

THE PASSING-OUT PARADE: DEMILITARISATION OF THE CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

AMANDA DISSEL
Police and Prison Research Project
Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation
University of the Witwatersrand

INTRODUCTION

In July 1995 The Minister of Correctional Services, Dr Sipo Mzimela, announced that the Department of Correctional Services was to be demilitarised. The minister stated that demilitarisation will have important psychological effects on "inmates, personnel and the whole country." He reasoned that the Department is an "...institution where we help people to change their behaviour. It is not a military institution".¹ Demilitarisation was finally introduced on 1 April 1996.

In order to understand the importance of demilitarisation, the manifestations and implications of a militarised correctional service must be examined and understood. A militarised institution is one which utilises force and authority for the maintenance and exercise of its power. It often relies on traditional military methods to do so. These methods may include discipline, arms, authoritarian communication, and unquestioning obedience.

The above elements were to be seen in the structure of the Department of Correctional Services which has, until now, adhered to strict military discipline. It was enforced through the ranking system, names, symbols, and disciplinary procedures and military codes. Recruits received training in "paraatheid" (preparedness) and drill, physical fitness and weapons training was thought to equip warders with the skills necessary to deal with inmates.

The military style and hierarchical structure of the organisation restricts communication between different levels of the organisation, relying on the issuing of

instructions from above. However, even more pervasive in its military character, was the department's attitude of being under constant threat or attack. This was manifest in the department's reluctance to open itself to criticism and scrutiny by the public, and to maintain secrecy in respect of most of its policies which affect prisoners and public alike. The interests of "security" often prevent members of the public from gaining access to even the simplest type of information.

While it is true that the Department has been in the process of changing its character for some time, and attempts have been made to open the institutions to public involvement, the impression is often created that the doors of this security establishment are still firmly bolted against the outside.

There are significant differences between the aims of a military and a correctional establishment. A military establishment exists in order to protect the country against foreign invaders and internal threats. It bolsters the authority of the government of the day. A correctional institution or prison, on the other hand, aims to protect the nation through incarceration of dangerous offenders, and more importantly, is geared towards the reduction of crime through positive intervention with the offenders. It is not so much concerned with protecting society from outside forces than dealing with crime as a socio-economic problem of society.

This paper seeks to examine why a military structure is inappropriate in a prison environment and why demilitarisation of the Department of Correctional Services (DCS) is necessary. Some of the important

areas affected by demilitarisation are highlighted. It will be argued in this paper that a militarised correctional service is inappropriate when that institution has been established for the safe keeping and rehabilitation² of offenders. It also focuses on the implications of a militarised and demilitarised structure and culture on the department.

ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE DCS PRIOR TO 1 APRIL 1996

The Department of Correctional Services is a service department within the government sector. The Correctional Services personnel are civil servants, although their status has been that of para-military personnel. Clear military ranking structures were laid down in the Regulations to the Correctional Services Act no 8 of 1959. It made allowance for the employment of commissioned and non-commissioned officers. Non-commissioned officers were appointed by the commissioner while commissioned officers were appointed by the State President, and could be discharged by the Minister.

Their conditions of service and salaries are determined by the Public Service Act 111 of 1984. When members resigned from service they became, (and remained until the age of 55 years) with the concurrence of the chief of the South African Defence Force, members of the reserve force. A commissioned officer could under certain circumstances retain his rank on retirement or be granted a higher honorary rank.

During South Africa's states of emergency, the DCS was defined as a "security force" in terms of which they were given wide ranging powers of arrest and detention to enable them to "maintain law and order".

The powers of the department are laid down in the Correctional Services Act from which the various levels of personnel derive their legal authority. The department is presently organised in a pyramid with

the head of the organisation, the commissioner, as the highest ranking individual, at the top. Clear lines of authority extend from him downwards to the bottom of the organisation. The management structure is characterised by the strict definition of responsibility and delegation of tasks to individuals. The fulfilment of tasks is strictly supervised and punitive measures could be used for non-fulfilment.

