

Sławomir Przybyliński

University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn

## On the Edge of Prison Existence – Convicted “Dodgers” in the Lens of the Subcultural Look

*Żeby księżyc umiał mówić, żeby znał słowa te, to napewno by wyszeptał że Ja Cwany  
brat Twój jest<sup>1</sup>.*

**Abstract:** The article deals with the prison subculture as a side and destructive phenomenon, which has been observed in our domestic penal institutions for years. Given the background of the traditional categorization of prisoners (“elite”, “non-elite”, “victims”), the article presents the image of prisoners called “dodgers” who – as there are not many of them – exist on the edge of a subculture world, making attempts to become a part of the present and significantly modified in recent years subculture structures, which are based mainly on financial relationships.

**Key words:** prison, prison subculture, “dodger” prisoners.

Leon Rabinovich in 1933 wrote: “The rising nineteenth century has found Europe plunged into utter barbarity in terms of the condition of the prison system; despite numerous protests and exhortations to reform, despite the example of several

.....

<sup>1</sup> Poem of “dodger” prisoners; the original spelling the prisoner (material from the Author’s archive).

model standard prisons, the overall situation has not changed. Even Howard's powerful voice, which reverberated around the world, were not able to move this stiffened state. Europe thought, philosophized, designed, but was unable to act; and here mainly acts, daring acts were needed" (Rabinovich 1933, p. 33). In the same period, Józef Loos (1933, p. 29–30) writes about the prison: "So what should it be? A warning that discourages imagination by the tragedy of penance? In the Middle Ages it was said: – yes? No wonder punishment was revenge, and guilt the product of a criminal brain. But today it is widely recognized that it has to be different. Punishment has apparently ceased to be a retaliation, guilt has become divided guilt; the guilt of a criminal and the criminal social conditions. And even the conservative theorists of criminal law melted their devalued theories of retribution into circulation coins of intentional penalty". The history of penitentiary thought show that for many years the world, Europe, and in it Poland, have struggled with the reform of the prison system, glorifying or devaluing different trends of thought and concepts about how to deal with prisoners. Today, it is impossible not to have doubts about the restorative function of the prison. Among the different views, that rejecting the elements of repression, revenge or retaliation dominates, pointing to the improvement and transformation of the convict. However, sometimes the efforts of prison officers at the level of education and social rehabilitation are thwarted and the effects of their work may be limited by factors whose source are often the informal stratification of convicts functioning within the prison subculture. Jerzy Śliwowski (1975, p. 102–103) talks about the second life, that "above all, all these processes which in the course of executing the penalty counteract the overriding mechanism of the sentence, legalistic attitudes inducing others to behave in accordance with the law. There is nothing more harmful and counteracting to the purposes of punishment than these processes". This phenomenon has been for many years accompanied by the national prison system, evolving with it and changing its portrait depending on the time, but also the place of occurrence. "Informal groups of convicted juvenile-elites appeared for the first time at the turn of the 50s and 60s (20th century – Author's note). Due to the temporal distance and the lack of any mention in penitentiary literature, it is difficult to accurately determine the period of formation of elites" (Braun 1975, p. 40). According to Kazimierz Braun (1975, p. 40–41) "elite" has its roots in the Warsaw environment, in the once functioning prison called "Gęsiówka". Later, the strong habitats of "elites" were recorded in prisons for juveniles in large cities. The strongest "elites" occurred in Warsaw, Łódź, Wrocław, and with relatively smaller force, according to Braun, in the province of Rzeszów and Lublin. The development of the phenomenon of subculture in incarcerated space was characterized by different dynamics depending on the location. For example, in September 1977 in the Prison in Iława, the percentage share of the group of "elite" prisoners in the convicted population was up to 54.2%, and in March 1986 only 11.3% (Kornowski 1986, p. 2).

Over the years, different elite schools, factions, sub-groups were created. The most common names were: „urka”, „charakterniak”, „git-człowiek”. However, others were also noted, e.g.: „możdżanie”, „apropacy” (Braun 1975, p. 41–44). Paul Moczydłowski (2002, p. 105–106) mentions another group called “ihermensze” (from the German *ühermenschen* – supermen).

