

1958

## Marital Relationships of Prisoners in Twenty-Eight Countries

Ruth Shonle Cavan

Eugene S. Zemans

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Ruth Shonle Cavan, Eugene S. Zemans, Marital Relationships of Prisoners in Twenty-Eight Countries, 49 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 133 (1958-1959)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

# MARITAL RELATIONSHIPS OF PRISONERS IN TWENTY-EIGHT COUNTRIES

RUTH SHONLE CAVAN AND EUGENE S. ZEMANS

Mrs. Ruth Shonle Cavan is Professor of Sociology in Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois. Mr. Eugene Zemans is Executive Director of John Howard Association in Chicago. "Marital Relationships of Prisoners," under their joint authorship, was published in our last number, 49, 1, at pages 50-57—EDITOR.

Imprisonment deprives the prisoner of many civilian rights and privileges in addition to his liberty. One deprivation is the loss of close personal contacts with his spouse. Another article discusses the ways in which marital relationships are handled in prisons in the United States.<sup>1</sup> The present article surveys the policies and practices in 28 other countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas.

The 53 countries officially or unofficially represented at the First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders were circularized with a two-page questionnaire asking about contacts between prisoners and their spouses and children and related subjects. Representatives of 27 countries replied and information was secured through other sources for another country. The respondents were either the official representatives at the Congress or others closely connected with the prison systems in each country. The 28 countries are widely distributed over the world. The chief omissions are the communist countries (except Yugoslavia), the Near East, and many of the Latin American countries. Other areas of the world were adequately represented, although never completely covered.

## SUMMARY OF THE REPORT ON THE UNITED STATES

In the United States, the customary pattern of contacts between a prisoner and his spouse consists of visits made by the free spouse within the prison buildings. The visits most frequently are of two hours' duration twice each month. A number of prisoners often receive their visitors simultaneously in the same room, often under crowded conditions, and always under supervision. The trend is toward more relaxed conditions of visiting,

<sup>1</sup> EUGENE S. ZEMANS AND RUTH SHONLE CAVAN, *Marital Relationships of Prisoners in the United States*, JOUR. OF CRIM. LAW, CRIMINOL. AND POL. SCI. 49, 1, 50-57. (May-June, 1958.)

especially in minimum security institutions, but always on the congregate level with supervision. Only one prison permits home leaves to selected prisoners as part of its regular program for family contacts. (For further details, see the article referred to in footnote 1.)

The point of view stated in the United States report applies to the present discussion also. Marriage structures personal life and fulfills many needs, which are left largely unfulfilled for the prisoner, who is denied married life. Also, if the marriage can be maintained during imprisonment, a small interested group is ready to receive the prisoner upon his release. Close contact of the prisoner with the spouse during imprisonment therefore has two possible functions: 1) to reduce various tensions during imprisonment, and 2) to contribute to rehabilitation of the prisoner during and after imprisonment. In the United States, a third point of view usually is neglected, that is, the human and civil right of an adult to marry and to have children. Sometimes this right is thought of as a sacred right and obligation. This neglected point of view is implicit in the practices of certain other countries.

## COUNTRIES WITH EUROPEAN CULTURAL BACKGROUND

In this group of 20 countries are England and Wales, North Ireland, Scotland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Denmark, Sweden, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Netherlands, Germany, Austria, Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Turkey.

In spite of many differences of language and culture among these countries, many similarities also exist, either because countries were colonized by Europeans, or due to cross-cultural influences. Prisons, as part of the culture, exhibit similarities.

All these countries permit visits from the spouse, in the prison, and under supervision. Table 1 shows the length of visits and the number of times

TABLE 1  
LENGTH AND FREQUENCY OF VISITS IN PRISONS IN  
19 COUNTRIES OF EUROPEAN CULTURE\*

Length of visit in hours	Number of visits per month						
	Less than one	One	Two	Three	Four	More than four	Total
Under one-half hour . . . . .		4	2				6
One-half up to one hour . . . . .		4	5			1	11
One up to two hours . . . . .					1		1
No reply . . . . .	1						1
Total							19

\* Greece did not give information on length and frequency of visits.

per month allowed as the minimum visiting rights granted to all prisoners; as in the United States, variations occur. The most frequent length of visit was under one hour; the most frequent interval for visits, once or twice per month. The visiting privilege therefore tends to be much more restricted than in the United States, where the most common arrangement is a visit of two hours twice a month. The most limited visiting privilege is in Turkey, where all prisons uniformly grant visits of 10 minutes twice a month; this practice has existed unchanged "from the beginning." The most liberal practices are in New Zealand with one hour weekly and France with one-half hour once or twice a week and a longer time if the visitor lives at a distance.