Decision-making in the department is largely centralised, although there are now nine regional areas headed by regional commissioners. The generals in the department form the top management level and they make decisions regarding the corporate policy of the department. Middle management (situated at head office) are responsible for functional policy decisions while their counterparts in the command areas and heads of prisons have to ensure that the policy is adhered to. The lower management is responsible for the management of the sections which they supervise. The majority of staff are excluded from decision-making.

In the military set-up an individual gains his or her authority not so much from the position he or she occupies, but from the person's rank. However, the level of authority is not always consistent with rank, and a situation may arise (especially at the lower levels) where two individuals of different rank occupy the same post level. For instance, a warrant officer could occupy the position of head of prison (usually a higher ranking officer held this position), and although he may have the same responsibilities as other heads of prisons, he would not have the same authority or ability to participate in decision-making when amongst personnel of a higher rank.

ARGUMENTS FOR DEMILITARISATION

Demilitarisation was raised as a concern in South Africa during the Lansdown Commission in 1949 which investigated various aspects of the Prison Service. At the time the Prisons and Reformatories Act 13 of

1911 laid the basis for some degree of military structure in the Prisons Department.

At this time subordinates within the department were trained in military discipline and had military rank and status. They were required to wear military uniform and to salute their superiors. The senior officers, administrative staff and the management were civilians, wearing civilian dress. The Commission argued that the executive of the prison service should not be militarised, nor should they wear uniform. It held the view that:

"... senior officers are better able, when not vested with military rank and clothed in military uniform, to hold the balance between subordinate officers and the inmates of the institution, and themselves are far more accessible to the inmates than they would be as military officers. Nor in the opinion of the Commission, under a scheme of military ranks and discipline, would that human contact between officers and inmates exist enabling the former to apply to the latter the various rehabilitative influences which modern views deem essential."(para 677)

On the other hand, the Commission maintained that subordinates should maintain their military status, but those members of staff in institutions for "subnormal, psycho- neurotic or psychopath prisoners or release depots" should wear civilian clothing.

It appears that Lansdown drew a distinction between disciplinary staff, or warders, who took care of the day-to-day operations in the prison, and treatment-orientated staff who were required to interact with prisoners and rehabilitate them. He suggested that rehabilitation of prisoners should be the planned aim of

the Prisons Department and this would be facilitated by the civilian attire and conduct of the senior members.

Lansdown's recommendations were important in recognising that a rehabilitative environment is best created by a civilian prisons staff. However, he failed to recognise the role which the ordinary warder could play in "rehabilitating" prisoners, instead confining that role to the senior officers and professional staff. In reality, it is the warder who interacts with the prisoner on a daily basis, and few prisoners ever have access to the "treatment-orientated" staff.

Disregarding Lansdown's recommendations, the Department of Prisons was fully militarised with the rewriting of the Prisons Act in 1959, from the Commissioner as the head of the organisation through to the subordinates.

Since then, the possible demilitarisation of the Department has been discussed several times: in 1976 when rationalisation of the civil service was instituted, and in 1993 during the budget debate. Some of the reasons which were advanced for demilitarisation then are still valid today.

The military structure has often been viewed as bolstering apartheid separatism in the department. At the time of the Lansdown Commission, black personnel were restricted to jobs as "Native Warders", and "Senior Native Warders", and they were required to supervise "native" prisoners only. The posts of superintendents, assistant superintendents, chief warders, warders, matrons and wardresses were reserved for white personnel. These were the managerial positions (Lansdown, para 713). Although in later years, officers' jobs were no longer strictly reserved for whites, the statistics for 1990 indicate that 90% of the officers' positions were filled by white personnel and only 9,2% by black, coloured and Indian personnel³. The number of white officers had reduced in 1994 to 68,4%. This is partially as a result of affirmative action and promotion of black candidates,

but it is largely attributable to the reincorporation of the ex TVBC and KwaZulu Natal Prison Services into the Correctional Services.

Although not the only prohibiting factor, the strict requirements which personnel had to meet before they were promoted to a higher military rank often disqualified black personnel who had not attained the required academic standards. Black staff were also seldom extended as many training opportunities as other staff, and formal and informal prejudice sought to prevent the fulfilling of black members' career aspirations. It was argued that demilitarisation would facilitate the development of a more representative personnel corps.

