intent or capability of the correctional system. As well, it was reported that too much emphasis on rehabilitation confused the issue of criminal responsibility and the notion of social determinism. An ambiguity sets in upon the inmate which the writers of the report see as detrimental. Confusion sets in upon the inmate as to whether he should be treated as a responsible individual who is being punished, or, who should be rehabilitated as a means of reintegration into society. The end result, felt the writers, is a feeling of resentment by the inmate towards a society which is seen as not shouldering enough of the blame (Task Force On The Creation Of An Integrated Canadian Corrections System; 1977).

Concern with the deterioration that resulted from overcrowding in prison encouraged Ellis (2) to study the American penal system. He concluded that most of the

violent riots occurred in crowded prisons. There was a strong association between crowded maximum security settings and riots. More inmates placed in the same place, according to this view, creates a social deterioration that will increase the chances a riot may occur. Overcrowding has other effects as well. Bolte (1978) found that disobedience will increase with overcrowding. But, he cautioned that the issue of overcrowding must be looked at in conjunction with such factors as how well an institution is prepared to deal with a problem such as overcrowding, as well as how much is available in terms of money, personnel, transfers of inmates and facilities as a means of alleviating the problems created by overcrowding.

Farrington and Nuttal (1980) found that there was no empirical evidence which could conclusively be used to specifically link overcrowding and riots. However, they conceded that there could be a strong link made between overcrowding and institutional effectiveness that in turn raises the possibilities for riots. In connection to this, Desroches (1983) argues that sheer numbers put a strain on resources, facilities and personnel. With the increase of demands upon all aspects of the prison there is a greater concern shown by the administration for providing basic necessities. Added to this, Desroches argues, the needs of the inmates come to take second place, the emphasis mainly

being placed on maintaining security. Wilds (1973) attempts to explain the effects of overcrowding using the concept of "Territoriality". He claims territoriality is a universal need of all creatures as a means of survival. When invasion of space takes place a violent reaction is not uncommon. All humans have a "Body Buffer Zone" which is part of the human make-up and varies for each of us. Within a prison invasion of that Zone is inevitable. Overcrowding will push the transgressions of territoriality to its limits, increasing the possibilities for violence. Supporting this idea, Veno (1977) found that the more violent the offender, the more "personal space" was required as opposed to those less violent.

With the outbreak of a riot the need arises to provide answers, or excuses, as to why it happened. As a result a host of reasons and theories have been put forward, attempting to bring together the "underlying reasons" (Firestone 1972). Feld (1977) argues that the difficulty in creating solid theories on prison riots and their patterns is that there is no consensus among policy makers, media, the public, or the academic circles. In a study of riots in the United States during the early 1950's MacCormick (1954) looked at "causation" factors and came to the conclusion that, upon investigation of the variables, for every riot that happened there were six other

potential riot situations. He went on to say that one could only speculate as to why riots did not take place in those prisons which had the riot variables.

Existing theories on prison riots fall into three basic types. The first is the "Ethological or Comparative" which sees aggressive behavior resulting from instinctual behavior that is brought about by learned or biological avenues. Second is the "Frustration-Aggression" theory format where inmates are seen reacting with violence because of the stimuli of frustration. Behavior patterns of aggression which already exist are encouraged. Third is the "Classical Conditioning and Aggression" theory format which sees riots resulting as a "conditional response" to stimuli that are brought on by environmental cues (Veno.1977).

Flynn (1980) has formulated a six component model to explain prison riots. The first component comprises "Structural Conduciveness" where such factors as inmate and staff dichotomy, or, no proper grievance system create the basic atmosphere necessary for rioting. The second component is "Strain" which recreates an atmosphere of distance between all levels of inmates and staff. Third is "Beliefs", heightening the suggestibility of negative elements among inmates, altering established norms. Fourth

is "Precipitating Factors" which turn the beliefs of inmates into a confirmed reality. The fifth element is "Mobilizing and Organizing", without which there could not be a riot. Lastly is a "Mechanism of Social Control" that has to be in place to off-set a riot, without which the chances for rioting increase. Several attempts at formulating a general theory has resulted in the identification of different types of riots. McKay and his colleagues identify five events which could lead up to a prison riot such as frustration due to conditions, drastic changes in policy, rising prisoner expectations, the nature of inmates, and the inmate power structure (McKay et al; p.15; 1977). They divided riots from a causation point of view into two categories. The first is "situational" which attributes the riot to the nature of the prison itself, while the second is "importational" where elements of unrest are brought into the prison from the outside.

Hartung (1956) believed that the nature of the inmate, in a socio-psychological interaction, plays a big role in the development of riots. Described were two types of riots resulting from two different sets of factors affecting inmate volatility. The first are "Brutal" riots which were the result of bad food, inhumane treatment, and similar factors. The second are "Collective" riots, taking place because of more general factors such as the

nature of maximum security settings, the type of inmates housed and enforced idleness.

In his study of prison riots Fox emphasizes the sentiment that with the establishment of prisons it was inevitable that prison riots would occur: "First came prisons -- then came prison riots." (Fox; p.1; 1956). He then points out that there has been an increase in prison riots with the growth of the prison system. DeFord (1962), who traced the evolution of the Penitentiary from its early period, also supports this view. With the change in penal philosophy and penal practice the make-up of the inmate and the ensuing reaction to prison life have both ~~been~~ affected. Expressing a similar view in relation to the Canadian system was a report by the Task Force On An Integrated Canadian Corrections System. This report explained that with the growth of the penal system there developed a trend towards the incarceration of more serious criminals. Where once those placed in prisons were "vagrants", "beggars" and "debtors", now incarceration was reserved for the harder criminals. (Task Force On An Integrated Canadian Corrections System; P.4; 1977). As a result of this change, serious problems developed.

Shoom has provided a description of an early Kingston penitentiary and how it reflected mid-nineteenth

century penal philosophy in Canada. "Life in the new provincial penitentiary was routine and discipline was strict" he claims "for penal theory of the age stressed a prison experience which would be painful to the prisoner and exemplary to the others". (Shoom; P.215; 1966). Punishment, he points out, was severe and assured for crimes which today are often overlooked. In a study on early prisons, Edmison has shown how prisons in Upper Canada, of which Kingston Penitentiary was one, reflected the nature of Canada -- the population was small, it was very rural and had a relatively small "serious" crime rate. It seems that a hard existence in society reflected an equally hard existence in the prisons. (Edmison; 1976).

Another author who has provided us with a historical glimpse of early prisons and the philosophy of that time is Bates (1936). Bates proceeds with the notion that Canadian society has been undergoing great changes and that these changes, in their turn, affected the nature of the prisons in Canada. Since the early part of the twentieth century he claims that both the rural and urban areas of Canada have been transformed. With the transformation, human and intellectual freedom has been expanding and fewer restraints have been placed upon society than at any other time in history. He then argues that a new type of inmate has consequently emerged, and

with the new type of inmate there arose new problems in the penal system. A major problem, according to Bates, was that confinement in a prison was less tolerable for those inmates who emerged from this changing society. As a result a restlessness set in from which there was no relief.

Fox found nineteenth century riots to have been quite small and limited in terms of numbers involved and of the violence displayed. Harsh treatment or simply a wish to escape were seen as the major causes of riots. The sophistication of intent, like the society, was not yet developed (Fox. 1956). With a comparison of riots in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries Garson (2)(1972) attempted to test Foxs' hypothesis. He found prison riots in the earlier period to have been much less violent than those arising in the later one.

Flynn (1980) described in a study a penal system which, with time, came to see a worsening of the nature of prison riots. It was argued that during those earlier riots violence was brief, few lives were lost and damage was seldom extensive. In the post World War years, with the development of an increasingly modern prison system, there was a great change in the pattern and nature of prison riots. Violence was not that brief, the loss of life was not inconsiderable and the damage was often extensive.

For Kidman (1974) it was the 1930's that saw prison riots take a definite turn for the worse in Canada. The whole system was described as having been in a state of change, creating confusion as to the nature of prisons. As a result, inmates constantly trod a fine line in an environment of uncertainty and ambiguity that had created a tension for all concerned.

Desroches (1983) has argued that since 1950 prison riots in North America have become more violent with hostages becoming a common feature of negotiations. He has sougth to illustrate this point with the example of changes in prison riots in Kingston Penitentiary (Desroches (1)(3) 1974). During the riot in 1932, he points out, there were no guards taken hostage, and the whole incident remained "peaceful and organized" with no attempts to instigate mass destruction. In contrast the riot of 1971 saw a number of guards taken hostage, a large amount of damage undertaken, extensive negotiations for the hostages, as well as assaults upon the less desirable members of the prison population.

A rather extensive historical study of prison riots has been done by Garson (1)(1972). He studied prison riots in the United States during the period 1868-1970. This study provides a number of examples of the changing nature

of prison riots. From the late nineteenth century up to 1920 Garson gives examples of riots showing them to be limited and isolated outbreaks. The riots were mainly small scale fist fights concerning such things as harsh discipline. The 1920's saw a sharp increase in the size of the prison riot and its violence which continued until the early 1930's. Garson states that from 1952 through to 1970 the nature of the riot in American prisons grew in terms of the numbers involved, increasing in size and occurring more frequently throughout this period. Referring to the situation in Canada and claiming that penitentiaries in Canada have evolved as much as those throughout the world, Gosselin asks: "Why, then, should Canada be exempt from those inherent problems of maintaining correctional facilities." (Gosselin; p. 70; 1982). Problems of prison riots are inherent in all systems with each having its own particular uniqueness.

Gosselin (1982), who took a historical look at prisons, claims that any general theory on riots had to take into account that such incidents were subject to the "realities of history". Therefore, he concluded, one must look to the social/political setting. If this is done, the possibility exists that what is sought to be explained -- prison riots -- will be found not to constitute a homogeneous phenomenon which could be explained by one general theory.

****

REFERENCES

****

CHAPTER ONE

American Correctional Association Committee. Riots and Disturbances in Correction Institutions. American Correctional Association 1970.

American Prison Association Committee on Riots, Prison Disturbances and Riots. Report. May, 1953.

Atkins, B., H. Glick(eds). Prisons, Protests, and Politics. Prentice-Hall. N.J. 1972.

Banister, P., et al. "Psychological Correlates of Long Term Imprisonment". British Journal of Criminology. Vol.13(4), Oct., 1973. pp 312-330.

Bates, S. Prisons And Beyond. Books for Libraries Press N.Y. 1936.

Berkowitz, L. "Frustrations, Comparisons, and Other Sources of Emotion Arousal as Contributors to Social Unrest Journal of Social Issues Vol. 28(1) 1972. pp 77-91.

Bolte, G. "Institutional Disobedience In A Maximum-Security Prison" Offender Rehabilitation. Vol.3(1). Fall 1978. pp 19-31.

Brody, S. "The Political Prisoner Syndrome. "Crime and Delinquency. Vol. 20(2). April, 1974. pp 97-106.

Clemmer, D. The Prison Community. Holt, Rinehart, Winston Inc. N.Y. 1958.

Cohen, A. "Prison Violence: A Sociological Perspective". Prison Violence. A. Cohen, G. Cole, R. Dayley (eds). Lexington Books, Massachusetts. 1976. pp 3-21.

Conrad, J. "The Beast Behind The Wall". Prison Violence. A. Cohen, G. Cole, R. Daily (eds). Lexington Books, Massachusetts. 1976. pp 23-29.

Cressey, D. (ed). The Prison Studies In Institutional Organization And Change. Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc. N.Y. 1961.

Criminal Code of Canada, 1981.

Culhane, C. Barred From Prison. Pulp Press, Vancouver. 1979.

Dandurand, Y. "The Report of the Sub-Committee On The Penitentiary System -- Another Look." Crime and Justice. Aug., 1977. pp 103-109.

Dauber, E., D. Shichor: "A Comparative Exploration of Prison Discipline." Journal of Criminal Justice. Vol. 7 (1) 1979. pp 22-35.

DeFord, M. Stone Walls: Prisons From Fetters to Furloughs. Chilton Co., N.Y. 1962.

Desroches, F. (1). "Patterns in Prison Riots." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. Vol. 16 (4) Oct., 1974. pp 332-351.

Desroches, F. (2). "Anomie: Two Theories Of Prison Riots "Canadian Journal of Criminology. Vol. 25(2), April, 1983. pp 173-190.

Desroches, F. (3). "The April 1971 Kingston Penitentiary Riot." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. Vol. 16 (4) 1974. pp 317-331.

Eastman, M. "Riot and Reform at Sing Sing". Prison Reform. C. Bacon (ed). H.W. Wilson Co. N.Y. 1917. pp 125-128.

Edmison, J. "Some Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Canadian Prisons." Crime And Its Treatment in Canada. W.T. McGrath (ed). Macmillan. T.O. 1976 pp 279-301.

Ellis, D., Grasmick, H. Gilman, B. "Violence In Prisons: A Sociological Analysis." American Journal of Sociology. Vol. 180 (1), July 1974. pp 16-43.

Ellis, D. (1). Disturbances In Canadian Penitentiaries During The Years 1971-1980. York University. La Marsh Research Programme, Report No. 4, July, 1982.

Ellis, D. (2). Size, Crowding And Violence: The Prison As Behavioral Sink. York University. Research Paper.

Else, J., K. Stepheson. "Vicarious Expiation: A Theory of Prison and Social Reform." Crime and Delinquency. Vol. 20 (4) Oct., 1974. pp 359-372.

Farrington, D., C. Nuttal. "Prison Size, Overcrowding, Prison Violence, And Recidivism." Journal of Criminal Justice. Vol. 8 (3), 1980. pp 221-231.

Feld, B. Neutralizing Inmate Violence. Ballinger Pub., Massachusetts 1977.

Firestone, J. "Theory of the Riot Process." American Behavioral Scientist. Vol. 15 (6), July/Aug. 1972. pp 859-882.

Flynn, E. "From Conflict Theory to Conflict Resolution." American Behavioral Scientist. Vol. 23 (5). May/June, 1980. pp 745-776.

Fox, V. (1). Violence Behind Bars. Greenwood Press. Connecticut. 1956.

Fox, V. (2). "Prison Riots In A Democratic Society. "Police". 16 Aug. 1972. pp 35-41.

Galtung, J. "Prison: The Organization Of Dilemma" D. Cressey. (ed). Prison Studies In Institutional Organization And Change. 1961. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York. 1961. pp 107-145.

Garson, G. (2). "Force Versus Restraint In Prison Riots." Crime And Delinquency. Vol. 18 (4) Oct. 1972. pp 411-421.

Garson, G. (1). "The Disruption of Prison Administration: An Investigation Of Alternative Theories Of The Relationship Among Administrators, Reformers, And Involuntary Social Service Clients." Law Society and Review. 6. 1972. pp 531-651.

Goffman, I. "On The Characteristics Of Total Institutions: The Inmate World." D. Cressey (ed) The Prison Studies In Institutional Organization And Change. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York. 1961. pp 68-106.

Gosselin, L. Prisons In Canada. Black Rose Books. Montreal. 1982.

Haney, C., et al. "Interpersonal Dynamics In A Simulated Prison." International Journal of Criminology and Penology. Vol. 1 1973. pp 69-97.

Hartung, F., M. Flock. "A Social-Psychology Analysis of Prison Riots: An Hypothesis." "Journal of Criminal Law Criminology, and Police Science. Vol. 47. 1956-57. pp 51-57.

Huff, C. "Unionization Behind The Walls." Criminology. Vol. 12 (2). Aug. 1974. pp 175-194.

Jacobs, J. Stateville: The Penitentiary in Mass Society. University of Chicago Press. 1977.

Jensen, G. "Age And Rule Breaking In Prison." Criminology. Vol. 14 (4). Feb., 1977. pp 555-568.

Kidman, J. The Canadian Prison. Ryerson Press. Toronto 1947.

Kirkpatrick, A. "The Prison Dilemma." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. Vol. 16 (2). April 1974. pp 282-290.

MacCormick, A. "Behind the Prison Riots. "American Academic of Political and Social Science. Vol. 203, May, 1954. pp 17-27.

McCleery, R. "The Governmental Process and Informal Social Control." D. Cressey (ed). Prison Studies In Institutional Organization And Change. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York. 1961. pp 149-188.

McKay, H., Krug-McKay, B. Jayewardene, C.H.S. Indicators of Disturbances in Penal Institutions. University of Ottawa, Criminology, 1977.

McNeil, G., S. Vance. Cruel And Unusual. Deneau and Greenburg. Canada. 1978.

Minor, W. "Political Crime, Political Justice, And Political Prisoners." Criminology. Vol. 12 (4) Feb. 1975. pp 385-398.

Morris, G. "Irrational Beliefs of Prison Inmates." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. Vol 16 (1), Jan. 1974. pp 53-59.

Morris, T. "The Parlous State of Prisons". J. Freedman (ed). Prisons Past And Future. Heinemann, London. 1978. pp 81-91.

Pallas, J., B. Barber. "From Riot to Revolution." Issues In Criminology. Vol. 7 (2), Fall, 1972. pp 1-19.

Schrag, C. "The Sociology of Prison Riots." Proceedings of the American Correctional Association. 1960. pp 136-146.

Scott, G. Inmate. Optimum Publishing. Montreal. 1982.

Smith, C., J. Hepburn. "Alienation in Prison Organizations." Criminology. Vol. 17 (2). Aug. 1979. pp. 251-262.

Stolz, B. "Prisons As Political Institutions: What Are The Implications For Prison Ministry." Proceedings of the One Hundred and Eighth Annual Congress of the American Correctional Association. Aug. 1978. pp 11-20.

Smith, J. "The Prediction of Prison Riots." British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology. Vol. 33 (2) Nov. 1980. pp 151-159.

Shoom, S. "Kingston Penitentiary: The Early Decades." Canadian Journal of Corrections. Vol. 8. July 1966. pp 215-220.

Task Force On The Creation Of An Integrated Canadian Corrections System. The Role Of Federal Corrections In Canada. Jan. 1977.