From these basic policies there are many variations. A number of countries stated that visits were lengthened if the visitor could come to the prison only at long intervals. Different categories of prisoners also are subject to different visiting regulations. For example, in Scotland the minimum visit, of which the prisoner cannot be deprived for disciplinary reasons, is one visit every two months. However, prisoners who are less than 21 years old when sentenced may receive three visits during the first two months and five visits each subsequent month; other prisoners usually receive two visits in the first two months, and three visits in each subsequent two months. In Canada, the federal penitentiaries, which house prisoners with sentences of two years or more, allow a 30 minute visit once a month; the provincial prisons, whose inmates are sentenced to

less than two years, allow weekly visits of 30 minutes to three hours. One provincial Director of Corrections emphasized:

"Provisions for family visiting in our institution are flexible to permit the fullest use of this privilege as an integral part of the inmates' treatment. The needs of the individual are of primary importance in determining the duration and supervision of visits and when children or other family are allowed to visit. Supervision is of a general nature, except in cases requiring unusual security precautions. The general supervision consists of having the visiting area under the surveillance of an officer. He does not listen to conversations."

In Denmark visitors from a long distance may stay longer than the normal 30 minutes. Toward the end of the sentence, the customary once-a-month visit is increased to two visits per month. Prisoners and visitors sit at opposite sides of a table under supervision. In Yugoslavia, the ordinary prisoner has two or three visits per month; the inmate sentenced to severe imprisonment is limited to one visit per month. Prisoners in Luxembourg's agricultural colony may have visits up to three hours with nominal supervision. Some other countries make similar provisions.

In Australia the standard pattern is a visit of 20 minutes monthly with one to three visitors at the same time, carried out in a cubicle with two wire partitions between prisoner and visitors. However, first offenders in the largest prisons may sit with their visitors on garden seats on the prison lawns. Still further relaxation of the standard pattern is found in non-maximum security prisons and in women's prisons. Visits are held in lounges or on the lawns, once a month, for one and one-half hours. Visitors may supply cigarettes, chocolate, or fruit, to be consumed during the visit. There is supervision but conversations are not overheard by the guards.

Sweden is the most liberal of this group of countries regarding visits within the prison. In closed prisons, the standard visit is 30 minutes one Sunday per month; in open institutions, however, visits of indeterminate length may be received each Sunday and may be unsupervised, that is, husband and wife may visit in the prisoner-husband's cell. In this connection, it should be noted that the standard European prison cell does not have an open barred front but has solid walls and door. Privacy may thus be complete. Most Swedish prisons are small, many having only 30 to 50 inmates. General supervision and control are

therefore simplified as compared with supervision in large prisons.<sup>2</sup>

The brief and infrequent visits in most European prisons, as compared with the practice in United States prisons, are offset in many countries by visits home. England and Wales, North Ireland, Scotland, Denmark, Switzerland, Germany, Greece and Sweden all reported short home leaves for selected classes of prisoners. Some other countries specified the kind of visits home that are used in the United States, that is, when a close relative is seriously ill or has died. The responses to the questionnaire indicated that at least in most of the countries listed above the visits were a regular part of the program of rehabilitation rather than simply an emergency measure. A few responses were difficult to interpret.

England and Wales, since 1951, grant home leaves (temporary parole) of five days toward the end of the sentence to certain categories of prisoners to enable the prisoner to renew his contacts with his family and to prepare himself for freedom. Scotland has a similar provision. North Ireland grants home leaves that differ with different categories of prisoners; for example, prisoners on first commitment with sentences of more than two years and who have completed 12 months, are granted Christmas and summer parole leaves and, prior to final release, a leave during which the man may seek work. In Denmark home leaves without escort are confined to inmates of penal work houses and juvenile prisons; offenders sentenced to an institution for psychopaths may be granted a short leave under escort for a few hours a day. Other than these special types, Danish prisoners are not permitted home leaves except in the case of death or severe illness and this privilege is limited to inmates of open-prison camps. In Switzerland, certain categories of prisoners are granted the privilege of visiting their families for 8 to 24 hours; the regulations vary from one prison to another. In the Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (German Federal Republic) inmates of closed institutions may be granted special leave up to seven days to enable them to attend to urgent personal or business affairs, provided there is assurance of their return to the prison. Greece has a similar provision

for inmates of open prisons, with a maximum length of visit of five days each six months of the year.