Both before and today, prison subculture<sup>2</sup> is a phenomenon that leaves its imprint on the holistically understood penitentiary system. As an informal decision-making center it operates alongside the formal, official camp of power and decision, which is represented by the employees of the Prison Service (Machel, 1995, p. 38). By creating their own shady and illegal structures, the prisoners do not fit the correctional narrative, existing in their own norms, principles and values. Hence, “the second trend of prison life” can be described as a conglomerate of hidden, uncontrolled rules forming a certain strategy of action, by which the prisoners know how to behave in given circumstances and optimally function in isolation” (Przybyliński 2005, p. 21). The phenomenon of prison subculture should be seen as a certain system of the following components: a specific hierarchy of values and associated system of standards of conduct, which is often accompanied by a *quasi*-magical way of thinking; a specific personal style and prison habits; social hierarchy and role in the prison; bizarre creations of subculture (slang, tattoos, songs, poetry, etc.) (Dobromilska, Dobromilski 1994, p. 118). Janusz Górski (1984, p. 66–67) says that the prison subculture “is a factor that mostly supports and protects those who have best adapted to the criminal lifestyle and, conversely, it is a factor disturbing the personality and demoralizing for those who are anchored in the world of crime”. According to Tomasz Kalisz (2013, p. 45–46) “when speaking about prison subculture in the context of personal safety, you need to pay special attention to the fact that the subculture tends to take over the community of prisoners. This leads to a situation in which in prisons programmed as one of the elements of justice there is a hidden lawlessness and brutality, and the humiliation of victims and violation of their sense of dignity is a daily thing, not extraordinary events”. The Author is probably referring to the infamous activity primarily of “elite” prisoners and their actions in relation to other prisoners, including “non-elite” prisoners, and in particular prisoners called pansies. These three groups created informally and functioning on penitentiary grounds, constitute the traditional subcultural tripartite division of prisoners. They do, of course, occur with varying numerical intensity in native social rehabilitation centers, inconsistently internalising prison regulations. The division of the informal world of prisoners into “elite” (“people”), “non-elite” (“non-people”, “losers”) and “victims”

.....

<sup>2</sup> Both in literature on the subject and in penitentiary practice, terminological ambiguity can be encountered in the context of naming informal relationships between inmates in prison, e.g.: prison subculture, criminal subculture, elite subculture, second life subculture, second life, prison subculture, elite, informal organization in a total institution, informal stratification of prisoners, second life of prison.

(“pansies”) (see more Przybyliński 2005, p. 27–37), does not constitute the entire subcultural content of the group appearance. The “dodgers” should also be mentioned here – they are relatively diagnosed and worked out, as it now seems, but also the least numerous in relation to the above listed.

“Elite” prisoners are also called “people”; this is the most important community in view of the development of informal relationships and shaping subcultural situations. When speaking of the prison “second life”, for the most part we are talking precisely about this group, which sees and creates itself as the most important of the informal groups noted in the prison space, appropriating the right to decide and settle what goes on among the prisoners. They do not respect and do not recognize voices from outside their own circle, by regarding themselves as prison elite they divide inmates into the better and worse, while “we” and only “we”, as the true “people” belong to the former group, as the “elite” say. While the remaining prisoners are: “they”, “losers”, “non-people”. The population of “elite” prisoners has a well-developed group structure with an ordered size and shape of a pyramid with a leading group – “general people” at the top. The implicit code of conduct of “elite” prisoners is based on strength, lawlessness and exploitation of people from outside the group; in profiling almost any behavior of “elites” integrates and internally unites them. Significant in this regard are the norms of conduct of “elites”, the set of which we can find in penitentiary literature (including Braun 1975; Kosewski 1985; Moczydłowski 1988; Wawszczyk et al. 1994; Szaszkiewicz 1997). Maciej Szaszkiewicz (1997, p. 49–60) lists three groups of basic norms with specific norms. These are: norms for “condemning condemners” (e.g.: it is prohibited to enter into any relationships with personnel, a person whose father is a police officer or employee of the justice system cannot become a “person”, it is not allowed to give up partners, it is not allowed to sell elites, it is not allowed to take positions allocated to prisoners by personnel nor perform any cleaning and voluntary work allocated by “screws”, privileges and regulation awards must be held in contempt, you cannot shake hands with “losers”, “screws”, you must destroy, beat, rape pansies and snitches, you should not touch the key of the cell, you should also be tough elite, i.e. be unruly and hostile towards the prison institution); norms protecting group solidarity (e.g. it is not allowed to shake hands with prisoners from outside the “elite” environment, a “person” does not cause trouble to a “person”, an “elite” has an obligation to share different goods with their compatriots in the group, “people” eat together at the table, and the “losers” separately, a “person” must be “cool” and he cannot deny being in the elite, you must do it openly); norms protecting the dignity of the “person” and elite honor (e.g.: it is not allowed to move things lying next to the toilet, it is not allowed to pick up rubbish with your hands, it is not allowed to wash the toilet bowl with your hands or a rag held in the hands, but you can clean it with a brush, it is not allowed to launder other people’s personal belongings, it is not allowed to bully “elites”, it is not allowed to insult a “person”, it is not allowed

