

Introduction

“The punishment of crime is a political act.”¹ It is the state, through public policy decisions, that defines what actions are considered criminal and determines which types of crimes will be targeted for prosecution at a given point in time and the forms that punishment will take. The punishment of crime is also a political act in that it “represents the use of physical force by the state to control the lives of people the state has defined as criminal.”²

The study of the penal system is of utmost importance if we consider that what distinguishes the state from other institutions of society is its claimed monopoly over the means of coercion. The state, as understood in this text, is composed of a series of administrative, legal, bureaucratic, and coercive organizations and relationships which reproduce political, socio-economic, racial/ethnic, gender, and sexual domination through repression, ideology, and struggles within and between classes and state actors.³

Within this context, the creation of the penitentiary as a form of punishment became an essential ideological and material component of the state apparatus which helped ensure its ability to exercise social control.⁴ For without the threat of punishment, and ultimately imprisonment, the state’s authority and legitimacy would continually be challenged by significant numbers of the population.⁵ It is within penal institutions that we can observe, perhaps most clearly, the various mechanisms used by the state to quell rebelliousness. The fact that what occurs within prisons tends to reflect what is taking place on the outside makes the study of the impact of imprisonment on women and people of color all the more imperative.

Throughout United States history a variety of punishments have been used to penalize persons convicted of breaking the law.⁶ The type of punishment applied has varied according to the social class, sex, age, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity and legal status (i.e., free versus slave) of the persons involved. Historically, public corporal and capital punishment as well as imprisonment have been used more

often to punish poor and working-class white and people of color.⁷ The fact that Latinas(os) are disproportionately imprisoned makes the study of the penal system and the functions it serves all the more imperative for the Latina(o) community.

One of the major assumptions guiding this book is that to understand the Latina(o) prison experience, we need to reconceptualize the experiences of all prisoners taking into account differences in race, nationality, ethnicity, class, and gender, among them and between them and others. Further, unless one analyzes the disparate impact state policies have on women and men, one cannot understand the full effect these policies have on a community. As a result, one cannot discern clearly the tactics and strategies needed to change oppressive social conditions. Another assumption is that unless one understands the experiences of Latinas and Latinos inside and outside the walls, one cannot fully understand the Latina(o) experience in the United States.

While this text will not directly compare the outside Latina(o) community's struggles with those of their peers on the inside, the reader is reminded that this book should be read with the understanding that the struggles being waged by the Latina(o) community inside and outside the walls and the state's response to them, are not only similar but complement one another.

Issues of Gender and Ethnicity⁸ in Prison Research

The past three decades have seen a flourishing within the social sciences of the literature on prisons and prisoners. With few exceptions, these studies have been written by white middle-class male academics,⁹ and civilians working in penal institutions,¹⁰ former guards,¹¹ and penal administrators.¹² Their focus has been almost exclusively on the male prisoner "society." Complementing these studies were the publications of the American Correctional Association, which concentrated on writings by prison administrators.¹³ A few studies have been written by white middle-class women academics¹⁴ and prison administrators.¹⁵ These, with few exceptions¹⁶ tended to focus on female prisoners. Until the 1970s, studies about prisoners were written as if the male and female¹⁷ prisoner populations were racially and ethnically homogeneous.

Although since the mid-1960s, a few male and female prisoners and ex-prisoners have published autobiographies, essays, poetry, and so forth,¹⁸ it has been the liberal and conservative studies carried out

by academics and penal personnel that have gained the most recognition within the social sciences. This is so despite the fact that much of the growing interest in prison politics was motivated by the activities of prisoners who, beginning in the 1950s, called increasing national attention to their plight through strikes,¹⁹ rebellions,²⁰ and litigation.²¹ Prisoner interpretation of reality continues to be basically ignored or dismissed as the work of a few biased "radicals" or "revolutionaries" who should not be taken seriously.

Interestingly, while the concept of "power" is central to the field of political science, little attention has been paid by contemporary United States political scientists to the role of the penal system in society. This is so despite the fact that major European and United States political theorists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries devoted a great deal of time to discussing the roles punishment and imprisonment played in maintaining the social order and legitimizing the status quo.²² While the academic literature on prisons, concentrated primarily in the field of sociology and criminology, has contributed to our understanding of some key aspects of prison life, the value of its theoretical contribution has been limited by the fact that the studies such literature was based upon were overwhelmingly biased in favor of state elites. One of the significant repercussions of such pro-status quo biases was that until the late 1970s, social scientists, with few exceptions,²³ avoided studying the dialectical relationship which existed between prisoners and penal personnel and the impact the actions of the latter had on the former. As a result, "By inadvertently stripping the social system of 'half' of its social action . . . the captives are left without captors to influence their social relationships."²⁴ The keepers, therefore, were exonerated from having to take responsibility for the manner in which their actions contributed to prisoner victimization.