Sweden, most lenient about unsupervised visiting in open prisons, is also most generous with home leaves. The Swedish Act of December 21, 1945, section 36, concerning imprisonment, provides that prisoners may be granted furloughs or home leaves even when there is no emergency in the prisoner's family. The home leaves come at regular intervals of time, the first being granted six to ten months after the admission of the prisoner, with subsequent leaves following at four month intervals. The prisoner may be absent from the institution from 48 to 72 hours, exclusive of travel time. These home leaves are regarded as a normal part of the sentence and apply to all types of prisons. In 1952, 2,527 home leaves were granted; in 1954, 3,085. Since some prisoners were granted several furloughs in the course of a year, the number of prisoners is somewhat less than these figures. Each year about 15 percent of the home leaves involve some violation of the trust placed in the prisoners, usually of a minor nature, such as getting intoxicated or failing to return to the institution; sometimes a new crime has been committed.<sup>3</sup> Conversations with Swedish criminologists indicate that they are undisturbed by these violations, inasmuch as they represent only a small proportion of the prisoners on leave, and for the majority the practice seems beneficial.

Some of the countries that provide for home leaves for men specify that women prisoners are not granted the same privilege; in other instances, it is not clear whether or not women may visit home. The implication usually is that women do not have this privilege or that there are no women's institutions equivalent to the men's institutions to whose inmates the leaves are granted.

All the countries being considered in this section give permission to prisoners to marry. The only specific reason stated for such marriages is pregnancy. Some respondents gave no reason and others stated "for serious reasons." Thus marriage of a prisoner seems to have much the same status as in the United States.

The European practices seem to derive from two sources. One is the traditional or customary practice of permitting the spouse to visit the prisoner in the prison. The following statement is

<sup>3</sup> GÖRANSON, *op. cit.*; ERIKSSON, *op. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> For a more complete discussion of Swedish prisons, see: HARDY GÖRANSON, *Some Aspects of the Swedish Prison System* (pamphlet of 7 pages), Stockholm: Regent Boktryckeri, 1955; TORSTEN ERIKSSON, *Post-war Prison Reform in Sweden*, ANNALS 293 (1954), 152-162.

given by one state prison director, regarding the purpose of the visit in prison:

"Visits in prison have been allowed for 100 years or more without any specific purpose being assigned to them beyond common humanity.

Few respondents gave dates for the beginning of visits in prison; when dates are given they range from 1900 to 1930; Turkey said the visits had been in use since the beginning. The second source applies to the loosely supervised visits and also to the home leaves. Dates for the institution of these measures are usually in the late forties, when a wave of prison reform touched many European countries. Often the greater privileges apply only to prisoners in open prisons, and therefore are related to the newer practices of classifying and separating prisoners. They are often justified by references to maintaining good family relations, helping the prisoner during his prison term, and to his right to some minimum amount of visiting regardless of his classification. The newer and more lenient practices therefore are related to a philosophy of human rights and rehabilitation."

#### LATIN AMERICAN PRACTICES

Four countries represent the Latin American cultural heritage—Chile, Puerto Rico,<sup>4</sup> Argentina, and Mexico. All four countries provide for supervised visits of the spouse to the prisoner within the prison. But all except Chile have moved beyond this minimum type of contact. Chile's laws provide for both private visits in the prison and for home leaves. However, public opinion is opposed to these practices and hence all visiting is carried out at the prison under supervision. The questionnaire from Puerto Rico, states that male prisoners are allowed home leaves of 48 to 52 hours once every two months; women prisoners, however, are limited to supervised visits within the prison.

From time to time Argentina has changed its regulations regarding visiting according to J. Carlos Garcia Basalo, Inspector General de Institutos Penales. For the national penitentiaries, regulations passed in 1925 permitted supervised visits within the prison, from either the legal or the common-law wife of the prisoner. The frequency of visits is determined by the conduct of the prisoner: exemplary conduct merits four visits monthly; conversely, very bad conduct cancels all visits. The visits, which take place on Sundays, are two hours in duration. Visiting through iron bars that

<sup>4</sup> Although Puerto Rico is part of the United States, it is culturally Latin American.

separate prisoner and guest has been partially replaced by more open but supervised visiting.