Toch, H. "Social Climate and Prison Violence." Federal Probation. Vol. 42 (4). 1978. pp 21-25.

Veno, A., M. Davidson. "Prison Violence: Some Different Perspectives." International Journal of Criminology and Penology. Vol. 5. 1977. pp 399-409.

Whitehead, J. (1). "Violence in Institutions." International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology. London Vol. 19 (1) 1975. pp 87-89.

Whitehead, J. (2). "Violence in Mental Hospitals and Prisons." International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology. Vol. 23 (1) 1979. pp 21-24.

Wilds, C. "Evaluation Of A Method Of Predicting Violence In Offenders." Criminology. Vol. 11 (3). Nov. 1973. pp 427-435.

Wilsnack, R. "Explaining Collective Violence in Prisons: Problems and Possibilities." Prison Violence. A. Cohen (ed) 1976. pp 61-78.

Wolf, P. "The Effect of Prison on Criminality." Past And Future. J. Freeman (ed) 1978. pp 17-102.

Woolpert, S. "Prisoner's Unions, Inmate Militancy, and Corretional Policymaking." Federal Probation. Vol. 24 (2) June, 1978. pp 40-45.

Zeeman, E., Hall, C. Harrison, P., Marriage, G., Shapland, P. "A Model For Prison Disturbances." British Journal of Criminology. Vol. 17 (3), July, 1977. pp 251-263.

Zellick, G. "The Hull Prison Riot". British Journal of Criminology. Vol. 18 (1), Jan. 1978. pp 75-79.

****

CHAPTER TWO

****

METHODOLOGY

In spite of the voluminous literature on prison riots, there has been no uniform definition of such riots. Despite such a lack of consistency riots have been studied as if they constituted a homogeneous phenomenon. There have been a number of phenomena in society which have been considered homogeneous and which have defied comprehension in spite of numerous efforts to understand them. One of the problems involved has been demonstrated to be the fact that what has been studied as a homogeneous phenomenon are a number of phenomena which have been lumped together because of the definition utilized but which are nonetheless morphologically as well as aetiologically different.

Suicide, defined as the conscious taking of one's own life, is the first phenomenon considered homogeneous which has shown to be heterogeneous. In 1951 Emile Durkheim pointed out that suicide was composed of differing aetiological and morphological phenomena. In total, Durkheim defined three types of categories of suicide which are aetiologically founded upon the workings of the social structure. Suide was shown to be a reality which could not be explained in any singular or insular manner. Instead, it has to be understood as an element within a host of social factors which exist in a changing social structure. Previous to the work of Durkheim, suicide was considered to

be solely the product developing from the nature of the individual. In providing a heterogeneous explanation for such behavior, Durkheim explained that "suicide which appears to be phenomenon relating to the individual is actually explicable aetiologically with reference to the social structure and its ramifying functions." (Durkheim; p. 14; 1951).

In 1964 Hans Mohr demonstrated that paedophilia was not the homogeneous phenomenon that it was considered to be. Mohr found that there were really three types of individuals who had been identified as paedophiliacs. They differed from each other in terms of age, consisting of three separate age groups from the teenage years up to those in their sixties and beyond. These individuals were different in regards to the sex of the victim as well.

In 1975 C.H.S. Jayewardene studied homicide in Canada with a view of ascertaining whether homicide was the heterogeneous phenomenon that he suspected it to be. Identifying homicides on the basis of the relationship that existed between the offender and victim, he classified homicide as being a continuum made up of different sorts of homicide, depending on the relationship between the victim and offender. Homicide thus becomes a heterogeneous phenomenon to which there are a number of characteristics

and relationships which become applicable. One incident of homocide differs from another when the relationship between the offender and victim are defined, determining which group of relationships the people involved belonged to.

In these three studies, what has been claimed and demonstrated is that a phenomenon identified in broad terms, utilizing a very minimal number of criteria, really comprises a number of phenomena which have been lumped together. In the case of paedophilia, the demonstration has been made utilizing what may be called an empirical approach where the characteristics of the phenomenon were analyzed not for the purpose of establishing its hetorogenity but for the purpose of delineating its dimensions. In the process it was discovered that included within the broad definition of paedophilia were three distinct and different types . In the case of suicide and homicide, the demonstration has been made utilizing what may be called an experimental approach. It was first hypothesized that these phenomena were heterogeneous and then attempts were made to establish the heterogeneity with the comparison of certain key variables.

In an attempt to study the homogeneity or heterogeneity of prison riots a quasi experimental technique could be utilized. The quasi experimental model is defined by Caporaso and Roos in the following way: "This approach is characterized by an effort to use the logic of experimentation in situations which are not truly experimental; in such situations the investigator cannot randomly assign individuals to groups and cannot control the administration of treatment or stimulus." (Caporaso and Roos; P. XXII; 1973). Yet in the quasi experimental method, the authors stated, design is emphasized and hypothesis are examined by data gathered with attention paid to physical controls. In addition, there is less reliance upon purely statistical controls or data analysis for reducing the deficiencies in the design of any method of this sort.

By using a quasi experimental method, laboratory logic could be closely replicated. However, it would have to be done without standard procedures and techniques of a laboratory approach. This could be done by careful exposure of the sources of error that could weaken the inferences which are forever present (Caporaso and Roos; 1973). When the subject studied is a phenomenon with historical overtones, Helmstadter explained what the quasi experimental approach entails; "a hypothesis as to what

happened may be formulated on the basis of those pieces of information already at hand... if this happened what else may have occurred that could leave data of some sort that could be uncovered?... if my hypothesis is true, what other kinds of data ought to be available that have not yet been found? Finally, the historical investigator seeks to verify his hypothesis by searching for this additional information." (Helmstadter; P. 42; 1970). Because of this the use of the quasi experimental model enables one to uncover facts which may not have been discovered if a less stringent approach were used. Such a model would force those who used it not only to think at an "operational level" of behavior, but also to develop controls to observe the entity being studied.

The quasi experimental model would be of use in formulating "a body of low-level empirical generalizations." (Caporaso and Roos; P. 36; 1973). Because of the elements of this model it offers more opportunities for converting broad generalizations and theory into something more concrete. Hence, it would be of most use in providing building blocks for further studies. The quasi experimental model would be of most use to a study such as this where a claim is made that what has been defined as a prison riot constitutes from a historical standpoint, not a homogeneous but a heterogeneous phenomenon. However, there does not exist sufficient information to identify the

different types of riots. In addition to this the quasi experimental model is one that focuses upon abrupt events. As a result less attention is allowed to be directed towards more long-term events. This draw-back would make it difficult to observe the numerous associations and trends which are vital to a study such as this. It is vital because this study claims that the heterogeneity of the phenomenon is a historical revelation -- that the nature of the prison riot, from a morphological and aetiological point of view, has changed over the years, that a prison riot that occurred during the last century is not the same as a prison riot that occurred during this century. Such a method does not allow for a full feeling of how an entire process unfolds. There is no grasp of the "temporal range" that is vital to a study in which something over a period of time is being studied. The quasi experimental method is essentially a quantitative one and as Leff points out "Quantitative methods alone, indisputable though they often are, can only provide the data, which to become meaningful historically must be processed and translated into human behaviour." (Leff; P.59; 1969). That is what has been called the "atheoretical leanings" of the quasi experimental method which restricts conclusions to that which has been noted through observations. It does not allow for too much speculation as to whether unobserved factors have had any

effect, The method results in the production of generalizations which adds knowledge that is, for the most part, confirmed and factual. But it nonetheless detracts from an overall accumulation of a more inclusive and extensive body of knowledge (Caporaso and Roos; 1973).

Lastly, in determining the suitability of the quasi experimental model for a study of prison riots, the experience of Zeeman and his colleagues, who utilized a statistical approach to study patterns in prison riots, is useful. "The problem, simply, is that conventional statistical techniques are generally unsuited to analyzing sudden, discontinuous events..." (Zeeman et al; P. 251; 1977).

A second method which could be used in this study is a historical-social model. This method has been described by Shafer as entailing first, the gathering of evidence and in that way bringing together as much of whatever happens to compose that which is being studied, then, the categorization of the elements and evidence collected and finally the establishment of some form of the communication of the evidence (Shafer; PP. 24-25; 1980). The historical-social method is the means by which what has occurred in the past is reconstructed and evaluated, then the information is placed within the context of the milieu

within which it has occurred. Practically all actions that occur must be attributed in part to the society in which they develop.

Social researchers often take an interest in situations that do not allow for manipulation of independent variables. Such manipulations are often impossible because many of the situations have already occurred, therefore the groups to be studied have already created their own associations and groupings, as opposed to having been randomly placed. Despite such a situation many interpretations of causal effects and the role of the variables looked at specifically are put forward. The study is a historical-social one in its form, therefore a historical-social model was chosen despite some of its draw-backs.

Helmstadter points out that "As a truly distinctive approach the historical method seems to fit in least well with the general scheme of the scientific method..." (Helmstadter; P. 41; 1970). The historical-social method requires that all of the events which are of interest have to be compared and contrasted with one another. The only real control mechanism available is by comparing previous situations with those that have followed after them. As many variables as possible have to be

uncovered and compared to those same variables which are found to exist, if at all, in other such similar situations which have gone before and after. Differences and similarities have to be noted.

There are some inherent problems with a historical-social method. One such problem is that regardless of the quantity of variables within each of the comparison groups there are no guarantees of similarity in regards to all of the factors which surround the variables in question. More than likely, in the case of prison riots, there will be differences within each of the entities looked at.

Leff had said of the historical-social method that problems exist which are very much a part of the process and would be difficult to overcome: "The historian, unlike the natural scientist, is not in a position to reduce the relation of events invariably to one of cause and effect, least of all sufficient cause, because he is repeatedly confronted by new solutions which cannot be explained in terms of the old." (Leff; P. 59; 1969). In substantiating the argument by Leff, Helmstadter (1970) claims that there is the risk of a degree of exaggeration in the findings with such a method. With a historical-social method an awareness has to be maintained that environmental, cultural

and social expressions of a historical nature are often interpreted in a manner which could result in a degree of distortion. Often inferences are put forward that cannot be validated in any "universal" sense. As one historian warned, using a historical model can lend itself to assumptions which often reflect a personal bias (Shafer; P20; 1980).

A historical-social method is not a completely encompassing substitute for a more statistical and experimental approach. This method is of greatest use for observing that which can never be repeated again either in an experimental setting or even by sheer coincidence. As a result less emphasis is placed upon the deductive and more placed upon the inductive process of reasoning: "In the historical approach, as compared with the experimental approach in particular, but the descriptive approach as well, instances of reasoning from the specific to the general occur much more frequently than do examples of reasoning from the general to the specific cases." (Helmstadter; P. 45; 1970). Where the experimental approach depends on deductions made about the hypothesis based on "proof", the historical-social approach relies upon inferences made from various sources of information that are pieced together.

The historical-social method lacks the tight controls of the more experimental approach. Instead, the bulk of emphasis is placed upon the "gross" effects as well as minimal causes which are attributable specifically to particular variables. Generalizations are needed and should be developed, however, they must be kept within "justified limits".

Despite the draw-backs of their historical-social method the more positive aspects of the method make it ideal to a study such as this. Shafer argues convincingly that "history deals in the past and an important past, with non-measurable things, as pride, courage, cruelty and leadership (only in part measurable). Even if no final judgement can be rendered on many non measurable aspects of history those aspects should be contemplated ... an understanding of the motives, beliefs, frustrations, culture patterns and hopes of the people." (Shafer; P. 6; 1980).

History is dealing with what will never be repeated "exactly". No controlled experiments can be conducted to observe what has taken place. The past is filled with deviations and irregularities that are best looked at in a qualitative manner. "Historical significance" Leff points out," lies in the effect upon

the lives of men." (Leff; P. 59; 1969). The nature of the prison riots, it might appear, are looked at simply for the sake of looking at them as a matter of academic interest. But that is not the case. The nature of prison riots is studied because a riot, perhaps, may be representing something that can be placed in a wider historical and social perspective and concern; "embrace either a certain individual object or event, or a certain finite class of such objects of events, so as to substantiate a certain proposition of a greater scope than covered by the investigation, often a universally valid proposition." (Nowak; P.17; 1977).

To determine the nature of the riot process within what is an ever-changing society requires consideration of change, of time and of space. Clark had mapped out what was entailed when trying to come to grips with historical change of a society and its institutions; "one begins with an examination of the process of disintegration of the society that was: the breaking down of old established habits of thought and behaviour and of established institutional forms, the development of types of deviance which no longer can be considered 'normal' to the society, the growth of new social movements at war within society, the strengthening efforts of segments of the population to separate from the society and form a little social world of

their own." (Clark; P. 11; 1976). To come to grips with such change, value judgements must be made; that will not render the findings any less useful for further research.

Studies drawing upon human and social experiences can best be done in a qualitative manner. To study the actions of individuals or the values of a society is an inductive approach to getting at the humanistic variables which come to mingle with the social attributes of the society. This requires consideration of the human factor which is not always measurable, but which should always be considered. These are the "hidden variables". Such variables are the norms, values, beliefs and other similar factors which can seldom be measured but are predominant ones nevertheless. To the overall accumulation of knowledge these variables are as important as empirical data. To better understand such variables is to better understand all of that which is encompassed by that we call society. Granted there are problems. All of the questions may not be answered, but some progress will result from it. As Rusche had stated "Historical observation can clarify many questions." (Rusche; P. 3; 1978).

The study undertaken here on the nature of prison riots is only the first step of the more extensive study of the riot process viewed in its historical perspective. It

seeks to ascertain whether the prison riot has remained the same in all its perspectives throughout time. This study will be directed to the riots that occurred at the Kingston Penitentiary during the period 1835 to 1980. This limitation has been placed on this study by restrictions of time and the volume of material available.

What will be done in this study is the analysis of prison riots that occurred in Kingston Penitentiary during this period using as many variables as possible. Scientific investigation seeks to answer the five questions of what, when, where, how and why. The analysis will encompass:

(1) the date on which the riot started;
(2) the manner in which the riot started;
(3) the place where the riot originated and to where it spread;
(4) the length of time that the riot lasted;
(5) whether hostages were taken;
(6) the number of inmates involved;
(7) the damage that was caused by the riot -- both of property and of life;
(8) the reaction of the staff;
(9) the manner that the riot terminated; and
(10) what the riot sought to achieve.

Once the data has been collected, the riots will be compared and contrasted to determine whether there has been any change and, if there has been a change, what these changes were and when they occurred. The necessary data will be obtained from a variety of sources. There are a host of articles and texts which have been written on the history of the Kingston Penitentiary, as well as articles written specifically on prison riots making mention of those in Kingston. There are also reports of the investigations that followed these riots; some of them better known as the Swackhammer Report concerning the 1971 riot at Kingston Penitentiary and others less known. In addition there is a wealth of newspaper and magazine articles, and a number of reports of the Superintendents of the Institution and other reports which could give information on a prison riot. Of all of the penal institutions in Canada, Kingston Penitentiary is the most written about in public and academic sources. Kingston Penitentiary is a piece of Canadian penal and social history which dates back to before Confederation. As Babcock had observed: "The history of the Penitentiary has been a long and stormy one." (Babcock; P. 1; 1965).

Referring to the nature of homicide, Jayewardene contended: "Not only must it be averred that the different types exist, it must be shown empirically that what is

conceptually thought to exist," does in reality exist." (Jayewardene; P. 283; 1975). To this may be added the claim that an attempt should be made to explain the existence of the different types. Although this study is limited to a demonstration of change in the nature of riots to the exclusion of explanations of that change, an attempt, nonetheless, will be made to place the changes in their historical perspective. To this end an attempt will be made to describe the nature of Canadian society at the time that the changes occurred.

****

REFERENCES

****

CHAPTER TWO

Babcock, E. "The History of Kingston Penitentiary." Mimeograph. Solicitor General Library, Ottawa. 1965. pp 1-8.

Caporaso, J., Ross, L. (eds). Quasi-Experimental Approaches. Evanston. Northwestern University Press. 1973.

Clark, S.D. Canadian Society in Historical Perspective. Toronto. McGraw-Hill Ryerson. 1976.

Durkheim, E. Suicide. The Free Press. New York. 1951.

Helmstadter, G. Research Concepts in Human Behavior. New York. Appleton-Century-Crofts. 1970.

Jayewardene, C.H.S. "The Nature of Homicide: Canada 1961-1970." Crime in Canadian Society. R. Silverman, J. Teevan Jr. (eds). Toronto. Butterworth and Co. 1975. pp 279-310.

Leff, G. History and Social Theory. Alabama. University of Alabama Press. 1969.

Mohr, J.W., Turner, R., Jerry, M. Pedophilia and Exhibitionism. Toronto. University of Toronto Press. 1964.

Nowak, S. Methodology of Social Research. Holland/USA. D. Reidel Pub. 1977.

Rawls, J. A Theory of Justice. Massachussetts. Harvard Press. 1971.

Rusche, G. "Labour Markets and Penal Sanctions: Thoughts On The Sociology of Criminal Justice." Crime and Social Justice. (10) 1978. 2.8.

Shafer, R.J. (ed). A Guide To Historical Method. Illinois. Dorsey Press. 1980.

Zeeman, E., Hall, C., Harrison, P., Marriage, G., Shapland, P. "A Model for Prison Disturbances." The British Journal of Criminology." 1977.17(3). pp 251-263.

****

CHAPTER THREE

****

AN EXAMINATION OF RIOTS: 1835-1980

Kingston Penitentiary came into being in 1835. During its 149 years of existence, there have been a number of outbreaks described as riots within this study. (See Table A). The first of such incidents occurred in 1868. In that year a Fenian inmate had assaulted a guard in the dining room. Upon being removed for punishment other Fenians came to the assistance of their comrade. A number of them had armed themselves with assorted eating utensils and proceeded to attach the guards in the dininghall. Soon, however, other guards appeared and overpowered the Fenians. This case had been noted by the Warden as "the excitement amongst the Fenian prisoners." The number of Fenians within the prison was not great. Hence, it caused little concern for penal authorities of the day. (Sessional Papers; 1870).