Through its military structure, the DCS formed a negative association with the South African Defence Force which played its part in maintaining the apartheid regime through domestic repression of anti-apartheid activists and civilians. The prisons played a more direct role in enforcing apartheid legislation through the incarceration of many of the regime's opponents, both as sentenced and awaiting-trial prisoners. The symbolic act of breaking from the militarised past represents a commitment to a more democratic future for all South African people, irrespective of race, religion or class.

The Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) White Paper clearly supports demilitarisation and states that security forces should be non-partisan, professional, uphold the Constitution and respect human rights. It further states that our society should develop a different demilitarised ethical code (para 1.3.4.). The key to the RPD programme in the public sector involves the democratisation of institutions.⁴ The RDP programme of the ANC went further than this stating that "prison staff need to be trained to reflect this approach (non-sexist and non-racist) and to transform the present military command structure of the prison service."⁵

In support of this *The Alternative White Paper*

prepared by the Penal Reform Lobby Group⁶ argued that the military nature of the DCS connected it strongly with apartheid's security structure and that demilitarisation would represent perhaps the greatest commitment to a new democratic order.

The department followed a cautious approach to demilitarisation in its White Paper in 1994⁷. While it undertook to investigate demilitarising the department, it firstly stated that it doubted whether the military character prevented the fulfillment of the aim of rehabilitation, and secondly, that the military structure is attractive to new recruits⁸, while it also enables stricter control of staff and inmates than a civilian order would do.

The arguments of this paper firstly contradicts the first premise. Military institutions are traditionally associated with the security of state institutions, upholding state authority, and the utilisation of force in the attainment of its objectives. It may be argued that an institution which is premised on repressive and aggressive measures cannot fulfil the function of developing offenders entrusted to its care. While the primary emphasis of correctional services in the past may have been on the punishment and incapacitation of offenders, this is not appropriate given modern understanding of corrections. Correctional institutions should aim primarily to rehabilitate and develop offenders enabling them to lead a more productive and crime-free life on release from prison.

Reliance on offensive measures to maintain internal discipline and order while protecting the security establishment, occurs at the expense of the ideal of rehabilitation of offenders. Military type rules require a minimum of interaction with the offender, and a sense that the inmate is the enemy who must be kept at bay. International penological trends indicate that an interactive approach with offenders often results in better order inside the prison. This approach requires that offenders are treated with respect, their individual dignity is accepted, and individual responsibility is

encouraged. The disciplinary focus of the DCS needs to shift to preventative security, through observation, negotiation, mediation and peaceful settlement of disputes.

In the second instance, the reliance on the attraction of the military status for new recruits is an inappropriate one for anyone involved in corrections, and could result in recruitment of staff unsuited to work with prisoners. The emphasis should instead be focused on the maturity of new recruits, their understanding of prisoners and imprisonment, and on their desire to be involved in rehabilitation or the development of offenders.

It is also questionable whether the military structure maintains discipline. The many allegations of assaults by warders on prisoners, or complicity in gang-related activity, indicates that military discipline was unsuccessful in restraining unlawful actions by personnel. Prisoner-on-prisoner violence also continued unchecked despite this so-called military discipline.

While military procedures, such as role call, may provide practical ways to check staff attendance, civilian methods could serve the same purpose.

INTERNATIONAL TRENDS IN PENAL INSTITUTIONS

During South Africa's apartheid years and exclusion from the international community, it was not strictly bound by any international human rights covenants dealing specifically with prisoners' rights. However, Dirk van Zyl Smit, South Africa's foremost prisons writer, argues that many of the international standards have become binding on South Africa through the application of international legal principles. With South Africa's re-entry into the international world, these principles have become increasingly important.

Article VII of the *Recommendations on the Selection*

and Training of Personnel for Penal and Corrective Institutions, adopted in conjunction with the *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners*⁹ in 1955, states that prison staff should be organised specifically along civilian rather than military lines. A more recent handbook, *Making Standards Work*¹⁰, has elaborated on the rule and suggests that:

"A prison should not have a militaristic set-up. An overly hierarchial structure and a military approach inhibit individual staff responsibility and reduce personal involvement and individual care."
(145)

In line with this approach, many European countries have adopted a civilian prison structure, or have transformed their military organisation into a civilian one. Italy, Cuba, Israel, Austria, and Hungary maintain a military structure. Most of South Africa's neighbours (Lesotho, Swaziland, Tanzania, Botswana and Zimbabwe), have also moved away from the military model.