to steal from another “person”, an “elite” cannot show fear, a “person” cannot be submissive and passive in homosexual relations, an “elite” cannot ask for anything because this shows his weakness and softness). Szaszkievicz (1997, p. 45–48) also points to the three superior “elite” values, calling them also group objectives. He talks about the struggle with the law and institutions guarding it, group solidarity, as well as “elite” dignity and honor. In the present matter, it is also worth noting in particular the “right of tabletop” and “right of key” (see more Przybyliński 2005, p. 77–78), which are not negligible in the conduct of convicted “people”.

Inferior in relation to “elite”, but less consolidated are “non-elite” prisoners, also called “non-people” or “losers”. They are generally passive, or even subculturally lazy, without much initiative in shaping the subcultural world. They want to rather quietly and amicably function to survive without any problems until they leave prison. Observations of the incarcerated environment lead me to conclude that so-called “non-people” are the largest group of those convicted and temporarily arrested. However, in the absence of a precisely formulated objective and norms of conduct consolidating the group or a strong and well-established in his dealings leader or group of leaders, who would outline a path of conduct, there is no reflection in the internal force and decisiveness of this group of prisoners.

Another group, or rather convicts thrown into the “prison sack”, i.e. symbolically devoid of humanity, or stripped of human elements, are the “victims”, in prison called “pansies”, but also “whores”, “wieners”, “pipes”, “blowers”. Their status is very fragile, as reflected by the daily contempt and disrespect in any situation directed towards them from other prisoners. They are at the bottom of the subcultural hierarchy, existing in the nothingness of prison, without the right to any voice and any respect of inmates. They are so low in the prison informal stratification, that the only thing they can do is respect the commands of other prisoners, which undoubtedly depreciates their personal dignity. A “pansy” is excluded from any prison actions, so he experiences life in special cells and wards of a prison or detention center, colloquially called “pansy house”. It should be emphasized that “victims” repeatedly become the victims of multidimensional exploitation and sexual violence from the “elites”. Imposing the status of a “pansy” on a prisoner by other inmates can have various grounds. Primarily it is related to committing or sometimes even the presumption of an offense against sexual freedom and morality. A prisoner can also become a “victim” by having female facial features or exhibiting childish behavior often resulting from psychophysical or a reduced intellectual level. “Giving away”, “snitching” on colleagues, outstanding commitments, including financial, but also association with the police, the justice system and prison personnel are also arguments for making someone a “pansy”. It sometimes happens that the “victim” name is imposed on an “elite” relegated from his own group for not respecting the internal subcultural arrangements.

Apart from the usual division into “elites”, “non-elites” and “victims”, it is worth noting convicts established in other subcultural structures from those men-

tioned above, operating under the name “dodgers” and using the shortcut C.K., and sometimes C.K. inscribed or located in a crown (the symbolism is described below). From my observation of the prison environment and interviews with officers of the Prison Service, I can say that “dodgers” are a very small group of inmates. They should be seen rather as individuals in the midst of an isolated community than given the status of a subcultural group. I think that in some penitentiary institutions there were and are no “dodgers” at all, and the personnel working there did not have a chance to work with them. They are a fraction, which in a very moderate way affects the “second life” in prison. This is mainly due to the small number of “dodger brothers” – as they call each other. They don’t have a long history, and their origins are not fully known and described in the literature. There are no scientific studies, communications from studies, or any broader studies showing the portrait of “dodger” prisoners. One thing is certain, that “dodgers” laboriously and firmly, sometimes alone without the support of their companions, construct their crafty skill, indicating that they exist, making attempts to widen their circle. I notice that during scientific peregrinations around various prisons, where exploring the incarceration space I encountered representatives of this fraction. They are individual convicts (often very communicative), who passionately paint the picture of the “dodger” world of prison. It is also difficult to determine whether dodgers are in the declining phase or vice versa. If they are developing, they are doing so very slowly and without any pressure of rapid growth and existence in the subcultural world. Previous knowledge of “dodgers” is collected and updated on a somewhat regular basis. Generally they do not openly declare membership in “dodging”, they do not flaunt belonging to this group of prisoners. It is known, that a significant part of them were “elites” excluded from the group.