A second incident which had been noted by penal authorities as being quite disruptive to the institutions occurred in 1869. That year J.M. Ferres was appointed Warden. Unlike his predecessors, Ferres was less prone to use the "cats" upon the inmates for infractions. According to the reports of the day, such reluctance led to a growing

TABLE A

NATURE OF RIOTING IN KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: 1835-1980

	LENGTH OF RIOT	HOSTAGES	NUMBER OF INMATES INVOLVED	DOLLAR DAMAGE	DEATHS	MANNER RIOT TERMINATED	WHAT IT SOUGHT TO ACHIEVE
1868	Matters of minutes	0	Less than twelve	0	0	Inmates removed to isolation	Inmate reaction to guards.
1869	Growing rebellious-ness over time	0	Less than twelve	0	0	Inmates were given the lash	A reaction by inmates to a belief that the Warden was be-coming lenient
1873	Growing rebellious behavior	0	Ten	0	0	Inmates were given the lash	Reaction by in-mates for un-known reasons
1883	Matter of minutes	0	Four - It was believed others were involved.	0	0	Inmates escaped but were apprenhended	It was an escape attempt
1889	0	0	0	0	0	0	Rumors of riot and escape. Authorities prepared for what never happened.
1906	0	0	Four	0	0	Inmates escaped and were apprehended	It was an escape attempt

	LENGTH OF RIOT	HOSTAGES	NUMBER OF INMATES INVOLVED	DOLLAR DAMAGE	DEATHS	MANNER RIOT TERMINATED	WHAT IT SOUGHT TO ACHIEVE
1921	Matter of Minutes	0	Approximately fifty	0	0	Inmates were dispersed	Attempts at drawing attemtion of administration to their problems
1923	Matter of minutes	0	Seventeen	0	0	Complaints were heard and addressed then inmates were sent to work.	Inmates gathered to complain of food.
1924	Maintained protest over a three day period	0	Ten	0	0	Inmates were marched off to cells	It was an attempt to gain a voice in the running of shops and in the placing of the guards
1927	Maintained protest over three day period	0	Approximately seventy-five	0	0	Inmates were over-powered and leaders placed in cells	A means of verbalizing their treatment in shops, airing grievances
1932 Oct.17	Approximately four hours	Staff members were not allowed to leave	Three hundred	Approximately $800.00	0	Inmates were promised their grievances would be heard	Attempts to bring attention of administration to requests for cigarette papers, recreation and newspapers

	LENGTH OF RIOT	HOSTAGES	NUMBER OF INMATES INVOLVED	DOLLAR DAMAGE	DEATHS	MANNER RIOT TERMINATED	WHAT IT SOUGHT TO ACHIEVE
1932 Oct.20	Approximately eight hours	Staff members were not allowed to leave	Three hundred to four hundred	$3,000.00	0	Inmates were locked in their cells	Inmates rioted because of a belief that previous promises made Oct.17 were broken
1934 May3rd	Several hours	0	Aproximately one hundred	$45,000.00	0	Ended when cell block was destroyed	Was attempt to air grievances
1934 May5th	Lasted one day	0	An entire cell block		0	Inmates left in cells the entire day	Increasing tension caused by cut-backs in recreation.
1934 May 15							Fires set by inmates in response to cut-backs in recreation and due to actions of administration
1935	Four hours	Two	Approximately seventy	$7,000.00	0	Negotiations ended riot	Attempt to gain public attention and in response to reduction in recreation since 1934 riots

	LENGTH OF RIOT	HOSTAGES	NUMBER OF INMATES INVOLVED	DOLLAR DAMAGE	DEATHS	MANNER RIOT TERMINATED	WHAT IT SOUGHT TO ACHIEVE
1954	Two hours	Three staff members were trapped	Approximately one hundred and twenty-five	$1,000,000.00	0	Inmates were dispersed by rushing militia	A host of complaints were expressed by inmates covering a large span of issues
1971	Ninety hours	Six	Five hundred to six hundred	$1,000,000.00 to $1,500,000.00	Two	Inmates surrendered due to a threat of attack by soldiers	Reasons were not quickly forthcoming. Once the inmates rioted then they proceeded to determine what their grievances were. Purpose seemed to be destruction and violence

belief among inmates that the new Warden was soft. Many inmates believed that the "cats" had been abolished leading to, as Ferres noted, "an attempt at mutiny about two months after my arrival" and was, he believed, "in a great measure the consequence of that belief." (Sessional Papers; 1870). There were twelve inmates involved in this incident.

In the annual report for the fiscal year 1873, the Warden had noted in his summary of punishments that there were ten inmates who were assigned to twenty-four lashes each for what he had termed "rebellious conduct" (Sessional Papers; 1874). Little information is available on this incident. No mention is made of it within the text of the report by the Warden or in the Director's report to the Minister of Justice.

The third incident occurred in 1883 when there was an attempted escape by inmates. This occurred in October when a "desperate" escape by four inmates was undertaken. There were rumors circulating through the prison at the time that if these four succeeded then other inmates were to follow. These four inmates were surprised by two guards upon whom the inmates had made a "murderous attack". Unlike previous incidents, this incident appears to have had a degree of planning and cohesion among a certain

percentage of the population. The intent was to escape rather than to cause any disturbance or disruption. Like in so many of these incidents, the event did not result in riotous behaviour (Sessional Papers; 1885).

In 1889, there were rumors which saw prison authorities prepare themselves for what they believed was going to be Kingston Penitentiary's first riot. Information had reached the Warden that a massive riot was to take place on a certain date, at a certain time. It was to be a rebellion "of a formidable and widespread character". The riot was to begin in the workshops, the guards were to be bound and there was to be a massive dash for the gates in attempts to escape. The prison authorities had prepared themselves for the event. Troops were called out on the appointed day. But a riot did not occur. Nothing, in hindsight, indicates that a riot was ever planned. (Sessional Papers; 1889).

In 1906, there was an incident in which four inmates had overpowered guards near the gates. The guards were bound, their weapons were taken and the inmates made their escape. These inmates were caught outside of the gates. This incident too was not associated with any riotous behaviour in the institution (Sessional Papers; 1906).

The first officially recognized riot occurred in 1921. In the annual report of the Warden for 1921, it is claimed that on September 17, 1921 there had been a riot. The whole incident had lasted approximately 20 minutes. It had started and ended in the prison yard with an inmate demonstration and involved approximately 50 inmates. Having ended as quickly as it had started, little was made of the entire incident by administrators. Inmates were not out of control, staff had little trouble in regaining control of the yard. Yet, it was described as a riot. The prison authorities had attributed the whole affair to "just one of those bravado expeditions which they thought would be smart to pull off." (Report of the Superintendent; 1932). From what little information exists on the matter, inmates at that time were attempting to express discontent with their situation in a manner that would attract the attention of the Warden and of those in Ottawa.

On July 17, 1923, seventeen inmates gathered in the main dome of the prison during their dinner break demanding to speak to the Warden. In the second officially recognized riot the Warden met with the inmates who complained of their food. After they made their complaint the inmates dispersed. Their grievances, however, were quickly dismissed, as the seventeen inmates were considered to be chronic complainers. In his report the Warden had

attributed the problem to "riff-raff of the worst type, and all were 'agitators ...'" The superintendent made an investigation of the incident on his own when revealing factors were uncovered. This incident was found to have been an attempt by the seventeen inmates to gain the sympathy of the other inmates in their efforts to organize a rebellion.

The reason for this attempt was believed to be the firing of a guard who was caught supplying inmates with contraband." This was the method chosen by the inmates to show their resentment at their source of contraband supplies having been cut off. "(Report of the Superintendent; P. 4; 1932). The attempt was unsuccessful.

The third riot occurred on October 3rd, 1924 when ten inmates had demanded to see the Chief Keeper while working in the inmate shoe shop. Asked to return to work they refused until their request was granted. These individuals were promptly marched off to the isolation cells, where they were kept until the 6th when the offending inmates agreed to return to their shops. While being moved to the isolation cells some of the protesting inmates broke away from the guards, inciting inmates from the other shops to riot. The demonstration, which lasted only a matter of minutes, was apparently an attempt to

obtain the removal of a certain supervising guard from the shoe shop. But, on one of the inmates in isolation was found a note describing plans to incite unrest in order to facilitate an escape.

The fourth riot occurred on January 22, 1927 when several inmates began to disrupt the tailor shop. Upon their removal to isolation cells, other inmates in the shop began demanding their return. In turn, members of the tailor shop were marched to their cells for fear of an outbreak. They remained in their cells throughout the Saturday and Monday working days. While in their cells inmates kept up continuous yelling and disruptions in protest. Upon discovery of the lock-up of the tailor workers the mail bag workers also refused to work. At the same time, members of the shoe shop and quarry gang initiated a disturbance in the yard. They armed themselves with make-shift weapons and then they proceeded to the shops to entice other inmates to join them. But these other inmates had refused to participate in this riot. This allowed correctional staff to overpower the rioters and place them in cells. The purpose of the riot had not been verbalized by those involved, nor by the administrators. Yet it appears to have been a response by inmates to the manner they were being treated in the shops, and was considered a means by which grievances could be

aired and more benefits could be had (Report of the Superintendent, 1932).

During the afternoon of the 17th of October, 1932, the fifth riot took the form of a demonstration involving three hundred inmates. The inmates had organized themselves so that all work in the shops would stop at 3:00 p.m. The inmates then began demonstrating. Their purpose was to bring the attention of the administration to their grievances. For quite some time prior to this inmates had been asking that their grievances be addressed. The report of the Royal Commission To Investigate The Penal System Of Canada in 1938 states that this incident was not intended to be a riot though it did end that way. Having gotten word of the intended demonstration, the Warden had ordered all shop doors locked to prevent the inmates from demonstrating. However, as the administrators soon discovered, "Now that they had decided upon the demonstration they were not to be balked", shop tools were used to open the doors releasing the inmates "who gathered in the shop dome". (Royal Commission; P. 25; 1938).

At this time a number of staff members were among the inmates. They made no attempts to remove themselves from the shop dome. The Warden had walked in among the inmates to determine why they were pursuing such rebellious

action. He soon realized that the inmates could not be controlled as in the past, and gave the order to call in military forces. Once the forces arrived the inmates, who up to then had been a perfectly controlled group, proceeded to barricade themselves in the shop area. At this point, the staff members decided that they should leave the area. However, they were unable to do so. There was no physical restraint of staff members but there were no means of departure available (Desroches; P. 332; 1974 B). When attempts were made by other correctional staff to enter the dome, inmates had utilized the staff members among them as human shields and word was spread that any injury to the inmates rioting would result in harm to those staff members held (Report of the Superintendent; P. 16, 1932).

Several hours later a meeting was established between administrators and inmates. The majority of the inmates agreed to discontinue their action: a few persisted. It was believed that these few inmates had planned to continue the riotous action until it was dark enough for them to escape. Though the other inmates had called off their actions, these few inmates continued barricading themselves for several hours. To appease the rioters, the Warden had promised that the three grievances the inmates put forward, more cigarette rolling papers, more recreation and more newspapers would be considered in

an investigation. Judge Deroches, who presided during the rioter's trials, has been quoted as saying "The riot itself was not as serious as it might have been. The men were in full charge that afternoon for some length of time. The Warden and staff had lost control completely. The men could have destroyed property at will, and could have done personal violence to the Warden, officers and guards." (Royal Commission; P. 76; 1938). In Deroche's opinion, the inmates had every intention of remaining peaceful, their control was obvious from the fact that only eight hundred dollars damage was done. Like many others, Judge Deroches also believed that the inmates had legitimate claims and grievances.

The sixth riot was really a continuation of the fifth. A short three days after October 17 a second riot broke out on the 20th of October. The Superintendent, in his attempt to resolve the earlier situation, had promised an investigation which he started the next day. From the start inmates demanded they be heard en masse. The investigating Superintendent, however, refused to do so, for fear of being taken hostage. Therefore, inmates were being kept in their cells. This they felt was another contravention of the agreements made on the 17th. On the morning of the 20th tension was high. Inmates in one wing of the prison overpowered the guards and began destroying

the main cell block. This violence was contained within the cell block. But by 4:00 p.m. that day the rest of the inmates, still in their cells, began destroying their cells, continuing the destruction and yelling for a period of five hours with considerable damage being done to most of the cells (The Citizen Oct. 21; 1932).

At the height of the outbreak a number of guards had fired shots into locked cells. One of the inmates fired upon was Tim Buck, spokesman for Canadian Communists, who used the incident to promote the belief that an assassination attempt had been made upon his life. There were no deaths. One inmate, however, was wounded. Since the inmates were contained within their cells, or at least their cell blocks, only three thousand dollars damage was incurred. By 9:00 p.m. inmates had spent their frustration and anger and the incident ended.

The riot of the 20th of October was very much a part of the riot which occurred on the 17th. By the time the riot of the 20th had developed the demands made on the 17th had increased greatly: "Between the afternoon of October 17th and the commencement of my hearing complaints at or about 12'oclock noon on the 19th, the convicts had availed themselves of the opportunity to think up over one hundred separate complaints, and in addition some absurd

requests to which no consideration has been given" states the Warden. (Memorandum Re: Kingston Penitentiary Disturbance 1932). Of the one hundred grievances aired there were sixteen which were most noteworthy and are considered to have been the basis of the grievances which led to the riots of the 17th and 20th of October, 1932. These were: (1) deprivation of cigarette papers; (2) close cropping of hair; (3) lack of recreation; (4) insufficient open-air exercise; (5) lack of newspapers; (6) insufficient lighting of cells; (7) harsh treatment by staff; (8) compulsory church attendance; (9) insufficient medical treatment; (10) insufficient dental treatment; (11) lack of toilet articles; (12) punishments improperly awarded for rule breaking; (13) more frequent letters; (14) more visits; (15) lack of paroles; (16) objections to the food and monotony of prison life (Report of the Superintendent; 1932: Memorandum Re: Kingston Penitentiary Disturbance; 1932).

Both riots in October were believed to have been the result of a number of beliefs which existed among the inmate population. In correspondence to the Superintendent of Penitentiaries, the Warden of Kingston Penitentiary claimed that the riots were preceded by a "spirit of unrest", resulting from a lack of paroles, overcrowded conditions, and a lack of meaningful work (Warden's

Correspondence to Superintendent; 1932). In an article in The Citizen an inmate was quoted as saying that the two riots were a result of beliefs among inmates that there was to be a reduction of sentences which did not come about (The Citizen; P. 8; 1932). Another newspaper article in The Star claimed that the riot resulted from beliefs held by inmates that inmates at nearby Collins Bay institution had better living conditions, and that they were required to serve only part of their sentences (The Star; Oct. 18; 1932). The Warden, in a memorandum to the Superintendent, makes mention of rumors, which had circulated prior to the riots, that revolvers were being placed in the yard, and that an attempt was to be made at an escape (Memorandum from Acting Warden to the Superintendent, Oct. 20, 1932). Lastly, there were beliefs that it had been the communists that had used the prison population as a means to cause unrest within the penitentiary in attempts to gain status as political prisoners (Report into Shooting in 'D' block, Oct. 20, 1932).

During 1934 there were three separate days on which disturbances took place. The first disturbance occurred on the 3rd of May. Inmates returned to their cells at the end of their working day and found that all medication had been removed from their cells by staff. Immediately, inmates began destroying the East Cell Block. The outbreak was

rapid and lasted only several hours, ending when there was nothing left to destroy. The reason given for the riot had been the removal of the medicine. Upon closer investigation, however, a number of other grievances surfaced. These were better food, more letter writing privileges, more toilet articles, more newspapers and tobacco, more recreation and no reports for minor breaches of rules.

Due to the outbreak on the 3rd, a baseball game scheduled for the 5th was cancelled as punishment. Upon hearing of the cancellation inmates began rioting in their cells, yelling and banging their furniture throughout the day and into the evening. Eventually the inmates stopped but there remained a lot of tension and hostility among inmates.

From the 5th onwards, rumors circulated that there was to be a riot. Individual incidents of violence and infractions in general were increasing. Finally, on the 15th smoke was detected in the inmate change room. There was a fire which spread quickly. At the time this fire was detected another fire had been detected in the carpentry shop. The inmate responsible for the shop fire was apprehended. The individual who started the change room fire was never caught. The three outbreaks had contributed

to what had amounted to $45,000 damage upon the penitentiaries' property (Report of the Superintendent; 1935).

In 1935 there was one riot. This occurred on the 21st of March. A guard who was returning inmates from the shops to their cells was seized from behind, tied and placed in a corner of the South-East section of the building. Inmates then removed the keys from the captured guard and proceeded to release inmates from the other shops who were awaiting return to their cells. These inmates then proceeded to barricade themselves in the shop area as other inmates moved to the main entrance of the shop area, as well as running through the other shop areas. While going through the shops four inmates entered the shoe shop, assaulted and bound the instructor, then set fire to shoe cement on the shop floor. Correctional staff broke through the barricades and were able to convince the inmates to surrender in order to avoid shots being fired. The hostages were released unharmed.

Total damage during the outbreak was set at $7,000 which had been incurred over a period of four hours. In all there were seventy inmates involved (Whig Standard Aug. 13, 1954). The Superintendent had claimed that the reason for the riot had been to draw attention from the

public in hopes of receiving sympathy and greater freedoms and privileges (Report of the Superintendent; 1935). However, inmates had told members of the Archambault Commission who investigated the riot that it was a result of reductions which had taken place in the recreation time of inmates since the riots of 1934 (Royal Commission; 1938).