Canada and Denmark provide interesting and more progressive models. Canada has undergone a more fundamental change and in the process has reorganised their Department of Corrections. It has recently changed from a para-military organisation to one with a professional case management approach and greater participative management. Canada follows the unit management approach where each institution is divided into smaller sections, each headed by a "Unit Manager". There are four managerial levels within each institution, each with its defined responsibilities. Each level has greater responsibility for the programmes which they manage and for the delivery of services to prisoners.

Denmark has also recently undergone institutional change. Each institution is divided into autonomous units, with its own staff team. This results in fewer

managerial levels and allows the prison officer greater responsibility and variety of work. In addition to their security function, officers fulfil certain other functions such as social work, spare time and occupational work with the prisoners to whom they are allocated. This allows for a higher degree of competence and responsibility as well as creating better opportunities for supporting prisoners and motivating them to lead a crime-free life on their release.

Both Canada and Denmark are structured along a more simple or flatter hierarchy. The positions of staff are characterised by the function they fulfil and not by their titles or status. There is a decentralised system of management allowing for participation by members and greater interaction with prisoners. This assists the prison to achieve its goal of creating an environment conducive for a prisoners' reintegration into the community and living a crime-free life after release, at the same time creating maximum opportunity for the personal development of the offender.

It can be seen from these examples that international trends in penal institutions are orientated towards assisting offenders to lead a crime-free life and to settle into the community on release. For these reasons, the prison rules and regulations of these countries are organised to be conducive to the adjustment of the offender and his/her reintegration. Conditions in prison should differ from those in the community only in so much as is necessary for purposes of their confinement. In this respect, a correctional institution which has a militarised approach is inconsistent with the civilian culture which predominates in most civil societies. Imprisonment creates its own unique environment which differs from that prevailing outside. If the institution is militarised, further alienation is created which imposes a barrier to adjustment and rehabilitation.

CHALLENGES OF DEMILITARISATION

The Transformation Forum on Correctional Services

(TFCS)¹¹ was requested by the minister to formulate recommendations for a new demilitarised correctional services department. The forum consulted with a number of organisations, and together with the department prepared a document on demilitarisation¹². Although this was presented to the minister in February 1996, a second document prepared solely by the department (although based on the joint TFCS/department document) formed the basis of the demilitarisation strategy.

The department's strategy has largely focused on the removal of visible signs of militarism. Thus the names of the ranks have changed, and civilian terms are used instead of military ones. Forms of address have changed so that members are no longer called by the name of "sergeant", "general", or "lieutenant", but are addressed according to the civilian titles of "Mr", "Mrs" or "Miss". The rank insignias have been removed from uniforms, although the current khaki uniform will be retained until a new uniform is designed. Staff who are not in direct contact with prisoners, and those in the head office will no longer be required to wear uniform.

However, the strategy dealt inadequately with the non-visible elements of demilitarisation, such as culture and discipline. It also failed to create an effective plan of implementation. In late March members of the Correctional Services were still completing questionnaires on how they felt about demilitarisation. Towards the end of March, they were given instructions that they were to demilitarise on 1 April 1996. No mechanism was introduced to acclimatise members to the new concept, nor was there one dealing with their concerns. For members used to dealing with issues of discipline according to military codes, removal of those codes meant a hiatus in discipline.

Demilitarisation for the department appears to have meant simply a removal of all things pertaining to the military. Yet, demilitarisation should go beyond this to establishing a new culture for the department as well as addressing the important concerns of members.