In 1951, private or conjugal visits were introduced for men prisoners only in prisons in Buenos Aires; such visits were suspended in 1955. To secure private visits, the marriage had to be legal, the conduct records of the prisoner good, and physical and mental conditions good. These private visits, permitting sexual union, could occur every 15 days and could last for two hours.

Between January and April, 1956, a new director of prisons in Argentina studied the possibility of home leaves and then instituted them for the prison in Buenos Aires. The procedure is feasible since an appreciable percentage of the families of prisoners live in the city or its immediate environs. The privilege covers both men and women prisoners. The visits may be granted once a month and may last 12 to 24 hours, or in exceptional cases, 48 hours. In order to obtain permission for a home leave, the prisoner must meet the following conditions:

- a. Served part of his sentence: of a life sentence, 15 years; of a lesser sentence, at least half.
- b. Have no other process pending.
- c. Have exemplary conduct or the maximum standard obtainable in accordance with the time served in prison.
- d. Have demonstrated industriousness at work or in school.
- e. Have favorably impressed the Director of the prison regarding his progress toward social rehabilitation.

In case of illness or death in the family, the above conditions are not required. Other reasons for visits are family anniversaries of special significance to the prisoner, as the birthday of his wife or son; the tightening of family bonds; and to obtain work, especially toward the end of the sentence. Some visits are made in the custody of a non-uniformed prison official, but others are made in the custody of a trustworthy friend or depend upon the word of honor of the prisoner.

In April and May, 1956, 234 home leaves were granted to 159 prisoners in the most important prison in Buenos Aires; in only one case did the prisoner fail to live up to his obligations for good conduct and prompt return to the prison.

Information on Mexico comes primarily from Professor Norman S. Hayner, Department of Sociology, University of Washington, who spent 18 months (1941-49) in a field study in Mexico, during which he gave special attention to prison

practices. In an unpublished manuscript he writes of the prison (*Cárcel*) of Santa Catarina at Oaxaca City. Although not a state prison, it receives long term prisoners from various districts of the state, most of whom are non-professional prisoners of peasant background. At the time of Dr. Hayner's visits to the prison, conjugal visits were permitted on Thursdays and Sundays, with 70 percent of the 230 inmates participating. The visits took place in the small cubicles into which the dormitories had been divided by walls of newspapers, strengthened by stalks of a bamboo-like plant. Conjugal visits were not permitted to women prisoners, who occupied a special section of the prison.

Dr. Hayner also comments on the Federal District Penitentiary of Mexico City. A circular building with private cells was used for conjugal visits, of which about 55 took place each week among a male prison population of 2,246. Each visit could last for two hours. The man had to have a record of good conduct and both he and his wife had to show freedom from any contagious disease, as established by a physical examination. In 1950, men were permitted to have conjugal visits in their own cells. In the state prison in Guadalajara, overnight visits were permitted to wives.

Mexico has also instituted a practice that will be discussed more fully in connection with the Philippine Islands, the practice of permitting prisoners under certain conditions to have their families live with them. The present status of this practice is not entirely clear. Dr. Hayner was told that at the *Isles Marias*, an island penal colony, families of prisoners were at one time allowed to live with prisoners, but that the practice had been discontinued. However, during the period of the United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in Geneva, the writers learned in an informal conversation with a delegate from Mexico that on the island penal colony maintained by Mexico, 30 prisoners among 800 had their families with them.

In the spring of 1957 United States newspapers carried a U. P. story about a new open prison for 1,000 inmates, called *Fábrica de Hombres Nuevos* (Factory of New Men) that was being constructed in Mexico. The name emphasizes the program of rehabilitation. As part of the structure there is to be a 20-room "hotel" for private conjugal visits.

The provisions for marital contacts and private visits of prisoners in the Latin American countries point to a different philosophy of sexual satisfac-

tion and family life than prevails either in Europe or the United States. Among the countries for which we have information, Sweden is the only one allowing private visits on the prison grounds, and among the countries that permit home leaves some limit them to the latter part of the prison sentence. In the United States, no informant spoke of private visits and only one state used home leaves except in case of some family emergency. The Latin American countries apparently accept sexual desires as normal and family unity as fundamental. Dr. Hayner writes thus about Mexico:

[The practice of conjugal visits] in Mexican prisons is a realistic method of meeting the sex problem. Not only does it combat homosexuality; it often changes the entire behavior of a convict. It should be remembered that Mexico has a very strong family tradition. Even more than in the United States the family is regarded as a fundamental institution. Anything that tends to destroy the family meets with opposition; anything that strengthens it is supported. It is believed that the conjugal visit keeps couples together. When the manager of a Mexican hotel gave his assistant cook her free day on Thursday so that she could visit her husband in the local bastille on that day, he was acting in harmony with Mexican mores.