The next riot occurred on August 15th, 1954. Of this riot, the Commissioner of Penitentiaries had said "Incendiary fires and a destructive riot were caused by a small minority of the inmates in Kingston Penitentiary, adding very materially to the administrative and financial problems with which we were already faced." (Report of the Commissioner; P.8; 1954-55). The riot began shortly after 9:00 a.m. Inmates were being moved into the recreation field for a game of baseball. According to witnesses an inmate had given out a yell as a signal, beginning two hours of "savage destruction". On the signal, a number of inmates had rushed back into the prison and started twenty-five separate fires which destroyed over half of the penitentiary's physical structure (Whightman; 1954). During the riot looting of stores and shops occurred. Firemen who had been called to the penitentiary were held at bay by inmates throwing debris at them. Control had been regained only after troops stormed the grounds,

herding the rioting inmates to the baseball field so firemen could fight the out-of-control fire. This riot had been the first time in twenty years that troops had been called to Kingston Penitentiary, and had been then given the title of "the worst prison riot in Canada's history." (Creighton; 1954: Johnstone; 1954).

As troops entered the prison yard it took but a few minutes to round up the approximately one hundred and twenty five rioters. They offered no resistance to the armed troops. Before the inmates had been subdued, however, they were able to cause an extensive amount of damage, totalling approximately $1,000.000 (House of Commons, Vol. 1; 1955: Wightman; 1954). As one newspaper account described "there was no need for desperate measures, the convicts submitted without a real show of their teeth. They were sullen and defiant at times, but they allowed themselves to be herded and that was the important thing." (Van Lunen; 1954).

At the time of the riot there were no hostages per se. There were, however, three individuals trapped within various areas of the prison. Two engineers remained in the boiler room throughout the ordeal, they were not reached by a group of inmates who attempted to break down the steel doors and blow up the boiler. In the shop area the Chief

Keeper found himself in the middle of rampaging inmates who were running throughout the smoke filled shop dome. He was able to escape inmates who discovered he was among them. The fact that these individuals were not taken hostage was quickly identified as the reason why the riot ended as quickly as it did (Van Lunen; 1954).

An article in the Globe and Mail of 1954 carried a quote by the Warden who stated he had no idea as to why the riot broke out, nor that an inordinate amount of tension existed in the prison (Wightman; 1954). The Commissioner of Penitentiaries was also quoted in the very same edition of the Globe and Mail. He believed the riot was the result of a sick portion of the inmate population: "Arsonists, psychopaths, -- the deadly, nothing-to-lose element -- were the ringleaders who started the orgy of destruction at Kingston Penitentiary today." (Hyman; 1954).

An article in the Telegram, carried after the riot, claims guards were aware of mounting tension among inmates (Creighton; 1954). This tension was belived to have been stemming from the quality of food; a belief that guards were corrupt and incompetent; inmates were made to live in outdated buildings; and a host of other similar complaints ranging from valid to irrelevant. As recent as the early 1950's inmates complained of their situation in Kingston

Penitentiary. An inmate paper called Hush Free Press had put forward some of the more pressing problems which had arisen again as reasons for the 1954 riot. There was the issue of inadequate medical facilities. There was an expressed hatred of the administration for the inhumane conditions inmates had to live in. There was the question of the adequacy of the financial compensation for work done. There was not enough reform or training, and too few Tickets of Leave. Recreation time was inadequate. Searches were overzealous. Classification was considered inept. Guards were seen as being poorly trained, leading to extensive corruption. Many of these factors remained unspoken as weaknesses which contributed to the 1954 riots. Still, many of these issues were relevant to the crisis at hand to some degree.

The riot of the 14th of April 1971 was the twelth riot and had been considered worse than any which has gone before it in Canadian penal history. Scott (1982) had labelled this riot not only the worst riot, but it was considered to have been one of the most "bizarre". While being returned from their recreation period to their cells, inmates had initiated a move to capture control of the main prison dome which took a matter of minutes to achieve. All of the proper procedures were being adhered to by staff, still inmates were able to completely immobilize attempts

to stop their take-over of the prison (Swackhammer; Report P. 17, 1971). As the inmates were being moved to their cells two inmates moved out of the group and overpowered a guard supervising the move; similar attacks were undertaken by other inmates; six guards in all were taken hostage. The way was cleared for inmates to move on to the main dome. A guard in the gun tower had noticed the oncoming rioters, administration was then notified of what was taking place. Once the Warden had arrived at the dome he met with inmate representatives and was made aware of the situation at which time the Warden had made the decision to turn the dome over to the inmates. Within one hour of the first hostage being taken all inmate cells were opened except those in the disassociation wing. At that point inmates began completely destroying various wings of the penitentiary. Out of the five hundreds inmates in Kingston Penitentiary in 1971, it has been claimed that approximately fifty made up the main core of rioters. But, the rioters numbered many more, many participating out of fear for their lives (Desroches; P. 322; 1974B: House of Commons; P. 5017; 1971).

Most of the rioting took place in the main cell block, but there was looting and violence occurring in various parts of the prison with the exception of the hospital wing. The rioting carried on through the night.

On the next morning inmate gangs entered the disassociation wing and stole what they could from the inmates housed there, beating a number of them. Throughout the day old grievances were settled. One task that the inmate leaders soon had was controlling the inmates. As inmates roamed throughout the prison the original inmate leadership, with an inmate named Knight as spokesman, was beginning negotiations with prison officials through a citizen's committee (Desroches; P. 324; 1974 A). Between negotiations the inmate leaders tried to protect the "undesirable" inmates from the rest of the population, as well as secure safety for the hostages.

On Friday the 16th there was a change in the riot and its leadership. A more violent group was gaining control. This group, led by an individual named Mackenzie, constituted those who were beating the "undesirables" and who had attempted to get at the hostages. A number of writers have claimed that many inmates had desired to see an end to the riot, but that the hard-core group of inmates had threatened those who considered bowing out of the rioting (Desroches; 1974: Ellis; 1982: Scott; 1982).

By Sunday morning another change was occurring. An even more violent group of inmates were gaining control of the riot, a crazed group led by an individual named

Shepley. It was this group that had a major role in the violence upon the "undesirables". On this day, which came to be known as "Bloody Sunday", the rioters went after the "undesirables" in the prison population. "child molesters, rapists, perverts, stoolies ... mostly emotional offenders" (Scott; P. 7; 1982), dragging fifteen inmates out of their cells to the main dome, tying them to their chairs and trying them in a Kangaroo court. The rest of the inmate body gathered round the upper levels of the dome and watched. Those tied to the chairs were systematically tortured upon conviction by inmates considered to be the "jury". The final count of the trial was two dead and thirteen wounded. By the Sunday afternoon rumors began to spread that the army was preparing to charge the dome. The majority of inmates were eager to leave the dome and surrender. Despite attempts by the violent inmates to stop others from surrendering, when the opportunity presented itself for inmates to leave the majority of the rioters stampeded out of the dome. By 5 p.m. on Sunday the riot was ended (Swackhammer Report; 1971).

When the riot broke inmates seemed at a loss as to what to do with it. "They sat around and thought up a few beefs and wrote them down" (Desroches; P. 343, 1974 B). As Ellis (1982) argued, the problem ran deeper than the dissatisfaction of a few. With this the Swackhammer Report

concurred: "We are in agreement that the evidence adduced established there was no single immediate triggering cause ... it is clear that the sum of the conditions which existed at Kingston Penitentiary immediately prior to the April disturbances caused those disturbances." (Swackhammer Report; P. 3; 1971). In letters sent by the Warden of Kingston Penitentiary to the Commissioner of Penitentiaries and to the Regional Director issues were outlined which spoke of the problems within the institution: an explosive inmate environment; an overworked professional staff; the slow replacement of administrative staff; a large number of experienced staff being transferred to Millhaven and being replaced by inexperienced ones; too few transfers of minimum and medium security inmates; inadequate psychiatric facilities; crowded disassociation cells; and a growing anxiety among inmates that they would be sent to Millhaven, an institution they viewed as a tougher prison. (Swackhammer Report; 1971).

In the House of Commons the Solicitor General stated that he was aware of three factors which were brought to his attention as reasons for such inmate unrest: There was the accusations by inmates of physical beatings: There was the opposition of inmates to the opening of their letters sent to their Members of

Parliament: Finally there was the belief held by inmates that prison staff tampered with their remission time (House of Commons; P. 5029-30; 1971. Vol. 1). To this list the Swackhammer Report (1971) added other inmate grievances which were instrumental to the outbreak. Inmates had enumerated a number of grievances to the citizen's committee. There was dissatisfaction with the administration of the criminal justice system and the operation of the courts and police. They opposed their total isolation from society. There was also the issue of punitive punishment and the excessive use of isolation cells. Inmates complained of the rough treatment by staff. Also, there was the degrading effects of imprisonment. The psychiatrist in Kingston Penitentiary at the time of the riot had formed his own list of what he considered to be contributive factors for the outbreak of the 1971 riot. Among them was the nature of penitentiaries in themselves; a combination of boredom and inefficient emphasis on rehabilitation; out dated facilities; lack of recreation; and the development of "maximum security psychosis". Desroches had put forward some interesting ideas as to the reason for the riot. One such idea was the riot resulted from threats directed to the inmate's status quo by the suspected movement of inmates to MillHaven. The more stringent security at the new institution would affect the movement and control of inmate leaders over the inmate

population (Desroches; 1974 B).

From this description of incidents a process of change is evident. The earliest incident, in 1868, was a spontaneous reaction by inmates against guards who were removing an inmate from the dining area for punishment. All of the inmates involved were Fenians. They had armed themselves with eating utensils and assaulted the guards who however, were able to bring the situation to an end quickly. A second incident occurred in 1869. There had been an increase in what the Warden had labelled a growing "rebelliousness" among the inmates. Little information was available. The matter was closed when twelve inmates were administered lashes. Similarly, growing rebelliousness was prevalent in the penitentiary in 1873. The response of the administration to this incident was the removal of ten inmate leaders for lashes. These three incidents were very similar in nature. Inmates had been reacting to guards and to imprisonment. There appeared to be no other reasons for the manner inmates behaved. Inmates reacted in a way that was in keeping with the period and in a manner that was possible under the circumstances of their imprisonment. Incidents of any sort resulted in swift and harsh punishment by the staff. These early incidents represented the earliest stage of prison riots at Kingston Penitentiary.

The second stage could be said to have begun in 1883. In that year, four inmates had assaulted guards on duty and attempted to escape. They were captured outside of the gates. In an investigation it was determined that if these four inmates had succeeded others were to follow. Increasingly prison administrators became concerned that inmates would attempt escapes and use force to do so. Inmates had always escaped previously to this point. It became, however, a more pressing concern. In 1889 for example, information had reached the Warden that a riot was planned to facilitate a mass escape. The militia were called upon to ward off what was believed to be a large riot but which turned out to be a non-riot. In 1906, four inmates had assaulted the guards on duty at the gate, they were bound and their weapons taken. These inmates escaped but were quickly captured. All of these incidents were predominantly attempts at escape. In the earlier period two escapes had occurred, but these escapes were more on an individual basis and had taken place independent of what has been identified as disturbances. During the second period the situation was different. Through this period the prison authorities became increasingly aware of escapes. Rumors of potential rioting and escape, although just rumors, saw prison authorities take excessive precautionary measures in case the information proved valid. The incidents themselves became more purposeful,

inmates seemed increasingly determined to escape. It was this intent which came to differentiate the second period from the first.

Another change in the nature of riots ushering in what could be considered a third period took place in 1921. Fifty inmates had congregated in attempts to bring attention to what they considered to be problems. Without any consideration and with severity inmates were dispersed, ending the attempted protest. Similarly, in 1923 seventeen inmates gathered together during the mid-day break and presented the Warden with complaints of the quality of the food. Their complaints were considered unfounded and they too were dispersed. A more serious outbreak than these two occurred in 1924. Ten inmates had demanded that their grievances be heard and acted upon. They insisted upon having more control over the shop areas as well as a voice in the placement of guards in the shop areas. Those involved were quickly marched off to cells for a period of isolation. Refusal to return to work until their demands were met kept the protesters in the cells for three days. Following this incident was another attempted protest in 1927. Inmates attempted to voice their grievances. Like those previously they too were dispersed and the leaders were placed in cells. On October 17, 1932 a more serious incident had broken out. Approximately three hundred

inmates gained physical control of the shop area for a number of hours. Their initial purpose was to bring grievances to the attention of the administration. During this incident some damage was done to the shops and staff members were not allowed to leave, being used as shields in case of gun fire. Promises that their grievances would be investigated brought the riot to an end but negation of the promises saw another outbreak three days later.

Another series of riots had occurred in 1934 on the 3rd, 5th, and 15th of May. The first of these stemmed from the removal of all prescription drugs from the cells of the inmates. The destruction of the cells continued for a number of hours, ending when the anger abated. As punishment for this outbreak recreational activities planned for the 5th were cancelled. During that day inmates were kept in their cells. In protest to this tactic inmates maintained a day-long protest of banging and disruption within the cells. From the 5th to the 15th tension within the prison rose. On the 15th two separate fires were started and extensive damage was sustained. In 1935, a riot broke out during which two staff members were held hostage as approximately seventy inmates destroyed several shop areas. After four hours of rioting, staff members were able to communicate with the rioters, negotiations were concluded and the riot was ended.

Finally, in 1954, there was a riot that was well planned. Approximately 125 inmates had gained control of the prison. Throughout the prison fires were set and looting and destruction was prevalent. Two hours had passed before militia cleared the way for fire fighters to enter the grounds. Inmates had succeeded in doing over $1,000,000. in damage. After the riot it had been noted by a number of inmates that the incident was an attempt to effect change within the prison.

These incidents represent a period when inmates attempted to bring attention to life within the penitentiary. Unlike the riots in the previous periods, the riots of this third period were protests and demonstrations. Inmates wanted to bring to the attention of the public and the authorities that changes were needed in the prison. This period, however, is divisible into two sub periods. In the first of these the prisoners protested and demonstrated. Promises were made but never kept. However the prisoners did not pursue their objectives. In 1934, the pattern began to change. The prisoners began to resort to violence and destruction.

A different type of riot in Kingston Penitentiary occurred in 1971. For ninety hours more than 500 inmates had caused over $1,000,000 in damage. As well, two inmates

were killed by other inmates and six guards were held hostage. Reasons as to why the riot occurred were not quickly understood. Only as the riot was well under way did the inmates present grievances. This riot, unlike any of the riots before it, was bent on destruction right from the start. Upon gaining control of the prison inmates began to destroy the prison simply for the sake of destruction. As the riot progressed it began to take on increasingly bizarre forms. As soon as the initial destruction ended inmates proceeded to assault those who were on the lower rungs of the inmate sub-culture. Persecution of these inmates worsened as inmate leadership underwent three changes -- each one more violent than the one before. It had been the third inmate leader who encouraged the Kangaroo court in which the "undesirables" were tried and assaulted.

This was a riot which represents a period in which destructiveness was foremost in the minds of the rioters. Occurrences that developed during the riot also made it a unique incident. Several changes in the inmate leadership brought about changes in the direction that the riot was moving towards. Despite negotiations with a citizen's committee it is evident that the sole purpose of the incident became violence and destruction, giving this riot a very bizarre form. The essence of the riot made it an

incident which is not comparable to any other riot that had occurred in Kingston Penitentiary in any of the previous three periods of rioting. It is this element that distinguishes the fourth period of change in the nature of rioting in Kingston Penitentiary.

****

REFERENCES

****

CHAPTER THREE

Assistant Warden To Superintendent of Penitentiaries. Re: Unrest of Inmates October 20, 1932. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1). Public Archives. Ottawa

Babcock, E. "The History of Kingston Penitentiary." Historic Kingston. Mimeograph. Ottawa. Solicitor General Library. 1965.

Creighton, D. "Troops Ready For Any Sign Of New Riot." Telegram. August 16, 1954.

Desroches, F. "The April 1971 Kingston Penitentiary Riot." Canadian Journal of Corrections. Vol. 16 October, 1964 (A). pp 317-331.

Desroches, F. "Patterns in Prison Riots." Canadian Journal of Corrections. Vol. 16 October, 1974 (B) pp 332-351.

Ellis, D. Disturbances In Canadian Penitentiaries During The Years 1971-1980. Report #4. July, 1982.

Editorial. "Those Prison Riots" The Ottawa Journal. October 20, 1932.

Editorial. "Call For Ventilation." The Halifax Chronicle. August 15, 1933.

Emison, J. "The History of Kingston Penitentiary." Historic Kingston. No. 3. November, 1954, pp 26-35.

House of Commons Debates. Vol. 111, 1955.

House of Commons Debates. Vol. 1, 1955.

Hush Free Press. "Is Graft Rampant At Kingston Pen?" July 2, 1949.

Hush Free Press. "300 Prisoners Sign Smuggled Statement." May 15, 1950.

Hyman, R. "Saved Keys Despite Fire and Mob." Globe and Mail. August 16, 1954.

Hamilton, G. "Inmate's Story: Two Fires, Break Plotted". Globe and Mail. August 6, 1954.

House of Commons Debates. Vol. V, 1971.

Journal Of The Legislative Assembly Of The Province Of Canada. Vol. 16, No. 4, 1858.

Johnstone, W., B. Henheffer. "History Of Treatment In Canadian Penitentiaries." Social Problems: A Canadian Profile. Lasking (ed). Toronto. McGraw-Hill. 1964. pp 449-454.

Letter To Department Of Justice. Re: Disturbance at Kingston Penitentiary. August 21, 1946 Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1). Public Archives. Ottawa.

Letter to Minister of Justice Guthrie, July 10, 1933. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1) Public Archives. Ottawa.

Letter To The Warden. July 10, 1933. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1) Public Archives, Ottawa.

Memorandum For The Honourable The Minister Of Justice, December 5, 1932. Re: Kingston Penitentiary Disturbances October, 1932, Vol. 107, 4-15-5 (1). Public Archives, Ottawa.

Memorandum For the Honourable The Minister Of Justice Re: Kingston Penitentiary Disturbance or Insurrection. October, 1932. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1) Public Archives. Ottawa.

Memorandum For The Deputy Minister Of Justice 8th January, 1933. Re: Dorchester Revolt. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1). Public Archives. Ottawa.