Organisational structure

The pyramidal structure in the DCS is more suited to a militaristic culture. However, the demands of a democratic South Africa require a new approach to management of public sector institutions, and this includes the Department of Correctional Services. Demilitarisation should serve as an opportunity to re-evaluate the existing structure. Adebayo Adedeji, the Head of the UN Economic Commission for Africa, stated that:

"The democratisation of the development process - by which we mean the empowerment of the people, their involvement in decision-making, in implementation and monitoring processes - is a condition *sine qua* for socio-economic recovery and transformation."¹³

Although there is limited possibility for prisoner participation in prison management, there is potential for involving a greater number of staff in participative management. There are already some procedures in place for staff participation¹⁴, but it occurs mainly around affirmative action issues. Participative management could create the opportunities for staff to engage in real management and staff development. The effects of apartheid policies have resulted in a management predominated by white personnel. Democratic management would allow for under-represented groups to be affirmed and developed, and trained to take an active part in the management of prisons.

The new demilitarised structure follows the police example¹⁵ by reducing the number of post levels and changing their names. The positions are renamed according to civilian titles, and only members in a few positions, such as the head of prison and the commander, will retain some form of title. Although the

new structure creates some opportunity for staff participation at all levels, it does not create a new democratic management style.

The unit management approach which the Department of Correctional Services has introduced into some prisons as a pilot project, proposes a new management style. It is stated that this approach has the "philosophy, strategies and programmes for skills, knowledge and coping strategies to be acquired and a change in attitude to occur", to meet the needs of temporal security and deterrence, as well as for lessening the harmful effects of imprisonment through offering the opportunity for development of prisoners¹⁶. Under this system the prison is divided into manageable units each under the control of a unit management. Managerial responsibility is decentralised allowing for a certain degree of institutional independence. Greater responsibility would be given to the heads of unit management institutions to give content to DCS policy and to ensure its implementation in the most meaningful way.

The present emphasis on strict communication channels along the line functions prohibits free communication and participation from lower ranking members. Restructuring should attempt to open up those channels which prevent a member from communicating with anyone other than his immediate superior.

Concerns of members

A restructuring process which reduces the number of post levels would facilitate the promotion of large numbers of these people to a higher level. This will assist the fulfilment of the affirmative action programme agreed upon by the Linda Human Forum¹⁷. However, longer-term restructuring must also be sensitive to affirmative action requirements.

Under the militarised system, commissioned officers held a senior managerial position over non-

commissioned officers, and were accorded a different statuses. This is removed through demilitarisation, although some may retain their managerial positions.

Many DCS staff feel threatened by the concept of demilitarisation. Removal of visible rank is perceived as a loss of status and identity, particularly for those black members who were awarded ranks despite their historical disadvantaged positions.

When demilitarisation was introduced no attempt was made to reassure members or address their concerns. Many are uncertain of how to function without the backing of military status and discipline, or how they will be able to control prisoners. In some prisons, this has already led to a loss of institutional discipline and morale. A concerted attempt has to be made to educate members around demilitarisation, and deal with their concerns.

Uniforms, rank insignia and titles

Much of the culture of the department manifested itself by means of the military uniforms, ranks and titles, which gave status and created a sense of identity. In demilitarising, attention needs to be paid to the creation of a new identity, one based on civilian standards. An important indication of a change in identity is the dress of the staff. Management and staff not directly involved with prisoners, now wear private clothing. New uniforms for the remaining staff have yet to be designed, and they continue to wear the old khaki uniforms with insignia removed.

A uniform should be developed which is quite distinctive from the current khaki uniform which symbolises the military culture of the department.

The non-custodial or professional staff such as teachers, social workers and health workers, should not be required to wear uniform. They are professionals who must maintain, and be seen to be maintaining, their independence from those aspects of the

correctional services which are equated with enforcing discipline and order.

The provision of uniforms is currently considered as part of members' benefits, and allowances for civilian dress will have to be negotiated through the bargaining chamber.

Training

Inevitably, in order to facilitate organisational change, training programmes must be devised and made available for staff at all levels. Bill Kidston, the Director-General of Corrections in Victoria¹⁸, states that the senior and middle managers should be the first groups to receive training in order to demonstrate their commitment to training of all staff. New concepts can then be disseminated through to the lower levels.

Training need not only be through formal procedures, but may also occur through the informal provision of skills and knowledge required to carry out the work, and the development of changing attitudes, as well as the provision of skills necessary for managing and initiating organisational change.