A second consequence of the pro-elite bias was that the impact of third parties on prisoners tended to be ignored unless it was to argue (particularly after the emergence of various civil rights movements of the 1960s) that radical groups were "importing" their revolutionary ideas into prisons, thus disrupting the orderly process of prison administration.²⁵ This argument ignored the effect white supremacist ideology and activism within various sectors of the state, such as prisons, has historically had on the development of penal policies as well as prisoner/staff and intra-prisoner relations. Thus, for example, the implications of Ku Klux Klan recruitment of staff within penal institutions, as well as the preferential treatment white staff have gener-

ally accorded white prisoners, have been downplayed or ignored by students of northern prisons.

Furthermore, mainstream social scientists failed to analyze the differential impact of state policies on significant sectors of the prisoner population. This was particularly true in the case of women, people of color, and lesbian and gay prisoners. As a result, there was little or no recognition of how biases based on race, gender, nationality, ethnicity, class, and sexual orientation influenced the treatment given prisoners. Two of the significant political ramifications of such an oversight were that the concerns of women prisoners and male prisoners of color were basically ignored as penal policies and programs were primarily shaped by studies conducted about white male prisoners. The differential treatment accorded diverse groups of prisoners helped deepen existing differences and rivalries among a captive population competing for scarce resources.

Researching Women Prisoners

Women who break the law have been viewed in different ways depending on the nature of their crimes, their social class, their race and ethnicity, their sexual orientation, the historical period involved, their political persuasion, and so forth. Women offenders, however, share one thing in common; their actions have been perceived as the result of their inability to adapt to their socially-prescribed roles of dutiful wives, mothers, and daughters.²⁶ As such, women's crimes, by challenging the subordinate roles assigned to women in society, have been seen as threatening the foundations of the social, economic, legal, political, and moral order in ways that men's crimes have not.²⁷ Consequently, women offenders have not always been conferred the same treatment by the criminal justice system.²⁸ In many states discrimination against women was justified by legal statutes which, through the use of indeterminate sentencing, prescribed longer sentences for women than for men convicted of the same substantive offenses.²⁹

Gender stereotypes, ultimately based on biological assumptions about the inherent nature of the sexes, have also been used to justify discriminatory policies. As a result, in many cases, women prisoners have been denied access to certain vocational programs available to male prisoners. In other instances, women in prison have been penalized for behavior, such as the use of profanity, generally expected of male prisoners. The result being that imprisoned women received a

disproportionate number of misbehavior reports in comparison to their male counterparts.

Differential treatment has also been justified by social science studies on women prisoners that highlight the role played by women's prison family groups and kinship networks,³⁰ almost to the complete exclusion of other types of prisoner organization. By focusing on the dynamics of prison families, the studies reinforced *a priori* the assumption that the main concern of women in prison was to maintain their traditional roles. Hence, it was appropriate for penal elites to limit women's educational and vocational training to areas traditionally considered appropriate "women's" work, such as cooking, sewing, ironing, etc.

The bias in favor of highlighting prison family and kinship networks complemented those studies which portrayed women prisoners as "passive" and "apolitical," despite evidence to the contrary. By ignoring the various ways in which prison authorities hindered women's ability to organize themselves to pursue reforms, such as the use of male guards to physically subdue women prisoners, social scientists distorted the prison experiences of women and ignored important ways in which state sectors sought to maintain their continued subordination. Notwithstanding, women prisoners, as the current study will show, rebelled against traditionally imposed gender roles and oppressive penal policies in a number of ways. In addition to forming prison family groups and kinship networks, they created other informal and formal prisoner groups, participated in rebellions, work strikes and hunger strikes,³¹ filed petitions and class action suits,³² wrote for prisoners' rights newsletters,³³ published their autobiographies, physically resisted the attacks by their keepers, and escaped.³⁴

In view of what has been discussed above, one of my objectives was to examine how major assumptions about women prisoners have influenced the treatment accorded Latinas in prison. While it is likely that a good deal of the information gathered by social scientists, private organizations, and government personnel on the problems encountered by Latinos throughout the criminal justice system are shared by both sexes, the fact that Latinas are also part of the women's prison population means that their needs have been ignored, not only because of their ethnicity but also because the concerns of women prisoners have generally been subordinated to those of their male counterparts. In light of prevailing stereotypes about women prisoners and the lack of data concerning the prison experiences of

Latinas in the United States, the current research examines how different the prison experience of Latinas was from that of Latinos as well as what were their common experiences as a socially subordinate group.

As a partial study of the impact of ethnicity on prisoner organizing, however, we must start by identifying Latina(o) prisoner concerns. Since Latinas(os) co-exist with non-Latina(o) prisoners with whom they share a number of interests, a distinction must be made between those concerns which are perceived as specific to Latinas(os) (e.g., end to discriminatory language policies, the implementation of bilingual Spanish/English programs and the hiring of more bilingual personnel)³⁵ and those which they shared with other prisoners (e.g., prison conditions, access to third parties).