MacGuigan Report. The Sub-Committee on the Penitentiary System In Canada. Ottawa, 1977.

Norman, W. A Chapter Of Canadian Penal History: The Early Years Of The Provincial Penitentiary At Kingston And The Commission Inquiry Into Its Management, 1835-1851. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Queen's University, 1979.

Royal Commission To Investigate The Penal System Of Canada. Archambault Report. Ottawa, 1938.

Report Of Investigation Into Shooting Into "D" Block Kingston Penitentiary. October 20, 1932. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1) Public Archives. Ottawa.

Report Of The Superintendent of Penitentiaries. 1932.

Report Of The Superintendent of Penitentiaries. 1933.

Report Of The Superintendent of Penitentiaries. 1935

Report Of The Superintendent of Penitentiaries. 1954-55.

Report Of The Superintendent of Penitentiaries. 1955.

Sessional Papers. Vol. XX1. 1863

Sessional Papers. Vol. 11. 1870.

Sessional Papers. Vol. 11. 1874.

Sessional Papers. Vol. XV11. 1885.

Sessional Papers. Vol. 11. 1890.

Sessional Papers. Vol. X1V. 1906.

Solicitor General. A Summary And Analysis Of Some Major Inquiries On Corrections, 1938-1977. May, 1977. Ottawa.

Solicitor General. Historical Background of the Canadian Penitentiary Service. Ottawa. 1965.

Solicitor General. Historical Background of the Canadian Penitentiary Service. Ottawa. 1965.

Shoom, S. "The Upper Canada Reformatory. Penetanguishene: The Dawn Of Prison Reform In Canada." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. Vol. 14, No. 3 July, 1979. pp 260-267.

Scott, G. Inmate. Toronto. Optimum Pub. 1982.

Star Correspondent. Star Special. The Star. October 18, 1932.

Swackhammer Report. Report Of The Commission Of Inquiry Into Certain Disturbances At Kingston Penitentiary During April, 1971. Ottawa, 1973.

The Citizen. "Summon Troops Again to Halt Prison Rioting". October 21, 1932.

Van Luven, D. "200 Rampaging Prisoners Create $1,000,000 Havoc" The Kingston Whig Standard. August 16, 1954.

Wightman, H. "Uprising At Kingston Worst Ever" Globe and Mail. August 15, 1954.

****

CHAPTER FOUR

****

THE IMPACT OF A CHANGING SOCIETY ON THE NATURE OF RIOTING

The riots that have occurred in Kingston Penitentiary constitute four distinct types with each type occurring during a specific period. The first two of these four periods spanned the years 1835 to 1873 and 1873 to 1920. In the first period the riots were the spontaneous reaction of prisoners to some incident, while in the second period they were associated with attempts at escape. The 50 year period 1920 to 1970, identified as a third period of rioting, is divisible into 2 sub periods with 1934 as the dividing point. During this period the riots were protests against existing prison conditions. Prior to 1934, they were generally mild demonstrations which ended tamely with administration promises of change which were never kept. After 1934, they became violent, perhaps, when it was realized that the administration had no intention of keeping their promises. Finally, the period from 1970 to 1980 included one major riot that was considered to have been the worst in the penitentiary's history. The question to be addressed now is whether changes noted in the prison riots are associated with or reflect changes that occurred in society at large.

During the period 1835 to 1873 Upper Canada, which was to become Ontario, was a rural society dependent heavily upon agriculture. More than half of the population was involved in some form of agricultural production. Approximately 80 to 90 percent of the populations was rural. Images of rural tranquility are presented in describing the society, but there is evidence that it was not as stable and serene as is often believed. Mann suggests, it was "an era of stagnation and despondency." (Mann; P. 135; 1970). There were cities, but: "The cities were relatively small and not socially or economically dominant in their regions ... "(Morton; P. 3; 1977). The rural nature of this society created problems particular to itself. Clark claims: "The social problems of Upper Canada were almost entirely those of a purely agrarian frontier ... " (Clark; P. 63; 1962).

During the period of 1835 to 1870, Ontario was economically tied to the production of staples. It was an economy heavily dependent upon preferential treatment from Great Britain which guaranteed it by the British Corn Laws and Navigation Laws. However, in 1846 Britain repealed the Corn Laws and in 1849 the Navigation Laws. The repeal of these two laws threw the rural Canadian society into a precocious global market (Brown and Cook; 1976) forcing it to pursue other areas of economic production and initiate changes in the economic base of society.

During the period between 1835 and 1873 the nature of society was also influenced by a growing population. Immigrants were coming to Canada, particularly from Ireland and Britain (McNaught; 1976: Morton; 1977). Most of the immigrants preferred to live in a rural setting. Urban society had no appeal for these early settlers. They were "Frugal and diligent, parochial and isolated, loyal to empires secular or holy," and they "seemed almost to live in a middle ages of their own". (Careless and Craig; IX; 1971). They were a people who feared progressive developments, as was occurring in the more southern parts of North American through the operation of Democracy, resulting in the failure of the 1837 Rebellion (Gaucher; 1983). A stringent conservatism was inherent in the society. This early society upheld a moral order as the basis for social order.

In this society a belief was prevalent that moral reform, achievable through isolation and hard work, was to be the aim of any punishment given the inmate (Beattie; 1977). With the strengthening of this belief, imprisonment not only became increasingly a punishment in itself, but also became harsher. Harsh incarceration was in keeping with the nature of the society itself in which the hardship and moral fortitude of a rural existence permeated the norms and values of that society: "Serville work of

enforced penance was to lead to an acceptance of guilt on the part of the person, or acceptance which was to be induced by reflection in solitude". (Bellomo; p. 17, 1972.

Imprisonment had to be of a length and sort so that it led to the reformation of the wrong-doer. Thus the prison had to be inhospitable, and the duration of the incarceration had to subject the offender to conditions of life far worse than those that the convict was used to (Rusche; 1978). Life for inmates was made intentionally difficult. Upon being placed in the institution they became social outcasts and little concern was given to their fate.

Economic hardships of the period, and the rural make-up of the society at large created a situation in which the majority of the society was willing to accept limited social and economic expenditure upon criminals (Graff; P. 174; 1979). Living conditions within the prison, then, reflected the rustic nature of the society, as well as the unwillingness of that society to spend too much energy and money towards anti-social members of the society. Conditions within the prison were abhorrent. Corporal punishment was administered harshly and frequently for the slightest infraction. At times death resulted from such punishment. These conditions were further worsened by unhygienic, damp, cold and poorly ventilated cells.

Records of the prison doctor are filled with cases of inmates dying from pneumonia and typhoid. As well, inmates were expected to work hard and long days, at the end of which they were marched back to their crowded cells.

Emison (1954) had labelled the Kingston Penitentiary in this early society as being "depressive" and "soul destroying". It was know by many in the local Kingston community that "a high level of brutality was increasingly necessary to control the convict population. (Norman; P. 58; 1979). Many people in the community and in the prison itself believed that harsh discipline was needed to reform the inmates. Warden reports of the time often expounded upon the need to treat inmates harshly. It was believed that such treatment would deter any attempts at rebellion. Although inmates made few attempts at rebellion, the prison staff continued to treat the inmates brutally. Prison staff wanted to make sure that inmates had no opportunity for rioting; "It is true a majority of convicts, though mischievous and full of deceit, are not dangerous, but if not guarded with the utmost vigilance, and punishment for breaches of discipline with promptness they would soon become disorderly." (Journal of the Legislative Assembly; 1858). There prevailed a constant fear of inmate revolt within the community as well as in the prison itself. This resulted in attempts to control

inmates. As a result of the constant vigil by staff, inmates had little opportunity for more than just impulsive outbreaks of insubordination against prison staff whenever the opportunity arose. For the most part, inmates were primarily concerned with the ordeals of daily life imposed upon them by the society. Inmate concerns focused upon remaining alive. Minor altercations and impulsive outbursts were mainly expressions of frustration and anger against the keepers that dominated them.

Another element of the lack of rioting in the penitentiary can be attributed to the type of people who were inmates. It was not uncommon for a vast array of individuals to be placed among one another, although their "crimes" did not warrant it. The composition of the inmate population during those early years included juveniles and adults of both sexes who committed a vast array of crimes, from petty and mundane crimes to acts of violence and murder. Included among these were others who suffered mental handicaps and found themselves in the penitentiary for reasons beyond their control. All of these individuals were placed among one another regardless of age, sex, or crime. Because there was a lack of social networks in that early rural society that the unfortunate and homeless could rely upon, infractions of the law resulted in being placed in the penitentiary.

The diversity of inmates did not allow for any cohesive alliances to form for the purpose of any rebellious action. Many of those placed in the penitentiary were not well versed with the ways in prison life, therefore, they believed they had to tolerate life in the prison, as it was defined by the society. For others, acts of overt rebellion was impossible because they were unaware of such actions and, if they were, feared what reprisals would follow such an outbreak.

Inmates in the penitentiary were very much the products of their time. When Kingston Penitentiary was built in 1835, certain assumptions were inherent in that society that prevailed among the inmates themselves. The society held beliefs in how inmates should be treated. Inmates, being of that society, often acted as they were expected to. That is not to say that they were model inmates. Often they were not. Yet from the reports of the Wardens, there was little rebellious behaviour. The exception to this were the outbreaks of impulsive acts against prison staff. Such individual acts of hostility were punished, still it was considered a normal part of the prison setting and of the interactive process between inmates and staff. Inmates, therefore, reacted to their situation in what was considered to be an acceptable manner to them, based upon what the society as a whole considered to be acceptable behaviour.

The early years of the period 1873 and 1920 was a time when Ontario was still predominantly rural. Increasingly, however, the growing population was having an effect upon the nature of the society. By 1920, the total Canadian population was to rise to approximately ten million people, having grown from a 1838 total of four hundred thousand (Brown and Cook; P. 50; 1976: Lower; P. 82; 1966: Stanley; P. 62; 1971).

Prior to the 1880's Ontario was still rural and agricultural. However, in the period 1873 to 1920 Ontario was to undergo a continuous shift towards urban growth. This was a trend that was increased by a newly developing industrialization that was well under way in the United States and Great Britain. It was to be such industrial growth and development that was to initiate some of the greatest changes in Canadian society. (Fearn; P. 40; 1973: Careless and Craig; P. 62-63; 1971). Included in these changes were urbanization, labour unionism and immigration, all of which cemented into the Canadian context at the time of the First World War: "The First World War had supplied the needed stimulus to begin to change Canada from a predominantly agricultural nation to an industrial one." (Lower; P. 193; 1966).

During the period of industrialization in Canada, there were major shifts in the immigration pattern that was initiated in the 1850's. Many of the immigrants that came to Canada between 1873 and 1920 were from the industrialized areas of Europe. Less often were the immigrants predominantly farmers who had successively lost their crops, or who were displaced off of their land. Increasingly, immigrants coming to Canada were products of the industrial revolution. Periods of economic hardship for European mills and factories resulted in greater numbers of these unemployed workers immigrating to Canada. The major concerns of these immigrants was finding employment. Like many others of the industrialized world, Canadians were becoming less preoccupied with the notions of land than with the realities of factory employment or unemployment. The growing emphasis upon industrialization by newly arrived immigrants changed the pattern of existence for these new Canadians. Increasingly, those arriving in Canada during this period remained primarily in the urban centres and in the developing industrial areas. This pattern of immigration was to become a lasting one, with the exception of the period during the movement of immigrants to Western Canada prior to World War One.

Migration from the rural areas to the urban centres played an important role in affecting the nature of the

society. The advent of industrialization had revolutionized the nature of farming. More sophisticated machines made it possible for fewer people to do more work. As labour intensive tasks were being done away with, the flow increased from the rural areas as people went searching for work.

With the steady flow of people into Canada's urban areas, both from within and outside of the country, a pool of labour was growing. Until World War One there grew a pool of labour for which there was not a constant supply of employment. These workers came to be affected by the constant swings of a global market. As the precariousness of the industrial market continued during the 1880's and 1900's an activism began to emerge which was to have a profound influence upon the nature of the society. Many of the new immigrants to Canada during these years had been exposed to the teachings of unionism. Prior to 1914, the philosophy of labour unionism was spreading, resuming in intensity at the end of World War One. During the war years, a continuous flow of people took place from the rural to the urban areas of the country. Among these people unionism took root. As the soldiers returned from the front, and those in the factories refused to return to the rural areas, a large labour pool developed. What took place was that the tenets of unionism were eagerly adopted

by a growing unemployed work force which had returned from a war believed to have been fought for the sake of Canada. People expected industrial growth to provide them with employment. Labour unionism was presented as a means of getting it for them. Thus arose a by-product of industrialization which was to have a profound effect upon the nature of the Canadian society.

The changes occurring between 1873 and 1920 affected the way Canadians came to view themselves within the society, and how they viewed their country in relation to the rest of the world. This was a process of development that was solidified by the years of the war. By the 1920's, some of the elements of the old society were still to be found among those of the new. Developments of the 1900's, however, were quickly diminishing the effects the old society was having upon the new. Canadians entered upon the world pace of growth that, by 1920, saw a new society rising which had little in common with the old society.

As the society underwent change, the priorities were shifting drastically from those of a rural society to those of an urban one. One society was ending while another took form. Growth of an urban society brought about social concerns which did not exist previously. The

war between 1914 and 1918 represents the turning point of a process of change that upset the precarious balance which, to that time, existed between the rural and urban society (Lower; 1966).

As the society was growing, so too was Kingston Penitentiary. Inmates in the prison between 1873 and 1920 were the builders as well as the captives. A growing population placed increasing demands upon the prison to house more inmates. Expansion of the prison put more inmates in the quarries and on the walls as plans were under way to expand the capacity of the prison. Numerous opportunities for escape arose. Any opportunity for escape by inmates was taken advantage of, causing prison officials to become harsher with and suspicious of the inmates (Edmison; 1954: Norman; 1979: Scott; 1982: Shoom; 1979). Increasing numbers of escapes and attempted escapes initiated attempts by officials to gain more control over the inmates. These attempts at control were often invalidated by the opportunities presented during various phases of construction.

Inmates of Kingston Penitentiary between 1873 and 1920 were no longer composed primarily of individuals from the rural setting of a rustic community. Increases in immigration increased the percentage of inmates who were

those immigrants. Since many of these immigrants were coming from the urban and industrialized areas of Europe, they were often more sophisticated than individuals from more rural settings. They were less willing to tolerate the harshness of life in the penitentiary. As a result, these types of people were more likely to attempt escapes.

Urban growth affected all aspects of Canadian society in different ways. A prison in a rural setting has markedly different problems from one in an urban setting. Growing urbanization and an expanding population lent itself to the phenomenon of inmate escapes. As the communities grew and changed around the urban and rural areas of Ontario, so too did the numbers and types of inmates in the penitentiary. Urbanization had a massive impact upon the traditional Canadian community. Changes occurred to the traditional beliefs and activities of communities and people which had prevailed for decades. Often the values and norms were reshaped or abolished to allow for change. A readjustment of community standards and the ways of life was taking place as a host of cultures and influences were taking root in Canadian society. The smallness of the rural community was quickly given way to the multitude of people between 1873 and 1920.

Unlike people of the early 1800's, those of the

1870's and onwards were of a different type. These individuals were less likely to adhere to notions of criminality as sin or moral decay in need of confinement. Incarceration of these individuals changed the make-up of the prison, affecting the manner of interaction between inmates and staff. Inmates became increasingly less conformist, more apt to break the rules and regulations than was the case with inmates from the rural settings. These were the individuals who were more likely to attempt to escape.

Changes were also taking place in the type of prison staff hired as well. When the penitentiary was first built in the rural country-side, staff members were chosen from among the local population who, due to the economic instability and underdevelopment, were grateful for having steady employment. Fear of losing employment often made prison staff less tolerant of inmate freedoms and were less likely to allow inmates into situations that offered opportunities for escape. At times they were abusive because of a fear that inmates were untrustworthy. The developing society surrounding the penitentiary began to offer prison staff other opportunities for employment. Less dependence on limited avenues for employment created situations where staff members became less concerned with the safe-keeping of inmates. More opportunities arose for

escape because of the increasing problems prison authorities faced due to staff carelessness, lack of interest and drunkenness as well as bribery. Reports by Wardens often lamented of the growing difficulty in finding staff who were competent and of better character than the inmates. The problem with staffing was increased two-fold by the growing and diverse population. Increasingly staff had to be chosen from among the growing number of people who immigrated. These were individuals who took employment in the prison for the sake of a job, also they had much less of a stake in adhering to the moral norms of the community in regards to how inmates should be treated during incarceration.

Prior to the 1873 period of development, inmates often held the belief that their fate was sealed. The dictates of the community would have to be adhered to and the sentences of incarceration satisfied. In the earlier rural society, punishment such as imprisonment was more desirable than banishment or severe corporal punishment and death. To not accept the sentence of incarceration the inmate would have to totally leave the community if he escaped, leaving behind friends, family and a known way of life. The rural nature of the community made it impossible for an escaped convict to hide within the community. An increasingly urban society during the 1873 period of

development began to erode notions that escaping from prison required an inmate to leave the community forever. Growing urban areas provided inmates with a means of existence after escaping. For the recent immigrants, their associations with any one community was tenuous, identifying minimally with the physical constraints of any one community. For many inmates, then, urbanization made it possible to escape and hide in an urban area without detection. As areas grew more people escaping from the penitentiary could maintain a life style they were accustomed to before incarceration.

The changes occurring throughout the society increasingly lent themselves to inmate escapes. As the society became more urban, attracting more urban people from larger European and American centres, escapes began to prevail as a more acceptable form of rebellion among inmates in Kingston Penitentiary. Popular historians had noted the start of the 1920's as a time when a new society was arising. This process of change gained its momentum during the Second World War, increasing as the economic hardships of the 1920's and early 1930's became more pronounced. These hardships kept pace with the growth of labour unionism, industrialization and rapid urbanization. As well, the population increased rapidly while migration continued as during the First World War. This ten year

period noted an almost even split between rural and urban populations (Lower; P. 168; 1966). Urban areas were surpassing rural ones in all elements of social priorities. Industrial production surpassed rural production in terms of monetary, social and cultural value. Food production was of less importance to people since they were no longer dependent on themselves to produce food. Effects upon the society were great: "The point of all this is that resources and priorities of the society are bent into new shapes as the society's population alters its basis composition." (Fearn; P. 48; 1973). As the society changes, little is left undisturbed.