The basic training of new recruits will have to be changed fundamentally. A large proportion of the programme currently focuses on military aspects, drill and security measures. A demilitarised system does not require such an intensive focus on these aspects of correctional work. No doubt there should be some emphasis on physical fitness and self-defence techniques, but the security aspect should focus instead on preventative and dynamic security techniques. A very small section of basic training involves learning how to deal with prisoners. The new training curriculum has attempted to change the situation, but it has still allocated only a small part to interpersonal relationships with prisoners. The criminological aspects of prison officers' work is usually only covered through private study with Unisa or Technicon RSA¹⁹.

If and when unit management is introduced, the correctional officer may be required to fulfil a number of tasks which prison officers were not taught in the past. Similarly, if the warder is required to have a more interactive relationship with prisoners, then he or she may be required to fulfil the functions of social worker, advisor, guidance counsellor, in addition to performing the custodial function. Special training will have to be provided to allow correctional officers to gain the requisite skills.

Disciplinary procedures

The DCS military disciplinary procedures and codes require unquestioning loyalty and obedience to orders. The procedures were different for commissioned and non-commissioned officers, and followed the format of a trial. A source suggested that some members, particularly the officers, were concerned that demilitarisation would result in a lack of discipline among members.

"Discipline will deteriorate, but one can't say it is discipline if it is maintained by force. Discipline should be based on respect rather than on force."²⁰

A fair and equitable disciplinary procedure needs to be established which is the same for both senior and junior members. Provision should also be made for members to be represented by another member or a member of their trade union.

The disciplinary procedure and offences need to be addressed when demilitarising the department, so that the procedure will reflect civilian methods of disciplining staff.

Maintaining discipline in prison

Military codes and ethics call for a certain type of discipline from prisoners. Respect and deference to

high-ranking officers is called for. Militarised personnel give instructions to prisoners instead of creating the impression of being open and available to listen to prisoners' concerns. But perhaps the most important impact of militarism is the reliance on force or the threat of force in maintaining order in the prison. Members are equipped and are trained in the use of batons, as well as on the use of firearms. In the past members were not trained non-violent methods of maintaining peace in the prison, and many continue to use force in solving disputes and controlling difficult prisoners.

New relationships will have to be developed which, although it allows staff greater flexibility in their decisions-making, does not compromise their ability to maintain a safe and secure environment in the prison. Non-violent solutions to disturbances need to be included in the training curricula of new recruits. More senior officers also need to be trained in the use of these methods. Force should only be used as a last resort, and then only by specially trained personnel.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the culture of democracy and transparency requires that there should be full consultation with the people affected by decisions before these take place. There was little consultation in the process of demilitarisation. While demilitarisation may occur more smoothly in some provinces or sectors of the department, there are bound to be many members who feel excluded and alienated from the process. Their concerns must be thoroughly dealt with to minimise potential frustration and disillusionment. The task of dealing with members' concerns should not be left to the unions, but should be directed from within the department itself. Opportunities need to be created where members can express their grievances and voice their concerns, and in turn, these concerns need to be taken seriously by management.

The department appears to be opting for a phased process of demilitarisation which involves removing the

obvious signs of the military culture. A comprehensive plan which addresses the more structural and cultural issues has not been developed. It is the real issues behind demilitarisation: transformation of the structures, culture and ideology of the Department of Correctional Services that must be addressed.