Researching Latina(o) Prisoners: The Study

During the two hundred years penitentiaries have existed in the United States, the experiences and concerns of Latina and Latino prisoners have been virtually ignored by state elites, social scientists, and third parties.³⁶ In New York State, it was not until the visible participation of Latinos in the New York City and upstate male prison rebellions of the early 1970s that their presence within the state's penal system was significantly acknowledged.³⁷ Even so, the plight of Latina prisoners continues to be basically ignored.³⁸

This study seeks to remedy the scarcity of data on Latina(o) prisoners in the United States in a number of ways. It examines and compares the experiences of Latinas and Latinos imprisoned in New York State during the 1970s and 1980s. It explores the major conflicts existing within the Latina(o) prisoner population. It analyzes the nature of the relationship between Latina(o) prisoners, third parties, and penal personnel. Moreover, it examines the confining conditions under which members of the state as well as third parties provided support. Lastly, it studies the combination of factors under which Latina(o) prisoners obtained concessions from state elites.

By providing information not hitherto available about Latina(o) prisoners and their relationship to other sectors of society, I offer a more realistic interpretation of the relationship that exists between prisoners, the state, and the civil society within which prisons operate. Through the lens of this illustration we can appraise the impact of state policies on affected sectors of society, the manner in which subordinate groups make demands on the state, and the ways in

which the state responds to such demands. Moreover, the data gathered challenges a number of widely accepted stereotypes about the behavior of imprisoned women. As a result, the book expands on current theories of gender, ethnicity, imprisonment, and the state.

The lack of data on Latina(o) prisoners led me to use a combination of methods for compiling the information encompassed in this text. Prisoner and mainstream English and Spanish language newspapers³⁹ were used as were books, articles, court cases, and government and private organizational reports. This data was complemented by private files made available to me by individuals and community groups. The latter included a variety of correspondence and position papers written by Latina(o) prisoners and their organizations as well as third parties. An additional source of valuable information was the newsletters published by community groups supportive of prisoners' struggles. However, the most exciting sources of information were the in-depth open ended interviews and oral histories conducted with Latina(o) and African-American ex-prisoners, prisoners' rights attorneys, community activists, and penal staff.

The fact that I had worked with prisoners and was eager to document their struggles made it possible for me to gain the trust of the ex-prisoners and third parties interviewed. Latina(o) penal personnel, generally marginalized within the penal bureaucracy as a result of racism and sexism, were also eager to talk about their experiences. Moreover, being Latina allowed me to approach the Latina(o) community with a deeper understanding, respect, and interest than mainstream white Anglo-European social scientists have historically shown it.

The importance of using oral histories and interviews when compiling information on Latina(o) prisoners cannot be overstated. With few exceptions, the material written by the prisoners themselves, which is difficult to come by, and oral histories and interviews have been, until recently, the only sources of information available on Latina(o) prisoners. One of the benefits of conducting oral history research is that it allows people to speak about their experiences from their own perspectives. One of the drawbacks is that human beings tend to forget even important events in their lives and sometimes simply distort reality. The fact that I interviewed a diverse number of ex-prisoners, penal personnel, and third parties about the same events allowed me to cross-check the information obtained. This information was then cross-referenced, wherever possible, with the written material available.

A case study approach was used to recreate and compare the experiences of Latina prisoners in Bedford Hills with Latino prisoners in Green Haven between 1970 and 1987. New York State was targeted as the site for the study because it has one of the highest concentrations of Latina(o) prisoners in the country. The period between 1970 and 1987 was chosen for several reasons. It was during the late 1960s that we began to see a steady increase in the number of Latina(o) prisoners in the state. The seventeen-year span studied allowed me to measure the impact the increasing number of Latina(o) prisoners had on the penal system. Moreover, it was after the Attica Prison Rebellion of September 1971 that widespread penal reforms emphasizing "rehabilitative" goals were carried out. These reforms created a new type of administrative organization, the Inmate Liaison Committees (ILCs),⁴⁰ and made it possible for prisoners to create formal prisoner groups⁴¹ to pursue collective goals. The time span chosen allowed me to examine, not only the relationship between prison rebellions and prison reforms, but also the relationship between informal and formal prisoner groups. Additionally, I was able to explore the impact the post-Attica Rebellion reforms had on male and female prisoners, particularly Latinas and Latinos. Moreover, because the reforms allowed the entrance of a larger number of outside "volunteers" into the state's prisons, I was able to compare the type of support both penal staff and third parties offered male and female prisoners and the impact such support had on the framing of prisoner goals and the tactics and strategies prisoners pursued.