After World War One little was left untouched: "The First World War had a powerful impact on every aspect of Canadian life." (Cook; P. 179; 1963). People in the 1920's expressed a frustration which existed before the war. There were hopeless and unfounded dreams of uninterrupted economic prosperity and social cohesion, brought about briefly by the false condition created by the war. The early 1930's were to completely dash those myths and dreams of prosperity. The period of the 1920's and early 1930's was seen as a time "of transition from a country in which chaos was steadily reduced to order to one in which order was to increasingly disintegrate." (Morton; P. 207; 1971).

In the 1920's and 1930's Canada underwent a total transition, from the society in which the individual rural resident, depending on his own resources, was replaced by an urban society in which public means and collective action were seen as the cure for social and personal ills. As Callwoods pointed out: "The country rumbled with unrest." (Callwords P. 255; 1981).

Some of the more undesirable elements of the new Canadian society were prevailing throughout the 1920's and 1930's. The nature of the society was one in which people were faced with social developments of a magnitude never before seen by many in that lifetime. The society as a whole was attempting "to bring its institutions into conformity with the demands of a new, unfamiliar kind of society." (Brown and Cook; P. 2; 1976).

The 1930's was to be an especially important element upon the nature of the society, as the hardships faced by many people increased daily. For many there was hunger, unemployment, futility and social dislocation. It was a fluid population that travelled across the country, looking for a better situation than the one that was left behind. (Lower; 1966). Many of the problems of the Depression were hardest felt in the increasingly urban areas. People called for relief. Offering a doctrine of

hope for a number of people were the Communists who claimed that they had the best interests of the growing unemployed urban pool of labour in mind (Bowles, Hanley, Hodgins, Rawlyck; P. 138; 1972). The hungry unemployed made for a good audience as a radicalism of limited proportion bubbled among the urban dwellers hardest hit by the Depression. "Least of all can the statistics portray the bitterness of newly pauperized classes forced to forgo ammenities and even adequate food while the salaried and rentier groups suffered little." (McNaught; P. 240; 1971). The difficulties of life in the changing society became more than many had ever bargained for.

The Communist element had some effect upon the nature of the society at the time. An example of their influences involved an incident with Tim Buck. Tim Buck and his associates were spokesmen for Communists in Canada. They were incarcerated in Kingston Penitentiary at the time of the 1932 riots. During these riots gun shots were fired into Buck's cell. This had been perceived by the public as an assassination attempt upon his life. Public fervor was loud and wide-spread: "Public indifference to the draconian style of the government's suppression of dissent changed when there was an attempt to assassinate Tim Buck in prison." (Callwoods; P. 272; 1981). The impact of the Communists upon the Canadian public during the hard years of the Depression were best

described by the 17,000 cheering people who greeted Buck in Toronto upon his release from prison (Callwoods; 1981).

In 1939 war was declared upon Germany and Italy. The outbreak of war had brought an end to the Depression. Hostilities had reduced the appeal of communism in Canada, increasing the economic prosperity of the country. The economic and social revitalization took time. However, armament production and the need for soldiers quickly reduced the long line of unemployed. To fill the manpower requirements of the factories, rural migration resumed once more, having stopped almost completely during the Depression. The war-time years had been the start of a social revitalization which was to last long after the end of hostilities.

After the war social developments were unlike anything previously encountered. A society was unfolding which was demanding concessions in the form of increased growth and economic prosperity. This became a society which had decided to accept whole-heartedly the post-war boom. Generally, the concern of the people, for the most part, centred around attempting to insure that the economic health continued. The dreams of economic prosperity that arose after World War One, which had been dashed by the Depression of the 1930's, came alive in the society. For

particular segments of society, a truly golden age had arrived.

At the end of the war in 1945, urbanization of Canadian society resumed once more, prompted by the increasing flow of post-war immigration which between 1945 and 1970 accounted for two million people (McNaught; 1976). Associations between the United States and Canada increased dramatically during and after the war. By the end of the war, the traditional Canadian aversion and fear of the United States gave way to an eager Americanism within Canada that was to account for an increase of American investment in the country. Such massive investment was to account for 75 percent of foreign investment with British concerns declining to 25 percent: It was a complete reversal from the pre-war period (Callwoods; P. 290; 1981). Americanism was becoming integrated into Canadian society economically, socially and culturally. This was a phase of development that would continue through to the 1980's. A hunger for economic development and stability made Canadians view any sort of economic association with the Untied States as beneficial, concerning themselves with the short-term rewards. It was believed that the golden era imagined to have existed in the nineteenth century had come to stay. Few people concerned themselves with the costs of such growth. It was

a society short-sighted in nature, unaware of the effects of Americanism upon the changing nature of the Canadian society.

The period after World War Two was one of drastic change in Canada: "there can be no questioning that far reaching changes have been taking place in the Canadian society since the Second World War" (Clark; P. 15; 1976). Urban grown continued on a course of rapid ascent as the population rose from a 1945 high of 11 million to 22 million in the late 1970's. By 1966, the urban population outnumbered the rural populace by more than 75 percent (Ossenberg; P. 7; 1971). A continued growth in the urban population increased the size of cities in Canada. Problems inherent in urban centres also became an increasing feature of the Canadian landscape (Lower; P. 211; 1966).

After 1945, economic, social and technological developments abounded. Many of these developments intensified old problems as the 1960's wore on: urban slums were spreading; poverty became an increasingly real problem; life generally was becoming more complex. The "Welfare State" grew in prominance throughout this entire period of development. Thus, the period leading up to the 1970's was one which developed over a period of more than

100 years. It was to be in the 1970's that many of the problems of urban life and of the industrialized global economy were to be strongly felt by a large number of Canadians.

The period from 1921 to 1970 is best understood when divided into two subperiods. The first period consists of the years 1921 to 1932. Shortly after World War One, their first period witnessed an increase in trade unionism which was to have an instrumental impact upon the growth of a collective attitude among many Canadian to problems within the society. Inevitably this turn of events would have some impact upon the behavior of inmates in Kingston Penitentiary. This period had noted an increasingly demonstrative attitude among inmates in the penitentiary. Escapes were still occurring, however, demonstrations and rebellious behaviour presented even greater problems for prison officials. As the people within the society generally became more disgruntled with the inconsistencies around them, so too did inmates react emotionally to situations they felt to be unjust. The labour riots of 1918 and 1919, such as the Winnipeg General Strike, had shown people that they had some control over their destinies. This was a lesson that was to filter into the penitentiary: Inmates came to realize that for prisons to function the co-operation of the inmates was required.

(Norman: 1979). In the earlier period of Canadian development, people generally and inmates specifically had little understanding of the power they as a collective held, both inside and outside of the prison. Prison officials, on the other hand, were well aware of the power inmates held unknowingly. Like the workers in the society itself, inmates during the 1920's and early 1930's came to realize the potential power they could unleash as a group. The period had become the developmental time for inmates towards a more rebellious phase and more rebellious behaviour. Inmates realized that in order for them to have any impact upon their lives within the prison they would have to perfect their demonstrative abilities; "the convicts having learned that unless they were well organized and worked in unity, they would be unable to attain their desired objectives." (Report of the Superintendent; 1932).

As all of the realities of urban growth and economic changes began to arise in Canadian society, confusion began to infuse itself in the penitentiary much like it had within the society itself. Throughout the 1920's the progression of Depression increasingly made itself felt. Economic hardship and social dislocation were the results. The economic and social realities of a fluctuating world economy came to prevail. The economic

stability during World War One disappeared shortly after the war ended. People who contributed to the war effort came to believe that their sacrifices would be rewarded. Such beliefs were not lost upon the inmate population, many of whom had fought in the war or worked in the factories. The doctrines of the labour unions were not lost upon these individual when the war had ended. People were less tolerant of the sacrifices they were expected to make without questioning life in the changing society that was to have some impact upon the changing nature of inmate rioting during this period of development. Inmates were more willing to protest and demonstrate against the demands imposed upon them by prison officials; inmates were quicker to confront officials with demands for change in the prison. Yet like the society itself, inmate's rebelliousness was not overly radical during this time. There was still some apprehension as to the extent such rebellious action could be taken. Protest within the society was reflected within the prison, having been action on the part of the people which was limited in scope and limited in terms of effects upon the governing agencies against which such action was directed.

During the first sub period from 1920 to 1932 the most predominant feature of the prison riots was their growing demonstrative elements. For the most part no

violence was associated with the incidents during this period. In these incidents inmates attempted to unite in hopes of expressing their grievances towards situations they wanted changed.

This period was a product of the society which arose during this time. It was a period when society welcomed the doctrines of labour unions which grew in popularity after the First World War. Within the society generally, people increasingly realized that to effect some change their voices would have to be heard. A spirit of unrest of limited scope existed in Canada to the extent that people became more willing to demonstrate their anger and frustration. As Canada entered into the post-war period changes were evident, marking this period of Canadian history as being different from previous periods.

As the 1920's progressed, more people began to find themselves victim to the economic hardships which fell upon many of the less fortunate in the society. Many of the promises of a golden age, which were in circulation after the war, were empty like many other such promises of previous years. Many of the hardships themselves were unknown to Canadians, yet, many problems remained the same as those which existed during the 1880's. Changes within the society were making new problems while exasperating

many of the old ones. For the most part Canadian society after 1918 continued on its path of urbanization, gaining in importance as the rural concerns were delegated a less prominant place. The society became more progressive. With this period of growth and development, however, came an increasing threat of economic hardship, manifesting in the Depression of the 1930's.

The incidents that broke out in Kingston Penitentiary between 1920 and 1932 reflected the incidents created in society by virtue of the nature of that society. During these twelve years, riots and other sorts of incidents caused growing concern for prison administrators. Throughout this first sub period, the nature of inmate unrest reflected the same unrest which was in the society. Whether it was the food they were served, or the conditions they were forced to live in, inmates increasingly adopted the process of demonstration and a sort of activism to display their discontent. This was a process of disruption initiated in the prison which was similar to the nature of the unrest which was initiated by the labour unrest of the post-war years.

The discontent within the prison during this period was similar in nature to that within the society itself. For although there was unrest, it was a sort of disruption

which seldom involved violence, especially within the penitentiary. Comparatively, Canada did not undergo the sort of social unrest which may have been found in other industrializing nations. However, there was a stream of discontent which existed, manifesting itself in the growth of labour unions and an increase in the number of outspoken critics against the manner in which the society was developing. There were reactions against the social developments of the time and it was this sort of response which came to prevail within the penitentiary.

Inevitably, the penitentiary would house people from within the society who had participated in many of the new developments that took place in the world. The call to arms between 1914 and 1918 witnessed a large number of Canadians shipped overseas. At the same time, the large influx of rural people into the factories increased the rate of rural decline which was in effect since the late 1800's. Thus, the end of the war had brought with it the return of soldiers to a less than favourable economic future, as well as an increasing closure of factories due to decreased post-war industrial needs. The final result was a society in which its people resorted to the process of demonstration to attain what they felt they had been fighting for. It was this attitude that brought forward the growing popularity of unionism and demonstration.

People who were involved in many of the activities of this post-war society lived in the urban areas, often being the hardest hit. In most cases it was this very same strata which made up the majority of Kingston Penitentiary inmates. Thus these were individuals who were familiar with the activities that occurred in the society, therefore, they were quick to adopt them when situations within the prison warranted.

Inmates in the penitentiary were what the society had made them. As the less fortunate in the society, they often found themselves the hardest hit by turns in the economy or changes in social policy which increased their hardships. In turn, it was from this group that any movement against the status quo would be based upon for support. As the less fortunate, it would be this very same group which would find itself inhabiting the prisons. Inevitably, the atmosphere from which these inmates had come from would have an impact upon the nature of the incidents which broke out in the penitentiary.

It should be noted that the incidents which occurred in the society decreased as the 1920's progressed. However, those incidents which did occur did so during the earlier years of that decade. For the most part, the incidents that occurred were non-violent in

nature. The incidents which took place in the penitentiary were also non-violent. This similarity persisted until the early 1930's, at which time the nature of the society underwent changes which were turbulent. But it was to be at that time, with the changing nature of the society, that changes took place in the changing nature of prison riots towards a more violent nature.

The second sub period spanned the years 1932 to 1970. This period was distinguishable from the previous one by virtue of the increasing violent nature of the prison riots.

In a number of respects developments within the society had an effect upon the increasing violence that was infused into the nature of inmate outbreaks against their keepers. Developments of the last several decades had created a situation in Canada where people living in the urban areas had virtually no control over their lives. Once the rural way of life was given up, and as more immigrants stayed in the urban centres and the cities themselves grew in size and importance, the individual had less with which to bargain with. Thus, people increasingly found themselves in situations they had no control over and were at a loss as to how they were to avert the changes which took control over their lives. As the society grew,

becoming more urban, people came to rely upon the growing institutions to solve many of the problems. However, as the Depression of the 1930's fell upon the world, people were totally without a means of addressing their desperation. When the economic situation was healthier the labour unions provided an effective vehicle to address the problems many working people faced. But as the economic situation plummeted unions became ineffective. As well, other social institutions found themselves equally helpless to stop the hardships of the Depression.

With the hopelessness there came a growing unrest which was far from revolutionary, however, it was a force of some consequence. Within the society incidents of violence arose, increasing as the Depression wore on. In many instances unemployed men and women fought with police as attempts were made to demonstrate against the helplessness of their situations. As well, there was violence in the rail yards, in the food and unemployment lines and at the gates of industrial yards as thousands of workers competed for limited jobs. As the Depression wore on a number of riots broke out in the camps of unemployed people which were springing up in the country.

A growing frustration was evident in the penitentiary as well. It was this frustration which

initiated the violent response during the 1932 riots. Increasingly, inmates in Kingston Penitentiary had adopted the lessons which were being devised within the society itself. As the frustrations of the times became too much, people had demonstrated against that which they did not understand. All too often the response became violent. The times were hard. For people in the urban areas who were unemployed and with little hope of economic security, reactions against anything which seemed the least threatening were often violent. As the society became uncontrollable the responses of the people became more hostile and unpredictable. It was in the nature of the society itself that the elements of change could be found. It was in that society that the mandate of a communist party could grow in popularity as the desperation became unbearable. That was a time during which the society adopted measures which were different from those chosen in previous periods. But, a closer look at the changing nature of the society would disclose a society that was unlike any other that ever existed in Canada during any previous period.

Thus as the society changed so too would the manner in which the people within that society reacted to any given situation. The riots of 1932 marked a period in the history of the penitentiary, as well as a time in the

society, when the reactions of the 1930's to the hardships were in keeping with the developments of that time. Previously, the nature of the early Canadian society was strongly affected by the people coming from other countries. The 1930's marked a growing change in that the people were increasingly becoming affected by the society which they had created.

During the years of the Depression, people in the urban areas, as well as those in the penitentiary, were often part of the swelling urban ghettos. They were the victims of economic hardship and unemployment. A radicalism of limited scope was becoming evident among those people hardest hit by the Depression -- many of who often found themselves in the prison system. Popularity of the Communists in Canada during the ten years of the Depression portrayed this brewing radicalism of particular members of the societies' urban population. Unrest and discontent existed in the prison as well as in the urban areas. Unionism had little chance for growth during this period because of the numerous factory closures and economic stagnation generally. Still, many urban dwellers remembered the earlier strength of labour unionism which was displayed after World War One. Despite the increasing helplessness people were feeling throughout the 1930's, there was still a feeling among the unemployed that they

were victims of global economic forces. The communists provided answers for the unemployed workers who were eager to direct their concerns towards whatever the cause of their problems may have been.

During the time of the Depression a sense of community could not be maintained. The population was fluid, people travelled extensively in hopes of finding work. Social dislocation was prevalent. The disruption within the society was reflected in the protestations and demonstrations that took place in Kingston Penitentiary prior to World War Two (Callwoods; 255: Lower; 1966). Had the Depression lasted much longer than it did, large-scale reaction may have erupted throughout the society. It was this growing disillusionment, frustration and anger that was reflected during the rioting of 1934 and 1935, during which the damage was extensive and hostages were taken. War in 1939 had ended the short period of prosperity that the communists enjoyed in Canada. Growing economic health brought on by war turned the attention of people towards more personal economic gains in attempts to avoid the hardship many faced in the 1930's.

The two periods between 1920 and 1970 was a phase in the changing nature of the society which had an impact upon the changing nature of rioting in Kingston

Penitentiary. Although both of these periods varied from one another, they were the result of growing integration of inmates into the society. Incarceration during the 1800's and early 1900's was based upon isolation and hardship. The basic premise of such treatment was that inmates were to be removed from the society and placed in an institution which received little social concern. After World War One this attitude was changing. This was a period which saw greater links established between the society and the concerns of inmates.

Between the years 1920 and 1932 Canadian society underwent a transitional period from a pre-war rural society to an increasingly urbanized post-war society. Life for many urban dwellers was less than ideal as the harshness of industrial and urban developments took their toll. Many of the less fortunate members of the community often composed the greatest majority of inmates. Thus the more vocal and rebellious times of the 1920's developed into a greater willingness to demonstrate against those discrepancies which arose after 1918. As individuals, inmates became more willing to concern themselves with the harshness of their lives within the prison. Unlike before, inmates became increasingly less removed from the social reality within which they existed and from which they had previously been alienated from. Such a greater association

with the concerns of the society becomes increasingly evident by the responses adopted by the inmates which were similar to responses undertaken in the society generally.