Perhaps the comparison with the United States might be summarized by saying that in the United States punishment of the criminal takes precedence over marital and family rights and ties; in Mexico the reverse is true.

#### THE FAR EAST

Four replies came from countries in the Far East—Cambodia, India, West Pakistan, and the Philippine Islands. These countries have all felt the impress of European culture and, in the case of the Philippine Islands, of the United States as well. Their prison systems therefore are a combination of European (or United States) culture, indigenous trends, and factors of the physical environment. No attempt will be made to untangle the strands of influence.

As compared with other countries, Cambodia follows a restricted regime—ten minutes of supervised visiting on Sundays in the closed prisons, and no marriage allowed for prisoners (the ceremony as used in Cambodia is too long). The official who answered the questionnaire expressed satisfaction with conditions.

India, Pakistan, and the Philippines all introduce an element found so far in the survey only on the Mexican island penal colony—provision for certain

categories of prisoners to have their families live with them on the prison grounds.

In India, practices vary from state to state, and the information at hand does not give a complete picture.<sup>5</sup> However, in Benaras, State of Uttar Pradesh, long termers have been living in the heart of the city, without guards, working on public projects and mingling freely with civilian men and women workers. Other instances are given of prisoners working side by side with civilian workers. Whether or not the freedom extends to home leaves is not clear. In closed prisons contacts of prisoners with their wives seem to be limited to supervised visits. In certain small open work camps, men prisoners are allowed to have their wives with them. Swatantrapur Colony (Bombay), an unwallled jungle work camp, is given as an example. Upon completion of his sentence, the prisoner may leave or settle in the colony. In Uttar Pradesh, some 2,000 to 3,000 prisoners are used on such public works as dams and canals, being moved from one site to another. The system of home leaves was introduced in these camps in 1955; in approximately one year, 25 prisoners were granted home leaves. Some of these practices are newly instituted and are regarded as successful rehabilitative experiments.

In West Pakistan, inmates of closed prisons may receive supervised visits from the spouse for 30 minutes to an hour once a month. A few male prisoners are permitted temporary paroles of 15 days on rare occasions. The Inspector-General of Prisons, West Pakistan, who says he is dissatisfied with present provisions, feels that such leaves once a year are essential for long-term prisoners in order to keep contacts with their families.

"We have generally lifers who have to remain in prison for at least 8 to 12 years. They are generally 20 to 30 years old (75 per cent). It is essential that they must go on parole leave for 14 to 20 days a year to keep contact with their families and wives. An average person here marries at about 20 years of age and keeping husband and wife away from each other breaks their intimate regard. Hearsay about each other's loyalty creates suspicion and so breaks homes. If visits are encouraged, chances of such occasions will be less, and relations will remain close. They will have something to look forward to."

<sup>5</sup> Our informant is PARIPURNANAND VARMA, M. L. A., President of the All India Crime Prevention Society. He provided a specially prepared manuscript statement (May 1956) and also a pamphlet, *Open Institutions and Treatment of Offenders* (Paper submitted to the World Congress on Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, Geneva, 1955).

The Inspector General of Prisons in West Pakistan also would approve of an increase in open camps for selected prisoners, where the men might live with their families. At present there is only one such camp, a farm camp, which accommodates 250 families, out of a total prison population of about 20,000.

The Philippine Islands have gone further than any other country about which we have information in permitting prisoners to have their families with them on prison grounds.<sup>6</sup> Without fanfare, an open prison colony called Iwahig Penal Colony was established about 50 years ago on the Island of Palawan, a large island already inhabited. Approximately 3,600 male prisoners live in the colony. They have committed all types of crimes and, after serving one-fifth of their sentences at New Bilibid Prison near Manila, have been selected as presenting minimum risks for successful living in an open colony. Once in the colony, the prisoner may have his wife and family join him, or he may marry his fiancee and establish his family in the colony. The government helps each family financially to get a start. The government pays transportation of the family or fiancee to the colony and provides a plot of land, a small house, tools for farming, and subsistence and clothing for the family until it is able to be self-supporting from its own efforts. Young children attend a public school on the prison grounds and later attend the schools in the free communities of the island. Normal social life among the families is encouraged. When the man completes his sentence, if he wishes, he receives a plot of about 15 acres in another part of the island, which he must cultivate successfully for two years; he may not own land elsewhere.