The broader historical questions that guided the chapters were: What impact did the post-Attica Rebellion reforms have on Latina and Latino prisoners? What constraints affected their ability to frame concerns, organize groups, mobilize support, and win concessions? What were the constraints under which third parties and penal personnel sought to provide support to Latina(o) prisoners? How did the nature of third party support, penal and non-Latina(o) prisoner response, affect the formulation of Latina(o) prisoner goals as well as the tactics and strategies they used? How did notions of gender and ethnicity affect the support given Latina(o) prisoners?

I show that while Latina and Latino prisoners tended to share the same concerns, substantial gender differences existed with respect to the manner in which they organized. The variation in organizing tactics was conditioned not only by the priority they assigned to diverse interests but also by the disparate treatment male and female prisoners have historically received from both penal personnel

and third parties. Furthermore, the study concludes that the ability of Latina(o) prisoners to have their concerns addressed was affected by their level of organization and unity, the degree to which they were able to mobilize penal personnel and Latina(o) community members on their behalf, and their ability to secure the support of non-Latina(o) prisoners, or at least, neutralize their resistance to Latina(o) prisoner concerns.

The first section of the book discusses the conditions which gave rise to the Prisoners' Rights Movement of the late 1960s and 1970s and the response of penal personnel and third parties to prisoners' calls for reforms. Particular attention will be given to the response of the outside Latina(o) community to the plight of Latino prisoners. The second and third sections explore the impact of the post-Attica reforms on Latinos and Latinas imprisoned at Green Haven and Bedford Hills correctional facilities, two maximum security prisons in New York State from 1970 through 1987. The sections also explore the conditions under which Latina(o) prisoners organized themselves to achieve concessions from state elites and the manner in which third parties and sympathetic penal personnel provided support to Latina(o) prisoners. The concluding chapter compares and contrasts the experiences of Latina and Latino prisoners and offers a number of interpretations on the nature of the relationship between them, the state, and third parties.

Notes: Chapter 1

1. Erik Olin Wright, *The Politics of Punishment: A Critical Analysis of Prisons in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973), 22.

2. *Ibid.* This type of analysis, as Erik Olin Wright argues, does not find expression in United States political theory which, by calling those unjustly imprisoned or imprisoned for their political beliefs "political prisoners" and those breaking criminal laws "criminals," obscures "the meaning of punishment and the political functions it plays in society" (*Ibid.*, 23).

3. For a discussion on theories of the state, see Ralph Miliband, *The State in Capitalist Society* (New York: Basic Books, 1969); Alfred Stepan, *The State and Society: Peru in Comparative Perspective* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); Theda Skocpol, *State and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979); and Charles Tilly, *From Mobilization to Revolution* (New York: Random House, 1978).

4. For a discussion of the evolution of penal institutions and their role in helping maintain social control, see Harry Elmer Barnes, *The Story of Punishment: A Record of Man's Inhumanity to Man* (Boston: The Stratford Co., 1930); Idem, *The Evolution of Penology in Pennsylvania* (Montclair: Patterson Smith [1927] 1968); Georg Rusche and Otto Kirchheimer, *Punishment and Social Structure* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Reprint ed., New York: Russell and Russell, 1968); Erik Olin Wright, *The Politics of Punishment: A Critical Analysis of Prisons in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1973); Paul Takagi, "The Walnut Street Jail: A Penal Reform to Centralize the Powers of the State," *Federal Probation* 39, No. 4 (December 1975): 18–26; Michael Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books Edition, 1979); Estelle Freedman, *Their Sisters' Keepers: Women's Prison Reform in America, 1830–1930* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1981); Christopher R. Adamson, "Punishment After Slavery: Southern State Penal Systems, 1865–1890," *Social Problems* 3, No. 5 (June 1983): 555–569; and George C. Killinger and Paul F. Crownwell, Jr., eds., *Penology: The Evolution of Corrections in America* (St. Paul: West Publishing Co., 1983).

5. It was precisely this authority and legitimacy that was questioned by the social movements of the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s, including the Prisoners' Rights Movement.

6. See Barnes, *The Story of Punishment*, 1930; Rusche and Kirchheimer, *Punishment and Social Structure* 1968; and Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 1979. Such punishments have included penance, fines, public corporal and capital punishment, draft, confiscation of property, probation, and confinement in houses of correction, reformatories, jails, and prisons.

7. Economically and socially, white-collar and corporate crimes are more costly to society than street crimes. However, it is the illegal actions committed by poor and working-class white and people of color in the United States which have been punished most frequently and severely, see Wright, *The Politics of Punishment*, 1973; Ian Taylor, Paul Watson, and Jack Young, eds., *Critical Criminology* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975); Gilbert Geis and Robert F. Meier, *White Collar Crime: Offenses in Business Politics and the Professions* (New York: Free Press, Macmillan Publishing Co., 1977); Peter Wickman and Timothy Dailey, eds., *White Collar and Economic Crime: Multidisciplinary and Cross-National Perspectives* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., Inc., 1982); and David M. Ermann and Richard J. Lundmann, *Corporate and Governmental Deviance: Problems of Organizational Behavior in Contemporary Society*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982).