In keeping with this notion of greater assimilation of inmates into society, as the 1930's continued, with increasing demonstration and violence brought on by the Depression, the nature of inmate incidents in Kingston Penitentiary also became increasingly violent. The integration of inmates was a phenomenon which continued throughout this second period of inmate rioting. As the 1930' progressed inmates in the penitentiary had initiated a number of outbreaks which were violent and unlike anything which had ever developed previously in Kingston Penitentiary. It was this violence which had separated this period into the two sub periods for the purpose of this study, however, it was the growing integration of inmates into the society at large which had a major impact between 1932 and 1970 upon the associations between the changing nature of society and the effects upon the nature of inmate rioting in Kingston Penitentiary. This integration of inmates continues to this day. It was during these two sub periods 1920 to 1932 and 1932 to 1970 that this process of integration was underway, initiating a process of changes from which inmates and their actions could not escape unscathed.

Throughout the war period inmate unrest was insignificant. The society as a whole was involved with the order of war, instilling people with feelings of patriotism or with the desire to become economically sound again. Inmates in the penitentiary, like those in the society, directed their energies and concerns outwards, away from life in the prison, for the duration of the war. A lack of unrest continued at the end of the war. From 1945 to 1954, a period of industrial and economic development took place as a result of the war which was to have a lasting impact upon the changing nature of Canadian society. This had been a period of rapid urban growth in Canada, immigration was resumed with vigor and people were willing to undergo drastic changes or accept what they had no control over for the sake of economic growth.

By 1954 there arose an awareness that the post-war period of unprecedented growth was demanding a price that was high. Until that time, dreams of American procured development spread throughout the Canadian urban centres with lightning speed. This had been the result of growing American involvement in Canada's economic, social and cultural development. The period after World War Two to 1954 reflected a time of transition for Canada, towards an increasing cosmopolitan society. This period of hope for success and stability prevailed throughout the society.

Inmates themselves displayed little behaviour that expressed discontent with the unfolding of the society which held them captive. Undoubtedly many believed that they too could benefit from the changes around them. The mid 1950's, however, represents a time when the problems inherent in a rapidly growing urban and industrial society began to show (McNaught; 1976: Fearn; 1973).

As the 1950's progressed, prosperity for the majority of the Canadian middle class was assured. The society was developing in such a manner that those who were capable of taking advantage of the economic benefits and social developments did so. As in any society, the benefits of the society did not touch all segments of the society. Thus the mid 1950's came to represent a time of realization for many people that the hardship of the Depression, or the sacrifices of the war period did not entitle them to unlimited opportunities; for many there were few if any real monetary or social gains. A period of discontent was rising which became verbalized during the more expressive period of the 1960's.

Growing discontent within the Kingston Penitentiary was very much a part of the disillusionment growing in the society. Extensive rioting in the penitentiary in 1954 portrayed the feelings and attitudes of the inmates and of

those less fortunate in the society at large. The manner in which the society was growing after 1945 created many who were discontent with their situations. Until the 1960's there were few outlets available for people to vent their feelings of hopelessness and anger. The price of growth pursued in Canada after the war demanded that people accept what is labelled as theirs without question with little room for argument. This lack of sense of participation for many people in the swelling urban areas created a climate of discontent that took hold during the 1960's.

The war years and post-war period witnessed a drastic decrease in the increasing rebelliousness and violence which arose during the 1930's. This was an occurrence which took place within the society as well as in the penitentiary. It was not until the 1950's that there arose increasing violence within the penitentiary. The major riot of 1954 in Kingston Penitentiary did have some impetus from the societal concerns of that time. That was a period in Canadian society when many of the promises of a society at war, and all of the immediate benefits from post-war economic growth, did not reach all segments of the society. It is true that there was no violence within the society as such. However, there was growing discontent and disillusionment among the less fortunate elements of the

growing urban centres. Inmates increasingly associated their situations with those of the growing urban poor and disadvantaged.

The riot of 1954 saw much of the prison destroyed. This had been a response by inmates to bring to the attention of their keepers, and the society, that they were being neglected during a time when many of the promises held out by a developing post-war Canadian society were not attainable. Like many of the disadvantaged, inmates were angered by the inability to attain many of the social and economic gains which had been promised. Such anger within the prison became increasingly expressed in issues of Hush Free Press, a prison newspaper, in which were noted all of the difficulties faced within the prison as well as outside of it. Like the inmates, those who were unable to attain the promised achievements became disillusioned and embittered. The nature of the society was such, however, that the bitterness many people felt could not be expressed violently. Post-war Canadian society, unlike during the Depression years, allowed little room for any violent outbreaks. During the hardship of the 1930's the society was more accommodating to outbursts of frustration. But the 1950's was a time when fewer people were disillusioned than in the 1930's, resulting in less acceptance for social action that is disruptive. For the inmates, however, their

feelings of neglect and frustration were expressed by rioting. They expressed these feelings during the 1954 riot which was the worst riot to have occurred in Kingston Penitentiary to that time. For members of society the 1950's proved to be a time when the opportunity for expressing discontent was less plausible because of the prevalent beliefs that those were times of growth and progress for everybody. The inmates, however, were not subject to those same constraints and expressed their anger in one of the few means open to them -- rioting.

The 1954 riot had been the final incident of inmate unrest during the third period in the changing nature of rioting in Kingston Penitentiary. With the end of the 1950's, and throughout the 1960's, came a period of social demonstration and unrest among various segments of the population. Within the penitentiary itself there were few incidents note-worthy. As demonstration and protest became more prevalent in the society an avenue was created so that people could voice their feelings or anger. It became a means through which discontent could be expressed. As the society became involved in what were, for the most part, acceptable forms of protest, inmates within Kingston Penitentiary adopted similar means of expressing discontent unlike in the 1930's and 1950's. Inmate unrest took place within the penitentiary, but there were no major outbreaks

of rioting. Inmates seemed to have believed, like others in the society at large, that group demonstrations and protests could be of some use in effecting change. Since the society tolerated demonstrations, inmates inevitably were caught up in the whole process of expressing discontent which prevailed at the time, and which was considered, in many instances, to have been a legitimate form of drawing the attention of the community to believed injustices. Such an avenue was considered relevant and effective up to the end of the 1960's and the start of the 1970's. Inmates, like others in the society, found that the effects of demonstrating their anger in the manner adhered to during the 1960's was limited, and it became outdated as the 1970's approached.

The final period in the changing nature of rioting in Kingston Penitentiary spanned a period of ten years, from 1970 to 1980. During this time there was one riot which was, by far, the worst riot in the history of the penitentiary. Inmates were tortured and killed by other inmates and prison staff were taken hostage and extensive damage was sustained.

Of all the riots looked at this particular incident is the one most difficult to attribute to changes in the nature of society. This riot had occurred at the start of

the 1970's, developing with a fury and violence uncharacteristic of the time. Perhaps if the incident had occurred as the 1970's came to a close more associations could be made. However, this final incident defies explanation in terms of any connections which could be made between the nature of that riot and the nature of the changing society.

****

REFERENCES

****

CHAPTER FOUR

Avery, D. "The Immigrant Industrial Worker in Canada 1896-1919: The Vertical Mosaic as an Historical Reality." Identities: The Impact Of Ethnicity On Canadian Society. Isajiw (ed). Peter Martin Associates Ltd. 1977.

Babcock, E. "The History of Kingston Penitentiary." Mimeograph. Solicitor General. Ottawa. 1965.

Beattie, J. Attitudes Towards Crime and Punishment In Upper Canada, 1830-1850: A Documentary Study. Toronto. Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto. 1977.

Bellomo, J. "Upper Canadian Attitudes Towards Crime and Punishment (1832-1851). Ontario History. Vol. LXIV. 1972.

Bowles, R., J. Hanley, B. Hodgins, G. Rawlyck. Protest, Violence, and Social Change. Scarborough. 1972.

Brown, R., R. Cook. Canada 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed. Toronto. McClelland and Stewart. 1976.

Callwood, J. Portrait of Canada. New York. Doubleday and Co. 1981.

Careless, J., B. Craig (eds). Part One of The Canadians 1867-1967. Toronto. Macmillan, 1971.

Chan, J. R. Ericson. Decarceration And The Economy Of Penal Reform. Toronto. Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto. 1981.

Clark, S. Canadian Society in Historical Perspective. Toronto, McGraw-Hill. 1976.

Cook, R. Canada: A Modern Study. Toronto. Clarke, Irwin and Co. 1963.

Cook, R. The Maple Leaf Forever. Toronto. Macmillan of Canada. 1971.

Desroches, F. "Patterns in Prison Riots." Canadian Journal of Corrections. Vol. 16, October. 1974. pp 332-351.

Editorial. "Call for Ventilation". The Halifax Chronicle August 15, 1933.

Fearn, G. Canadian Social Organization. Toronto. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1973.

Gaucher, B. "On The Need For Specificity In Marxist Criminology: An Illustration." Canadian Criminology Forum. Vol. 6 Fall. 1983. pp 35-47.

Graff, H. "Crime and Punishment in the Nineteenth Century: The Experience of Middlesex County, Ontario." Records of The Past. Toronto. Institute for Studies in Education. Series 13. 1979. pp 171-210.

House of Commons Debates. Vol. V, 1971.

Johnstone, W., B. Henheffer. "History of Treatment In Canadian Penitentiaries." Social Problems: A Canadian Profile. Laskin (ed). Toronto. McGraw-Hill. 1964. pp 449-454.

Journal Of The Legislative Assembly Of The Province Of Canada. Vol. 16, 1858.

Keyfits, N. "The Changing Canadian Population." Urbanism And The Changing Canadian Society. Clark (ed). Toronto, University of Toronto Press. 1961.

Letter to Department of Justice Re: Disturbances at Kingston Penitentiary August 21, 1946. Vol. 107 4-15-5(1) Public Archives. Ottawa.

Lower, J. Canada: An Outline History. Toronto. McGraw-Hill. 1966.

Mann, W. (ed). Social and Cultural Change in Canada. Toronto. Copp Clark. 1970.

McNaught, K. The Pelican History of Canada. Markham. Penguin Books. 1976.

Morton, W. The Critical Years. Toronto. McClelland and Stewart. 1977.

Norman, W. A Chapter Of Canadian Penal History: The Early Years Of The Provincial Penitentiary at Kingston, And The Commission Inquiry Into Its Management, 1835-1851. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. Queen's University. 1979.

Ossenberg, R. (ed). Canadian Society: Pluralism, Change, and Conflict. Scarborough. Prentice-Hall. 1971.

Report Of The Superintendent Of Penitentiaries. Re: Kingston Penitentiary Disturbances. Ottawa. 1932.

Rusche, G. "Labor Market And Penal Sanction: Thoughts On The Sociology Of Criminal Justice." Crime and Social Justice. Fall/Winter. 1978. pp 2-8.

Scott, G. Inmate. Toronto. Optimum Publishing. 1982.

Shoom, S. "The Upper Canadian Reformatory, Penetanguishene: The Dawn Of Prison Reform in Canada." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. V. 14, No. 3. July, 1979. pp 260-267.

Star Correspondent. "Star Special." Star October 18, 1932.

****

CONCLUSION

****

The riots examined in this study and the nature of the society in which they occurred were placed on a continuum according to specific periods of time. The intent of this study was to note, over time, outbreaks in Kingston Penitentiary which were seen by prison authorities as being threatening and disruptive to the operation of the prison. It was found that each period defined in this study, and the riots which occurred in those periods, represents a developmental stage for the penitentiary as well as for the society. In order to encompass all of these changes which took place over the time frame set out in this study, a single definition was used with which to define a riot. The nature of the study was such that to allow for an examination of the subject stated; over the period of time in question, an operational definition of riot was chosen upon which this study was based. The hypothesis upon which this study progressed undertook the examination of the outbreaks noted, within the confines of this study and its operational definition, and determine whether such outbreaks changed over time and, if so, whether such changes reflected the changing nature of the society.

There were four periods which had been defined out of the riots that took place in the penitentiary between 1835 and 1980. During each period different types of

rioting took place which seriously disrupted the operations of the institution. Each period defined was different from all those which came before and after it. Of the four periods, only the riots in three of the periods were found to have reflected the changing nature of the society at those particular points in time. The fourth period was such that no significant associations could be made between the nature of the riot that took place and the nature of the society in which it occurred.

The first of the four periods was from 1835 to 1873. The outbreaks which took place at this time, as defined within this study, were in the form of inmate assaults upon prison staff. It was this sort of disruptive behavior which prevailed in the institution and created the most threatening and disruptive crisis for the institution. These outbreaks were classified as riots within this study because they were the type of outbreaks which prevailed and were the prime concern of officials. As well, these outrbreaks reflected the nature of the society at that time which was rural, rustic and colonial, still in a pre-developmental stage. Some of the literature reviewed in Chapter One of this study, Shoom (1966), Fox (1956) and Garson (1972) made preliminary links between the nature of inmate responses to their environment and the nature of the society -- inmate assaults against staff were

in keeping with the nature of the society at the time in which such assaults were very real and threatening. For the most part, however, the literature provides few explanaitons for inmate reactions and with fewer links as to those reactions and the nature of the society. Since the society itself was far from being complex and sophisticated so too were the ways inmates chose to react to their environment, resulting in inmate attacks upon staff.

The second period defined within this study spanned from 1873 to 1920. The nature of rioting in this period was in the form of constant inmate escapes and attempted escapes during which numerous serious cases of violence took place, causing prison officials increasing concern for the continued safe operation of the institution. Some of the general literature on rioting touches upon the nature of inmate reactions in this period, such as Shoom (1966) and Garson (1972), but there is no in-depth or descriptive work available on the nature of such outbreaks. Few attempts have been made in the available literature to bring into perspective the sort of outbeaks which occurred in the penitentiary. The nature of inmate outbreaks in this period falls within the definition of riot in this study because of the prevalence with which such a reaction by inmates was noted by officials of the period. The

of such reactions by inmates posed serious problems for an institution which was finding itself in an increasingly more complex society. This second period is noted in this study as being a time of increasing social, economic and cultural changes. It was the time of the agricultural and industrial revolution which was to have a great impact upon Canadian society at large. With a growth in immigration from Europe and the increasing urbanization in Ontario specifically and Canada generally, inmate reactions to their environment became more sophisticated. The result of such broad changes in the society reflected the changes which were taking place in the manner of rioting for this period of time.

A third period was defined between the years 1921 to 1970, during which a third change was noted in the nature of inmate rioting in the penitentiary. This was a period which witnessed some of the large scale outbreaks which became more prevalent in an increasingly modern world. Such a change in rioting was noted in the work of Bates (1936) who wrote of the transformation of society and how that was affecting the nature of the prisons. Similar observations were noted by Fox (1956), Garson (1972) and Flynn (1980) yet these writers offered little in the way of an overall view of the changes taking place in prison riots. Like the other periods before this one there were

associations made between the changing nature of inmate rioting and the nature of the society. This had been a period in which inmate rioting became increasingly demonstrative, violent and large in proportion unlike any of the preceeding periods. Such a development reflected the society in which those outbreaks took place. The period in question had been a time of increasing social change and discontent: Economically, socially and even politically this period witnessed a time of urban unrest and political activism -- fuelled by depression and labour unionism -- which was unlike any other time in Canadian social history. Changes taking place in society during this period had become the catalyst of the modern society. The nature of inmate rioting during this period was witness to the changes occurring within the society at large.

Unlike the three periods which had gone before it, the fourth period in the nature of inmate rioting was distinctively different. Of the general literature reviewed in Chapter One the work of Desroches (1983) and Scott (1982) was directed specifically to the riot of 1971 which represents the only riot to have been noted in this study for the period from 1970 to 1980. This single outbreak was to represent the most devastating, gruesome and violent riot in Canadian penal history from which Kinston Penitentiary was to never completely recover. This

outbreak represented the worst riot of the period and one which caused prison officials more concern than any other type of incident which developed during that period; it was this outbreak which seriously threatened the operation of the institution. Unlike the three periods noted prior to this one there were no associations possible between the nature of the rioting and the nature of the society in which it occurred. There was nothing noted within the general overall developments of the society which reflected the violence and madness which prevailled in the rioting of this period in Kingston Penitentiary.

The literature reviewed in this study had provided few links between the changing nature of rioting in prisons and whether such changes reflected the nature of the society. Most attention in the literature has been directed towards isolated events, concentrating primarily within the institutions. Unlike the popular literature, however, this study has dealt with a general examination of rioting in Kingston Penitentiary over a 145 year period. During this time outbreaks took place which do not fit more contemporary definitions of rioting but which did fit under the operational definition used in this study. The result of such an approach has been a better general understanding of the nature of prison rioting over a long period of time as it unfolded in Kingston Penitentiary. An observation of

the phenomenon over time has allowed for a continuum to be developed showing where rioting started from, where it went and where it now is. Such a continuum, when placed within the nature of the society in which such rioting occurred, has shown rioting in Kingston Penitentiary to have been heterogeneous in nature yet not always reflecting the nature of the society in which such rioting arose. Such a continuum also shows that incidents occur at different points in time and what takes place in one period, although not considered a riot by contemporary terms, is significant enough to warrant its study as a riot by virtue of the disruption it brings to the institution and the threats it poses to the operation of an institution.

The parameters set for this study were such that only Kingston Penitentiary was examined. Despite the scope of the study some associations could be drawn between the findings of this study and what the experiences of other similar institutions may have been. However, no two institutions are alike in every respect, therefore, caution must be used when trying to impose the historical and social realities of one institution upon another. Provided within this study is, however, a general framework upon which other studies could build in order to gain a clearer understanding of rioting in Canadian prisons in an ever changing social landscape. More work is required to place

outbreaks in prisons into a national perspective, contributing to a more wholistic picture of rioting as the heterogeneous phenomenon it is which occurs in a society that is constantly in a state of transition.

****

BIBLIOGRAPHY

****

American Correctional Association Committee. Riots and Disturbances in Correction Institutions. American Correctional Association 1970.

American Prison Association Committee on Riots, Prison Disturbances and Riots. Report. May, 1953.