In order to appreciate these family provisions, it is necessary to look at the careful organization of the colony. The families and the unmarried prisoners are not simply assigned to Iwahig Penal Colony and left to their own devices. The colony is well organized into three sub-colonies, each of which is again subdivided into working divisions, such as those for farming, roads, and bridges, forestry, fishing, and the coconut industry. Under the warden and his staff are civilian employees;

<sup>6</sup> In addition to the questionnaire, the authors have drawn upon a mimeographed statement entitled "Modern Trends in the Field of the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in Asia and the Far East," read by DR. JORGE BOCOBO at the First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, 1955, and personal discussions with both DR. BOCOBO, and DR. ALFREDO M. BUNYE, Director of Prisons, Bureau of Prisons, Philippine Islands.

prisoner trusties are used at lower levels of supervision. A check is made each evening to assure all prisoners are accounted for. This large colony of virgin land and rich resources is unwallled and unfenced. An unarmed guard stands at the main entrance. Prisoners who are unable to fit themselves successfully into the pattern of life of the colony are returned to prison. The yearly number of escapes averages about one-tenth of one percent of the number of inmates.

Commenting on the value of the colony, Dr. Jorge Bocobo, Chairman of the Code Commission of the Philippine Islands, says:

"Inasmuch as one's home is wherever his loved ones may be found, the colonists do not feel that crushing nostalgia which is born of separation from one's family imposed by imprisonment. This resumption of home life is perhaps the most salutary factor for the colonists' moral and social rehabilitation, the more so because the family ties are further strengthened by the sharing of adversity."<sup>7</sup>

The success of the Iwahig Penal Colony has led to the extension to other prison colonies of the plan for families to live with prisoners. A few selected colonists at the San Ramon Prison and Penal Farm and at the Davao Penal Colony live with their families within the colony reservations.

In its closed prisons, the Philippine Islands follow the traditional western pattern of visits of the spouse to the prisoner within the grounds and under supervision. The visits are somewhat more generous than in many other countries. Regular visits may last four hours and on special holidays, as Christmas, New Year's Day, and the Fourth of July, the visit may extend throughout the day. Visits may occur once a week for colonists and trusties, twice a month for first class prisoners, and once a month for second class prisoners. There are no home leaves.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The general impression received from the questionnaire and from auxiliary material is that many countries hold a more humanitarian attitude toward prisoners than do many groups in the United States. Punishment for crime is held to be justified; the prisoner's right to and need for marriage is also recognized. Deprivation of marital contacts is less likely to be made a part of punishment than in the United States.

<sup>7</sup> JORGE BOCOBO, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

However, in only a few countries are provisions for marital contacts extended equally to all categories of prisoners. The limitation may be because of the unreliability or dangerousness of the criminal; or marital contacts may have some connotation of a privilege to be granted only to cooperative and conforming prisoners. In either case, the practice of home leaves or of family residence in a penal colony is not carried out haphazardly but tends to be integrated into the total prison regime.

It is worth noting that in general the countries from which we received responses do not favor private or conjugal visits within the prison, with the exception of Mexico.

Some of the practices of other countries are of long standing (e.g. the Philippines); others are very new (e.g. Argentina's home leaves). New practices are often tried out in a tentative fashion until the results can be studied. The measure of success is usually greater contentment of the prisoner and strengthening of family ties. There is a willingness to accept a small percentage of failures if the general effect is beneficial.

Prison policies and practices reflect to some extent the general philosophy of a country. However, in the past many prison practices originating in one part of the world have been adapted successfully to countries with other cultural backgrounds. Not automatic adoption of foreign practices but reflective adaptation is often possible. Is it not possible that in the United States a more reflective and experimental attitude toward marital contacts is needed? In the article "Marital Relationships of Prisoners in the United States," referred to in footnote 1, the authors advocated experimentation with home leaves. They now add the tentative suggestion that some open prisons might like to experiment with the practice of permitting families of prisoners to live on the grounds.

Conjugal visits in prisons are not compatible with mores of the United States, since they seem to emphasize only the physical satisfactions of sex. Home leaves and family residence in prison colonies place the emphasis on the whole complex of married life and family relationships—psychological and social as well as sexual. In the countries surveyed, much more so than in the United States, the trend is toward expansion of total family contacts.