8. It is difficult to speak about racial and ethnic identification because of the arbitrary nature of these categories and the manner in which they are used in the United States. For example, during much of United States history, the dominant categories for identification purposes were "racial" (e.g., black, white). Latinas(os) have generally been classified as white or black

depending on their skin color, place of birth, and/or Spanish surname. In reality, Latinas(os) are generally the product of the mixture of peoples of African, Indian and/or Spanish descent, with the Spanish itself being the result of a mixture of white European, Jews, and Arabs. Under these circumstances it is difficult to place "Latinas(os)" within a given racial or ethnic category. As a result, when I speak about ethnic and racial identification within the prison setting, I do so with the understanding that these concepts are insufficient to describe very complicated analytical concepts. In fact, the awareness of Latinas(os) that they were not all the same was reflected in the manner in which they tended to further subdivide according to: place of birth (nationality), language spoken, and/or racial identification. Racial identification led some dark-skinned Latinas(os) to identify as "Black" and to network primarily with African-American prisoners. It also led some light-skinned Latinas(os) to identify as "white" and to network primarily with white prisoners. English-speaking (e.g., Jamaican, Trinidadian) and French-speaking Caribbean peoples (e.g., Haitians), also tended to subdivide within the prison setting according to nationality and language even when they might all be labelled "Black" by prison staff and other prisoners.

9. See Gresham Sykes, *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1958); Richard A. Cloward, Donald R. Cressey, George H. Grosser, Richard McCleery, Lloyd E. Ohlin, and Gresham M. Sykes, *Theoretical Studies in the Social Organization of the Prison*, Pamphlet #15, Social Science Research Council, 1960; Erving Goffman, *Asylums* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1961); Theodore R. Davidson, *Chicano Prisoners: The Key to San Quentin* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974); and Eric Cummins, *The Rise and Fall of California's Radical Prison Movement* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).

10. See Kenneth McColl Dimick, *Ladies in Waiting . . . Behind Prison Walls* (Muncie: Accelerated Development Inc., 1979).

11. See Leo Carroll, *Hacks, Blacks, and Cons: Race Relations in a Maximum Security Prison* (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1974; repr., Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc., 1988).

12. See Donald Clemmer, *The Prison Community* (Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1940); Russell G. Oswald, *Attica—My Story* (Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday and Co., 1972); and Adolph Saenz, *Politics of a Prison Riot: The 1980 New Mexico Prison Riot, Its Causes and Aftermath* (Corrales: Rhombus Publishing Co., 1986). One exception to this is John Irwin who is both an ex-prisoner and an academic. See John Irwin, *The Felon* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1970); Idem, "Notes on the Present Status of the Concept of Subcultures," in *The Society of Subcultures*, ed. D. Arnold (Berkeley: Glendessary Press, 1970), 164–170; Idem, "Stratification and Conflict Among Prison Inmates," *Journal of Criminological Law and Criminology* 66 (1976): 476–482; and Idem and Donald Cressey, "Thieves, Convicts, and Inmate Culture," *Social Problems* 10 (1962): 142–155.

13. Its major publications are *Corrections Today* (formerly *The American Journal of Corrections*) and *Proceedings*, which publishes the yearly proceedings of the National Congress of Corrections.

14. See Rose Giallombardo, *Society of Women: A Study of a Women's Prison* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966); Esther Heffernan, *Making It in Prison: The Square, the Cool, and the Life* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972); Edna Walker Chandler, *Women in Prison* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1973); Joan W. Moore, *Homeboys: Gangs, Drugs and Prison in the Barrios of Los Angeles* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1978); and Erika Anne Kates, "Litigation As a Means of Achieving Social Change: A Case Study of Women in Prison" (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1984).

15. Joy S. Eyman, *Prisons for Women: A Practical Guide to Administration Problems* (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1971).

16. Moore, *Homeboys*, 1978.

17. For studies that have recognized the existence of racial differences among women prisoners, see Margaret Otis, "A Perversion Not Commonly Noted," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 8 (June/July 1913): 112-114; Charles A. Ford, "Homosexual Practices of Institutionalized Females," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 23 (January/March 1929): 442-444; Chandler, *Women in Prison*, 1973; Elouise Junius Spencer, "The Social System of a Medium Security Women's Prison," (Ph.D. diss., University of Kansas, 1977); Freedman, *Their Sisters' Keepers*, 1981; Nicole Hahn Rafter, *Partial Justice: Women in State Prisons, 1800-1935* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1985); James G. Fox, *Organizational and Racial Conflict in Maximum Security Prisons* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1982); and Candace Kruttschnitt, "Race Relations and the Federal Inmate," *Crime and Delinquency* 29 (October 1983): 577-592.