Demilitarisation of the Department of Correctional Services involves more than a mere renaming of parts. It requires a thorough examination of the existing culture and structure of the department, and a concerted effort to move away from the ethics of militarism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Africa Watch Prison Project. 1994. *Prison Conditions in South Africa*. USA: Human Rights Watch.
- Australia Institute of Criminology. 1987. "Correctional Officer training" Workshop held 7 - 9 July 1987. Canberra, A.C.T.
- Carlie, M K and Minor, K I. eds. *Prisons Around the World: Studies in International Penology*. 1992. USA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Cock, J. 1992. *Women, the Military and Militarisation: Some Questions raised by the South African Case*, Seminar No 7, Johannesburg, CSVr.
- Commission of Inquiry into Unrest in Prisons, *Final report of the Commission of Inquiry into Unrest in Prisons Appointed by the President on 27 June 1994*. 1995. Pretoria.
- Enloe, C. H. *Police, Military and Ethnicity: Foundations of State Power*. 1980, USA, Transaction Books.
- James, Jacobs B. 1983. *New Perspectives on Prisons and Imprisonment*. London: Cornell University Press.
- Neser, J J, ed. 1993. *Penitentiary Penology, Second Edition*. Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.
- Penal Reform International. *Making Standards Work: an international handbook on good prison practice*. 1995, The Hague: Penal Reform International.
- Penal Reform Lobby Group. 1995. *An Alternative White Paper on Correctional Services*. Johannesburg.
- Report of the Prison Reform Commission*, The Hon Charles, W. H. Lansdown. 1947. Pretoria, Government Printer.
- Technikon SA. 1994. *Correctional Services Management*. Study Guides.
- The Reconciliation and Development Programme: A Policy Framework*. 1994. Cape Town, ABC Printers.
- Van Zyl Smit, D. 1992. *South African Prison Law and Practice*. Durban: Butterworths.
- Wits P&DM. *Police Organisation and Management Programme: Principles of Public Management*. 1993. Public and Development Management Programme, Johannesburg: University of Witwatersrand.

 End notes

END NOTES

- 1 . "Mzimela announces demilitarising the prisons dept", 1 July 1995, Citizen.
- 2 . The word "rehabilitation" is used with caution as traditional rehabilitation programmes following the medical and psychoanalytical models have been discredited in prisons. The writer is referring to programmes which seek to develop the offender and assist him/her to lead a crime-free life.
- 3 . Statistics for Officers Corps 1990 vs 1994 as at 94/12/31.
- 4 . RDP White paper: Discussion Document, CTP Book Printers, Cape.
- 5 . Paragraph 5.8.1. *The Reconciliation and Development Programme: A Policy Framework*. 1994. Cape Town, ABC Printers.
- 6 . February 1995.
- 7 . White Paper on the Policy of the Department of Correctional Services in the New South Africa, 1994, Pretoria, Government Printer, page 22.
- 8 . Ibid. In discussing the military character of the Department the White Paper states that: "The Department has + 29 000 members who joined the Services as a para-military organisation, thereby obviously associating themselves with its long-standing tradition and culture". (paragraph 3.6.5)
- 9 . Adopted by the First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, 30 August 1995.
- 10 . *Making Standards Work: an international handbook on good prison practice*, attempts to give meaning to prison policies and good practice. Penal Reform International.
- 11 . The Transformation Forum on Correctional Services was established in April 1995 to oversee the transformation of the Correctional Services Department. It is comprised of representatives of the DCS, members of parliament, and community based and non-governmental organisations. The TFCS has a recommendatory function only.
- 12 . Demilitarisation Policy Document, submission to the Minister of Correctional Services from the Transformation Forum on Correctional Services: 19 February 1996.
- 13 . "Aid Tied to Democracy", Africa News (US) 12/2/90, in "South African Public Administration in Transition" - South Africa's Uncertain Transition: Reflections from Zimbabwe's experience, March 1992.
- 14 . Affirmative action committees have been established at some prisons. The Linda Human Forum on Affirmative Action also recommended the establishment of a National Monitoring Forum to monitor the implementation of affirmative action. Forums will also be established on a regional level. The National Training Committee allows for union participation in the design of a new training curriculum. Departmental Bargaining Chambers allow for employee organisations to negotiate around labour issues.
- 15 . The Department of Safety and Security has recently demilitarised its ranks.
- 16 . "Unit Management Approach", Col Rita Marx, unpublished paper presented to the Function subcommittee of the Transformation Forum on Correctional Services, 18 September 1995.
- 17 . In February 1995, the DCS announced the formation of a representative advisory forum to advise the department on principles and mechanisms for establishing a more representative personnel corps. The forum was chaired by Prof Linda Human, and in July 1995 completed a "Blue Print: Five Year Plan on Affirmative Action for the Department of Correctional Services".
- 18 . Opening address of "Correctional Officer training workshop" held 7-9 July 1987.
- 19 . Courses offered at these institutions are usually prerequisites to promotion to management positions in the Department of Correctional Services.
- 20 . Interviewee A.