Atkins, B., H. Glick(eds). Prisons, Protests, and Politics. Prentice-Hall. N.J. 1972.

Assistant Warden To Superintendent of Penitentiaries. Re: Unrest of Inmates October 20, 1932. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1). Public Archives. Ottawa

Avery, D. "The Immigrant Industrial Worker in Canada 1896-1919: The Vertical Mosaic as an Historical Reality." Identities: The Impact Of Ethnicity On Canadian Society. Isajiw (ed). Peter Martin Associates Ltd. 1977.

Babcock, E. "The History of Kingston Penitentiary." Historic Kingston. Mimeograph. Ottawa. Solicitor General Library. 1965.

Banister, P., et al. "Psychological Correlates of Long Term Imprisonment". British Journal of Criminology. Vol.13(4), Oct., 1973. pp 312-330.

Bates, S. Prisons And Beyond. Books for Libraries Press N.Y. 1936.

Beattie, J. Attitudes Towards Crime and Punishment In Upper Canada, 1830-1850: A Documentary Study. Toronto. Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto. 1977.

Bellomo, J. "Upper Canadian Attitudes Towards Crime and Punishment (1832-1851). Ontario History. Vol. LXIV. 1972.

Berkowitz, L. "Frustrations, Comparisons, and Other Sources of Emotion Arousal as Contributors to Social Unrest Journal of Social Issues Vol. 28(1) 1972. pp 77-91.

Bolte, G. "Institutional Disobedience In A Maximum-Security Prison" Offender Rehabilitation. Vol.3(1). Fall 1978. pp 19-31.

Bowles, R., J. Hanley, B. Hodgins, G. Rawlyck. Protest, Violence, and Social Change. Scarborough. 1972.

Brody, S. "The Political Prisoner Syndrome. "Crime and Delinquency. Vol. 20(2). April, 1974. pp. 97-106.

Brown, R., R. Cook. Canada 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed. Toronto. McClelland and Stewart. 1976.

Callwood, J. Portrait of Canada. New York. Doubleday and Co. 1981.

Caporaso, J., Ross, L. (eds). Quasi-Experimental Approaches. Evanston. Northwestern University Press. 1973.

Careless, J., B. Craig (eds). Part One of The Canadians 1867-1967. Toronto. Macmillan, 1971.

Chan, J. R. Ericson. Decarceration And The Economy Of Penal Reform. Toronto. Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto. 1981.

Clark, S. Canadian Society in Historical Perspective. Toronto, McGraw-Hill. 1976.

Clark, S.D. Canadian Society in Historical Perspective. Toronto. McGraw-Hill Ryerson. 1976.

Clemmer, D. The Prison Community. Holt, Rinehart, Winston Inc. N.Y. 1958.

Cohen, A. "Prison Violence: A Sociological Perspective". Prison Violence. A. Cohen, G. Cole, R. Dayley (eds). Lexington Books, Massachusetts. 1976. pp 3-21.

Conrad, J. "The Beast Behind The Wall". Prison Violence. A. Cohen, G. Cole, R. Daily (eds). Lexington Books, Massachusetts. 1976. pp 23-29.

Cook, R. Canada: A Modern Study. Toronto. Clarke, Irwin and Co. 1963.

Cook, R. The Maple Leaf Forever. Toronto. Macmillan of Canada. 1971.

Creighton, D. "Troops Ready For Any Sign Of New Riot." Telegram. August 16, 1954.

Cressey, D. (ed). The Prison Studies In Institutional Organization And Change. Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc. N.Y. 1961.

Criminal Code of Canada, 1981.

Culhane, C. Barred From Prison. Pulp Press, Vancouver. 1979.

Dandurand, Y. "The Report of the Sub-Committee On The Penitentiary System -- Another Look." Crime and Justice. Aug., 1977. pp 103-109.

Dauber, E., D. Shichor. "A Comparative Exploration of Prison Discipline." Journal of Criminal Justice. Vol. 7 (1) 1979. pp 22-35.

DeFord, M. Stone Walls: Prisons From Letters to Furloughs. Chilton Co., N.Y. 1962.

Desroches, F. (1). "Patterns in Prison Riots." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. Vol. 16 (4) Oct., 1974. pp 332-351.

Desroches, F. (2). "Anomie: Two Theories Of Prison Riots" Canadian Journal of Criminology. Vol. 25(2), April, 1983. pp 173-190.

Desroches, F. (3). "The April 1971 Kingston Penitentiary Riot." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. Vol. 16 (4) 1974. pp 317-331.

Durkheim, E. Suicide. The Free Press. New York. 1951.

Eastman, M. "Riot and Reform at Sing Sing". Prison Reform. C. Bacon (ed). H.W. Wilson Co. N.Y. 1917. pp 125-128.

Editorial. "Call for Ventilation". The Halifax Chronicle August 15, 1933.

Editorial. "Those Prison Riots." The Ottawa Journal. October 20, 1932.

Edmison, J. "Some Aspects of Nineteenth-Century Canadian Prisons." Crime And Its Treatment in Canada. W.T. McGrath (ed). Macmillan. T.O. 1976 pp 279-301.

Ellis, D., Grasmick, H. Gilman, B. "Violence In Prisons:A Sociological Analysis." American Journal of Sociology. Vol. 180 (1), July 1974. pp 16-43.

Ellis, D. (1). Disturbances In Canadian Penitentiaries During The Years 1971-1980. York University. La Marsh Research Programme, Report No. 4, July, 1982.

Ellis, D. (2). Size, Crowding And Violence: The Prison As Behavioral Sink. York University. Research Paper.

Emison, J. "The History of Kingston Penitentiary." Historic Kingston. No. 3. November, 1954, pp 26-35.

Else, J., K. Stepheson. "Vicarious Expiation: A Theory of Prison and Social Reform." Crime and Delinquency. Vol. 20 (4) Oct., 1974. pp 359-372.

Farrington, D., C. Nuttal. "Prison Size, Overcrowding, Prison Violence, And Recidivism." Journal of Criminal Justice. Vol. 8 (3), 1980. pp 221-231.

Feld, B. Neutralizing Inmate Violence. Ballinger Pub., Massachusetts 1977.

Fearn, G. Canadian Social Organization. Toronto. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1973.

Firestone, J. "Theory of the Riot Process." American Behavioral Scientist. Vol. 15 (6), July/Aug. 1972. pp 859-882.

Flynn, E. "From Conflict Theory to Conflict Resolution." American Behavioral Scientist. Vol. 23 (5). May/June, 1980. pp 745-776.

Fox, V. (1). Violence Behind Bars. Greenwood Press. Connecticut. 1956.

Fox, V. (2). "Prison Riots In A Democratic Society." Police. 16 Aug. 1972. pp 35-41.

Galtung, J. "Prison: The Organization Of Dilemma" D. Cressey. (ed). Prison Studies In Institutional Organization And Change. 1961. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York. 1961. pp 107-145.

Garson, G. (1). "The Disruption of Prison Administration: An Investigation Of Alternative Theories Of The Relationship Among Administrators, Reformers, And Involuntary Social Service Clients." Law Society and Review. 6. 1972. pp 531-651.

Garson, G. (2). "Force Versus Restraint In Prison Riots." Crime And Delinquency. Vol. 18 (4) Oct. 1972. pp 411-421.

Gaucher, B. "On The Need For Specificity In Marxist Criminology: An Illustration." Canadian Criminology Forum. Vol. 6. Fall. 1983. pp 35-47.

Graff, H. "Crime and Punishment in the Nineteenth Century: The Experience of Middlesex County, Ontario." Records of The Past. Toronto. Institute for Studies in Education. Series 13. 1979. pp 171-210.

Goffman, I. "On The Characteristics Of Total Institutions: The Inmate World." D. Cressey (ed) The Prison Studies In Institutional Organization And Change. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York. 1961. pp 68-106.

Gosselin, L. Prisons In Canada. Black Rose Books. Montreal. 1982.

Hamilton, G. "Inmate's Story: Two Fires, Break Plotted". Globe and Mail. August 6, 1954.

Haney, C., et al. "Interpersonal Dynamics In A Simulated Prison." International Journal of Criminology and Penology. Vol. 1 1973. pp 69-97.

Hartung, F., M. Flock. "A Social-Psychology Analysis of Prison Riots: An Hypothesis." Journal of Criminal Law Criminology, and Police Science. Vol. 47. 1956-57. pp 51-57.

Helmstadter, G. Research Concepts in Human Behavior. NewYork. Appleton-Century-Crofts. 1970.

House of Commons Debates. Vol. 1, 1955.

House of Commons Debates. Vol. 111, 1955.

House of Commons Debates. Vol. V, 1971.

Huff, C. "Unionization Behind The Walls." Criminology. Vol. 12 (2). Aug. 1974. pp 175-194.

Hush Free Press. "Is Graft Rampant At Kingston Pen?" July 2, 1949.

Hush Free Press. "300 Prisoners Sign Smuggled Statement." May 15, 1950.

Hyman, R. "Saved Keys Despite Fire and Mob." Globe and Mail. August 16, 1954.

Jacobs, J. Stateville: The Penitentiary in Mass Society. University of Chicago Press. 1977.

Jayewardene, C.H.S. "The Nature of Homicide: Canada 1961-1970." Crime in Canadian Society. R. Silverman, J. Teevan Jr. (eds). Toronto. Butterworth and Co. 1975. pp 279-310.

Jensen, G. "Age And Rule Breaking In Prison." Criminology. Vol. 14 (4). Feb., 1977. pp 555-568.

Journal Of The Legislative Assembly Of The Province Of Canada. Vol. 16, No. 4, 1858.

Johnstone, W., B. Henheffer. "History Of Treatment In Canadian Penitentiaries." Social Problems: A Canadian Profile. Lasking (ed). Toronto. McGraw-Hill. 1964. pp 449-454.

Keyfits, N. "The Changing Canadian Population." Urbanism And The Changing Canadian Society. Clark (ed). Toronto, University of Toronto Press. 1961.

Kidman, J. The Canadian Prison. Ryerson Press. Toronto 1947.

Kirkpatrick, A. "The Prison Dilemma." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. Vol. 16 (2). April 1974. pp 282-290.

Leff, G. History and Social Theory. Alabama. University of Alabama Press. 1969.

Letter to Department of Justice Re: Disturbances at Kingston Penitentiary August 21, 1946. Vol. 107 4-15-5(1) Public Archives. Ottawa.

Letter to Minister of Justice Guthrie, July 10, 1933. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1) Public Archives. Ottawa.

Letter To The Warden. July 10, 1933. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1) Public Archives, Ottawa.

Lower, J. Canada: An Outline History. Toronto. McGraw-Hill. 1966.

MacCormick, A. "Behind the Prison Riots. "American Academic of Political and Social Science. Vol. 203, May, 1954. pp 17-27.

MacGuigan Report. The Sub-Committee on the Penitentiary System In Canada. Ottawa, 1977.

Mann, W. (ed). Social and Cultural Change in Canada. Toronto. Copp Clark. 1970.

McCleery, R. "The Governmental Process and Informal Social Control." D. Cressey (ed). Prison Studies In Institutional Organization And Change. Holt, Rinehart and Winston. New York. 1961. pp 149-188.

McKay, H., Krug-McKay, B. Jayewardene, C.H.S. Indicators of Disturbances in Penal Institutions. University of Ottawa, Criminology, 1977.

McNaught, K. The Pelican History of Canada. Markham. Penquin Books. 1976.

McNeil, G., S. Vance. Cruel And Unusual. Deneau and Greenburg. Canada. 1978.

Memorandum For The Honourable The Minister Of Justice, December 5, 1932. Re: Kingston Penitentiary Disturbances October, 1932, Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1). Public Archives, Ottawa.

Memorandum For the Honourable The Minister Of Justice Re: Kingston Penitentiary Disturbance or Insurrection. October, 1932. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1) Public Archives. Ottawa.

Memorandum For The Deputy Minister Of Justice, 8th January, 1933. Re: Dorchester Revolt. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1). Public Archives. Ottawa.

Minor, W. "Political Crime, Political Justice, And Political Prisoners." Criminology. Vol. 12 (4) Feb. 1975. pp 385-398.

Mohr, J.W., Turner, R., Jerry, M. Pedophilia and Exhibitionism. Toronto. University of Toronto Press. 1964.

Morris, G. "Irrational Beliefs of Prison Inmates." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. Vol 16 (1), Jan. 1974. pp 53-59.

Morris, T. "The Parlous State of Prisons". J. Freedman (ed). Prisons Past And Future. Heinemann, London. 1978. pp 81-91.

Morton, W. The Critical Years. Toronto. McClelland and Stewart. 1977.

Norman, W. A Chapter Of Canadian Penal History: The Early Years Of The Provincial Penitentiary At Kingston And The Commission Inquiry Into Its Management, 1835-1851. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Queen's University, 1979.

Nowak, S. Methodology of Social Research. Holland/USA. D. Reidel Pub. 1977.

Ossenberg, R. (ed). Canadian Society: Pluralism, Change, and Conflict. Scarborough. Prentice-Hall. 1971.

Pallas, J., B. Barber. "From Riot to Revolution." Issues In Criminology. Vol. 7 (2), Fall, 1972. pp 1-19.

Rawls, J. A Theory of Justice. Massachussetts. Harvard Press. 1971.

Royal Commission To Investigate The Penal System Of Canada. Archambault Report. Ottawa, 1938.

Report Of Investigation Into Shooting Into "D" Block Kingston Penitentiary. October 20, 1932. Vol. 107 4-15-5 (1) Public Archives. Ottawa.

Report Of The Superintendent of Penitentiaries. 1932.

Report Of The Superintendent of Penitentiaries. 1933.

Report Of The Superintendent of Penitentiaries. 1935

Report Of The Superintendent of Penitentiaries. 1954-55.

Report Of The Superintendent of Penitentiaries. 1955.

Report Of The Superintendent Of Penitentiaries. Re: Kingston Penitentiary Disturbances. Ottawa. 1932.

Rusche, G. "Labor Market And Penal Sanction: Thoughts On The Sociology Of Criminal Justice." Crime and Social Justice. Fall/Winter. 1978. pp 2-8.

Scott, G. Inmate. Optimum Publishing. Montreal. 1982.

Scott, G. Inmate. Toronto. Optimum Publishing. 1982.

Schrag, C. "The Sociology of Prison Riots." Proceedings of the American Correctional Association. 1960. pp 136-146.

Sessional Papers. Vol. XX1. 1863

Sessional Papers. Vol. 11. 1870.

Sessional Papers. Vol. 11. 1874.

Sessional Papers. Vol. XV11. 1885.

Sessional Papers. Vol. 11. 1890.

Sessional Papers. Vol. X1V. 1906.

Shafer, R.J. (ed). A Guide To Historical Method. Illinois. Dorsey Press. 1980.

Shoom, S. "Kingston Penitentiary: The Early Decades." Canadian Journal of Corrections. Vol. 8. July 1966. pp 215-220.

Shoom, S. "The Upper Canada Reformatory. Penetanguishene: The Dawn Of Prison Reform In Canada." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections. Vol. 14, No. 3 July, 1979. pp 260-267.

Smith, C., J. Hepburn. "Alienation in Prison Organizations." Criminology. Vol. 17 (2). Aug. 1979. pp. 251-262.

Smith, J. "The Prediction of Prison Riots." British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology. Vol. 33 (2) Nov. 1980. pp 151-159.

Solicitor General. A Summary And Analysis Of Some Major Inquiries On Corrections, 1938-1977. May, 1977. Ottawa.

Solicitor General. Historical Background of the Canadian Penitentiary Service. Ottawa. 1965.

Star Correspondent. Star Special. The Star. October 18, 1932.

Stolz, B. "Prisons As Political Institutions: What Are The Implications For Prison Ministry." Proceedings of the One Hundred and Eighth Annual Congress of the American Correctional Association. Aug. 1978. pp 11-20.

Swackhammer Report. Report Of The Commission Of Inquiry Into Certain Disturbances At Kingston Penitentiary During April, 1971. Ottawa, 1973.

Task Force On The Creation Of An Integrated Canadian Corrections System. The Role Of Federal Corrections In Canada. Jan. 1977.

The Citizen. "Summon Troops Again to Halt Prison Rioting". October 21, 1932.

Toch, H. "Social Climate and Prison Violence." Federal Probation. Vol. 42 (4). 1978. pp 21-25.

Van Luven, D. "200 Rampaging Prisoners Create $1,000,000 Havoc" The Kingston Whig Standard. August 16, 1954.

Veno, A., M. Davidson. "Prison Violence: Some Different Perspectives." International Journal of Criminology and Penology. Vol. 5. 1977. pp 399-409.

Whitehead, J. (1). "Violence in Institutions." International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology. London Vol. 19 (1) 1975. pp 87-89.

Whitehead, J. (2). "Violence in Mental Hospitals and Prisons." International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology. Vol. 23 (1) 1979. pp 21-24.

Wightman, H. "Uprising At Kingston Worst Ever" Globe and Mail. August 15, 1954.

Wilds, C. "Evaluation Of A Method Of Predicting Violence In Offenders." Criminology. Vol. 11 (3). Nov. 1973. pp 427-435.

Wilsnack, R. "Explaining Collective Violence in Prisons: Problems and Possibilities." Prison Violence. A. Cohen (ed) 1976. pp 61-78.

Wolf, P. "The Effect of Prison on Criminality." Past And Future. J. Freeman (ed) 1978. pp 17-102.

Woolpert, S. "Prisoner's Unions, Inmate Militancy, and Corretional Policymaking." Federal Probation. Vol. 24 (2) June, 1978. pp 40-45.

Zeeman, E., Hall, C. Harrison, P., Marriage, G., Shapland, P. "A Model For Prison Disturbances." British Journal of Criminology. Vol. 17 (3), July, 1977. pp 251-263.

Zellick, G. "The Hull Prison Riot". British Journal of Criminology. Vol. 18 (1), Jan. 1978. pp 75-79.