18. See Malcolm X with Alex Haley, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (New York: Ballantine, 1964); Frank Ellis, *The Riot* (New York: Avon, 1966); Piri Thomas, *Down These Mean Streets* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1967); Eldridge Cleaver, *Soul on Ice* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1968); George Jackson, *Soledad Brother: The Prison Letters of George Jackson* (New York: Bantam, 1970); Angela Davis, *Angela Davis: An Autobiography* (New York: Random House, 1974; New York: International Publishers, 1988); Piri Thomas, *Seven Long Times* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974); Malcolm Braly, *False Starts: A Memoir of San Quentin and Other Prisons* (New York: Penguin, 1976); Jack Henry Abbott, *In the Belly of the Beast: Letters from Prison* (New York: Random House, Inc., 1978); Assata Shakur, *Assata: An Autobiography* (Westport, Conn.: Lawrence Hill and Co., 1987); Jean Harris, *They Always Call Us Ladies: Stories from Prison* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1988); Joyce Ann Brown, *Joyce Ann Brown: Justice Denied* (Chicago: The Noble Press, 1990); and Idella

Serna, *Locked Down: A Woman's Life in Prison, The Story of Mary (Lee) Dortch* (Norwich, Vt.: New Victoria Publishers, 1992).

19. Wright, *The Politics of Punishment*, 1973.

20. See Vernon Fox, *Violence Behind Bars: An Explosive Report on Prison Riots in the United States* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press Publishers, 1956); Phyllis Jo Baunach and Thomas Murton, "Women in Prison: An Awakening Minority," *Crime and Corrections* (Fall 1973): 4–12; Burton M. Atkins and Henry R. Glick, eds., *Prison, Protest, and Politics* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972); Wright, *The Politics of Punishment*, 1973; William D. Pederson, "Inmate Movements and Prison Uprisings: A Comparative Study," *Social Science Quarterly* 59, No. 3 (December 1978): 509–524; Saenz, *Politics of a Prison Riot*, 1986; Larry E. Sullivan, *The Prison Reform Movement: Forlone Hope* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1990); and Bert Useem and Peter Kimball, *States of Siege: U.S. Prison Riots, 1971–1986* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

21. See George F. Murphy, "The Courts Look at Prisoners' Rights: A Review," *Criminology* 10, No. 4 (February 1973): 441–459; Ronald Berkman, *Opening the Gates: The Rise of the Prisoners' Movement* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1979); James B. Jacobs, *New Perspectives on Prisons and Imprisonment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983); and Kates, "Litigation As a Means," 1984.

22. See Barnes, *The Story of Punishment*, 1930; and Idem, *The Evolution of Penology in Pennsylvania* (Montclair: Patterson Smith, [1927] 1968). A review of articles published in nine major U.S. political science journals between 1971 and 1987 revealed that when political scientists have addressed criminal justice issues their attention primarily focused on: the functioning of the courts; the relationship between crime and public policy; punishment as a deterrent to crime; methods of gathering criminal justice statistics; and juvenile delinquency. The few political scientists who have written about prisons have focused on prison conditions, penal policy (Philip Klein, *Prison Methods in New York State: A Contribution to the Study of the Theory and Practice of Correctional Institutions in New York State* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1920; repr., New York: Ames Press, 1969]; and Barbara Lavin McEleney, *Correctional Reform in New York: The Rockefeller Years* [Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1985]), and the relationship between the prisoner social system and the prison bureaucracy (Richard McCleery, "Communication Patterns As Bases of Systems of Authority and Power," in Cloward et al., *Theoretical Studies*, 1960).

23. See Sykes, *The Society of Captives*, 1958; and Cloward et al., *Theoretical Studies*, 1960.

24. Spencer, "The Social System," 6.

25. See James B. Jacobs, *Stateville: The Penitentiary in Mass Society* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1977); John Irwin, *Prisons in Turmoil*

(Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1980); and Leo Carroll, *Hacks, Blacks and Cons: Race Relations in a Maximum Security Prison* (Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press, Inc., [1977] 1988).

26. See W.I. Thomas, *Sex and Society* (Boston: Little Brown, 1907); *Ibid.*, *The Unadjusted Girl* (Boston: Little Brown, 1923); O. Pollack, *The Criminality of Women* (New York: A.S. Barnes, 1961); and G. Konopka, *The Adolescent Girl in Conflict* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966).