An extremely important and explanatory of the essence of “dodgers” was correspondence (see more Przybyliński 2005, p. 40–43) of a convict taken several years ago by the personnel of one of the local penitentiary institutions. This correspondence is a kind of ABC of “dodgers”, which presents a number of issues relating to their philosophy of functioning and prison being. As we read in the correspondence, the “dodger” “is an agile person with a rational way of thinking, does not recognize any rules in prison, because he lives the free life”. I indicated above that there are difficulties in determining the time and place of formation of “dodgers”, but the note shows that its origins are associated with the Prison in Ława, where some of the persecuted convicts, humiliated, beaten, robbed by “elites” rebelled and started a fight with them, thus giving an argument to create new subcultural structures. Grzegorz Brejtenbach (2003, p. 23) in the monthly magazine “Forum Penitencjarne” presented a specific report from conversations of prisoners heard, which show that dodgers are “ambitious thieves with a strong character and healthy mind”. They owe their name “dodgers” somewhat to a convicted “elite” who one day called the person fighting with him a “dodger” and

so it stayed and was adopted. As is clear from the correspondence, “people who fight with elites or whores similar to them are called Dodgers”. It is worth noting that the presented group of convicts are “dodgers”. Other names for them are offensive and pejorative, used by “elite” prisoners. “Dodgers” in their own company have respect for each other and respect the principle of helping themselves in all situations. They are like brothers to each other, who cannot demean each other, exalt, or cause affairs for each other. The most important principles of “dodgers”, as Breitenbach (2003, p. 23) writes, are: “First of all – help another dodger. Second – protect the elderly, the weak, who are not able to cope in jail. Third – protect the symbol of the cobra in everyday life and during fights. Fourth – don’t let yourself be insulted by a “git” or other whore like him. You always have to abreact. The main symbol of “dodgers” is the cobra. This is a tattoo which must be earned and gain the acceptance of the “dodger” environment. Take care of the symbol and respect it, it is a kind of talisman, even called “holy”. However, the most important symbol is the cobra in a crown, which, as we read in a note »can be inked only when every Dodger in a crown agrees to it, they must agree individually and together. Only a person in a crown can decide on inking the crown. Those without a crown cannot come to the fore in this matter due to seniority and respect for them”. For the unauthorized execution of the cobra in a crown there are severe consequences associated with disposing of the “ink”, but also the deprived for life possibility of “dodging”. Among “dodger brothers” all decisions are taken by a specific leading group – a council of elders – so “dodgers” with the cobra in a crown. The biggest enemy of “dodgers” is undoubtedly “elite”, with whom they cannot have friendly relations, on the contrary they must fight with them and “boot” them, i.e. painfully kick and beat him. Similar consequences of the so-called booting may also be encountered by a “dodger” who backslides on his environment or during a fight does not assist his companion. Then he may be expelled from the “dodger” community. “Dodgers” distinguish between two types of messages – black and white. The first concerns them and this message needs to be cared for and protected and absolutely passed onto the “dodger” personally. A white one on the other hand is called a trivial message, which can be delivered by other people from outside the environment. It does not have such weight and importance as the black. In the “dodger” environment there is a so-called entry. It is a certificate that a given person has been admitted to the group of dodgers. On it is the cobra in a crown and dedication” (Breitenbach 2003, p. 23).

To characterize “dodgers” more specifically, their commandments and rules are essential, which I present below and which I received from one of the “dodger brothers”, while visiting a prison<sup>3</sup>.

.....

<sup>3</sup> The original and broader than presented in the article material obtained from the convicted “dodger” can be found in the Author’s archive. For the purposes of the article, only part of the research materials are presented.