27. For studies challenging traditional stereotypes of women offenders, see Laura Crites, ed., *The Female Offender* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., Inc., 1976); Carol Smart, *Women, Crime, and Criminology: A Feminist Critique* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976); Carol Smart and June Kress, "Any Woman's Blues: A Critical Overview of Women, Crime, and the Criminal Justice System," *Crime and Criminal Justice* 5 (1976): 34-49; Carol Smart and Barry Kress, *Women, Sexuality and Social Control* (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978); Clarice Feinman, *Women in the Criminal Justice System* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1980; Freedman, *Their Sisters' Keepers*, 1981; Kates, "Litigation As a Means," 1984); S. K. Mukherjee and Jocelynn Scutt, *Women and Crime* (Boston: George Allen and Unwin, 1981); Frances M. Heidensohn, *Women and Crime: The Life of the Female Offender* (New York: New York University Press, 1985); Ngaire Naffine, *Female Crime: The Construction of Women in Criminology* (Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin Australia Pty., Ltd., 1987); and Juanita Diaz-Cotto, "Women and Crime in the United States," in Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, eds., *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1991).

28. Although the legislative and executive branches of the state government form part of the criminal justice system by virtue of their ability to criminalize and decriminalize behavior (e.g., pass and abolish laws, issue executive orders, issue pardons, commute sentences, etc.), I am using the term criminal justice system here to encompass the areas of law enforcement, detention, prosecution, courts, penal institutions, probation, and parole.

29. See *United States v. York*, 281 F. Supp. 8, 16 (D. Conn. 1968); *State v. Costello*, 59 NJ 334 (1971); *Frontiero v. Richardson* (1973); *State v. Chamber*, NJ Supreme Court (1973); and "legal victory for n.j. sisters," *Midnight Special* 3, No. 11 (November 1973): 22, 23.

30. Prison families and kinship networks are groups in which women prisoners adopt the roles of mother, father, brother, son, daughter, cousin, etc. Perhaps the two best known examples of social science studies of prison families are David A. Ward and Gene G. Kassebaum, *Women's Prisons* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965); and Giallombardo, *Society of Women*, 1966.

31. "rikers women—'we're demanding now,'" *Midnight Special* 3, No. 9 (September 1973): 1.

32. Kates, "Litigation As a Means," 1984.

33. Prisoners' rights newsletters, to which women prisoners submitted material, included *Midnight Special*, *The Outlaw*, and *No More Cages*.

34. "4 Women Flee Prison, Are Recaptured," *New York Times* (hereafter cited as *N.Y. Times*), 19 July 1976, 25; "Escapee Surrenders," *N.Y. Times*, 8 June 1977, II, 3; *N.Y. Times*, 3 November 1979; Robert Hanley, "Miss Chesimard Flees Jersey Prison, Helped by 3 Armed 'Visitors'," *N.Y. Times*, 3 November 1979, 1; *N.Y. Times*, John T. McQuiston, "'Squeaky' Fromme Sought After an Apparent Escape," 24 December 1987, 10; and Shakur, Assata, 1987. There were times when women's actions in self defense led to the murder of one of their keepers ("Joann Little," *Midnight Special* 5, No. 1 [January 1975]: 22).

35. This is not to say that other prisoners do not share the same concerns regarding the provision of bilingual personnel and services. In fact, as the number of non-Spanish-speaking prisoners of color increases in New York State's penal system (e.g., Haitians) so may the potential for them to unite with Latinas(os) to demand bilingual services and personnel.

36. Most studies of Latino prisoners in the United States have been written about Chicano prisoners. See Jorge H. del Pinal, "The Penal Population of California," in *Voices: Readings from El Grito, a Journal of Contemporary Mexican American Thought, 1967-1973* (1973): 483-499; Davidson, *Chicano Prisoners*, 1974; Moore, *Homeboys*, 1978; Michael Belsky, "Mexican Nationals in U.S. Prisons," *Theme* 10, No. 3 (May/June 1980): 20-21; U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistant Administration, *National Conference on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1980); Adalberto Aguirre Jr., and David Baker, "The Execution of Mexican American Prisoners in the Southwest," *Social Justice* 16, No. 4 (Issue 38, Winter 1989): 150-161; and Idem., "A Descriptive Profile of the Hispanic Penal Population: Conceptual and Reliability Limitations in Public Use Data," *The Justice Professional* 3, No. 2 (1988): 189-200. A few studies have been published about Puerto Rican prisoners in New Jersey (see Robert Joe Lee, *Hispanics—The Anonymous Prisoners* (Trenton: Department of Corrections, 1976); Idem, "Profile of Puerto Rican Prisoners in New Jersey and Its Implications for the Administration of Criminal Justice" (M.A. thesis, Rutgers University, 1977); Maggie Agüero, "An Exploratory Profile of Puerto Rican Prisoners in New Jersey" (M.A. thesis, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, 1980); and Idem, *Hispanics in New Jersey Adult Correctional Institutions: A Profile of Inmates, Staff, Services, and Recommendations* (Trenton: New Jersey Department of Correction, 1981). Until the current book, no major study has ever been published about Latina prisoners in the United States.

37. See Thomas, *Down These Mean Streets*, 1967; Francis A.J. Ianni, *Black Mafia: Ethnic Succession in Organized Crime* (New York: Simon and

Schuster, 1974); Thomas, *Seven Long Times*, 1974; Agenor L. Castro, "Meeting the Special Needs of Hispanic Inmates," *Law and Justice* (September/October 1977): 37-41; Idem, "A Close Look at the Hispanic Inmates and Methods of Meeting Their Needs," *American Journal of Correction* 40, No. 2 (March/April 1978): 15, 16, 18; Idem, "The Case for the Bilingual Prison," *Corrections Today* 44, No. 4 (August 1982): 72, 74, 78; Idem, "Los hispanos en presidios EEUU buscan lograr mejor trato," *El Mundo*, 31 diciembre 1978; Puerto Rican Bar Association of New York, *A New Look at the Hispanic Offender: A Proposal by the Puerto Rican Bar Association of New York for a Study of Hispanic Prisoners* by Joseph L. Torres and Mildred R. Stansky, New York, September 1978; Agenor Castro, "Programming for Hispanic Inmates and Ex-Offenders," *Proceedings of the One Hundred and Eighth Annual Congress of Correction of the American Correctional Association*, Portland, Oreg., August 20-24, 1978 (College Park, Md.: American Correctional Association, 1979): 77-88; Peter L. Sissons, *The Hispanic Experience of Criminal Justice* (New York: Hispanic Research Center, Fordham University, Monograph No. 3, 1979); United States, Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, *National Hispanic Conference on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice* (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1980); New York State Department of Correctional Services (hereafter cited as NYSDOCS), Division of Hispanic and Cultural Affairs, Hispanic Inmate Needs Task Force, *Report 1985 (Draft Action Plan for Hispanic Inmate Needs Programming)*, Albany, November 20, 1985; *Ibid.*, *Final Report, "A Meeting of Minds, an Encounter of Hearts," 1986 (Action Plan)*, Albany, 1986; NYSDOCS, Division of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation, *Selected Characteristics of the Department's Hispanic Inmate Population* by Charles H. Nygard, Albany, December 1986; *Ibid.*, *Year-to-Year Changes in the Hispanic Under Custody Population 1986 and 1987* by Charles H. Nygard, Albany, August 1987; Migdalia de Jesús-Torres, "Profile of Puerto Rican/Latino Women Offenders in New York State Correctional Institutions: Program, Policy and Statutory Changes," Somos Uno Conference, March 1988, New York State Assembly Puerto Rican/HSP Task Force, *The Hispanic Woman: Issues and Legislative Concerns*, Albany, New York (unpublished paper); Israel Ruíz Jr., "New York State Department of Correctional Services, Hispanic Needs: Employment and Inmate Programs. Report," February 29, 1988 (xeroxed copy); NYSDOCS, Division of Program Planning, Research, and Evaluation, *Comparison of Male and Female Inmates Under the Department's Custody as of December 31, 1990* by Kathy Canestrini, Albany, September 1991; and Correctional Association of New York, *Not Simply a Matter of Words: Academic and Vocational Programs for Latino Inmates in New York State Prisons*, New York, July 1992.

38. Only a few brief references have been made to the plight of Latina prisoners in New York State. See Sissons, *The Hispanic Experience*, 1979; NYSDOCS, Division of Hispanic and Cultural Affairs, *Hispanic Inmate*

Needs Task Force, *Report 1985*, 1985; Idem, *Final Report*, 1986; NYSDOCS, Division of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation, *Selected Characteristics*, December 1986; de Jesús-Torres, "Profile of Puerto Rican/Latino Women Offenders"; NYSDOCS, Division of Program Planning, Research, and Evaluation, *Comparison of Male and Female Inmates*, 1991; and Correctional Association of New York, *Not Simply a Matter of Words*, 1992.

39. Researching New York City's largest Spanish language newspaper, *El Diario-La Prensa* (hereafter cited as *El Diario*), was particularly challenging because the periodical does not have an index. This meant that micro-filmed copies of the newspaper had to be reviewed, page by page, for each of the years I selected for study. This time consuming process limited the amount of years I was able to focus on. The same process of page by page review had to be conducted in the case where prisoners' newspapers and prisoners' rights newsletters were available.

40. Administrative organizations, such as the Inmate Liaison Committees (ILCs) created in New York State prisons in 1972 and the Inmate Grievance Resolution Committees (IGRCs) created at the end of 1975, were groups whose existence was mandated by DOCS' directives and/or state laws. They could be comprised, as in the case of the ILCs, of prisoners, or, as in the case of the IGRCs, of prisoners and staff.

41. A prisoner group was composed of prisoners who had common goals and acted to further those goals. A formal prisoner group was one whose existence was officially recognized and authorized by DOCS. As such, it technically fell under the supervision of institutional personnel and/or outside DOCS approved volunteers. Informal prisoner groups were those whose existence had not been officially authorized by DOCS. Prisoner networks could include penal personnel and/or third parties who supported prisoner goals.