“Dziesięć przykazań Cwaniaka [the Ten Commandments of a Dodger]

1. Nie będziesz miał za mało skuna!
2. Nie będziesz miał Szamaka za ziomka!
3. Pamiętaj abyś dzień wolności święcił! [Remember to keep the day of freedom holy!]
4. Szanuj rodziców, kiedy przysyłają Ci grosz! [Respect your parents when they send you money!]
5. Głupim daj żyletkę niech się chlastają! [Give the stupid a razor, let them cut themselves!]
6. Nie mów nigdy prawdy szamakowi, ani szwajcarowi!
7. Nie kradnij kiedy Cię widzą bo Cię wsadzą! [Do not steal when they see you because they will put you in prison!]
8. Nie oszczędzaj Córkę ani żony szamaka!
9. Ufaj cwaniemu nie sprzedawając go! [Trust a dodger by not selling him out!]
10. Przyjaciół szukaj wśród cwanych braci!” [Look for friends among dodger brothers!”<sup>4</sup>]

„Dziesięć regułek Cwanego [the ten rules of a Dodger]

1. PECH – Droga przez mękę! [BAD LUCK – Ordeal!]
2. PRZYJAŹŃ – Przekonałem się na własnej skórze, że prawdziwych przyjaciół poznaje się w biedzie! [FRIENDSHIP – I learned the hard way that a friend in need is a friend indeed!]
3. MIŁOŚĆ – Wiem że kobiety „człowieka” niemożna zmusić do kochania, najpiękniejszym darem co może być, należy się zastanowić komu ten dar ofiarować! [LOVE – I know that the woman of a “person” can’t be made to make love, the most beautiful gift that can be, you need to think about who to give this gift!]
4. NADZIEJA – Nie wolno się poddawać, niemożna rezygnować, trzeba walczyć z kurestwem do końca! [HOPE – Do not give up, you can’t resign, you have to fight with whores to the end!]
5. CWANIACY – Są zawsze pomocni jak tego potrzebujesz i na to zasługujesz! [DODGERS – They are always helpful when you need it and when you deserve it!]
6. SZCZĘŚCIE – Niewiem to pytanie jest dla nie zatrudne! [HAPPINESS – I dunno this question is too hard for me!]
7. ZDROWIE – Cwaniak nie znajdzie nic cenniejszego! [HEALTH – A dodger cannot find anything more precious!]
8. RODZINA – Skarb który doceniłem po stracie! [FAMILY – A treasure, which I appreciated only after its loss!]
9. DOM – Forteca szczęścia! [HOME – The fortress of happiness!]

.....

<sup>4</sup> Presenting the commandments and rules, and poems, I retained the original spelling of the prisoner.



10. TĘSKNOTA – Nie myślę zabardzo boli!” [LONGING – I don’t think it hurts too much!”]

In addition to the formal kind of issues related to the functioning of “dodger” prisoners, this environment also has a developed set of own works in the form of tattoos, songs and poems, emphasizing group separateness, but also somewhat describing or specifying their portrait. As is clear from discussions with representatives of “dodgers”, there are basic rhymes which must be learned in order to be admitted to C.K. Here are several selected:

- „Tu za murem więzienia, odcięci od reszty świata młodzi cwaniacy na twardych zasadach, spędzają swe młode lata.
- Ze Cwaniakiem stracić cnotę, karzda panna ma ochotę. Pościel, łóżko moja mała za cwaniakiem będziesz spała.
- Tu w Z.K. jest wesoło, tutaj kobył chodzi sporo, a czasami mu przyjebie bo to koń a z koniem jedziesz.
- Życie jest piękne, wolność kochana, kryminał Cię chowa grypsa jebana.
- Są konie brązowe, Są konie białe, Są konie duże i całkiem małe Są konie pluszowe, Są też szklane i przez cwaniaków w dupe jebane.
- Malinowe masz usteczka, malinowy uśmiech Twój cały jesteś w cukiereczkach grypsujący cwelu mój.
- Bywają w życiu chwile, które w pamięci zostają, one nie przemijają... Są też kurwy w Z.K. poznane i zostają rozgrypsowane.
- Nie słuchałem ojca, nie słuchałem matki. Dlatego wjechałem tak szybko za kratki. Zaczęłem słuchać cwanych braci bo to mi się tu opłaci.
- Za górami, za lasami. Jest kryminał bardzo znany Ja tu siedzę i świruję, oczywiście cwaniakuje.
- Bóg stworzył cwaniaka, Bóg stworzył szamaka a jakaś kórwa stworzyła więzienie i tak się zaczęło w morde walenie.
- Szamak, szamak fifa rafa chuj ci w dupę od cwaniaka.
- Ludzie, ludzie cud na niebie cwaniak gita w dupę jebie.
- Mama mnie urodziła, Ojciec mnie wychował, pamiętaj ziomek żebyś nigdy niegrypsował.
- Jezus napisał taki wstęp, cwanych szanuj, gitów tęp.
- Fikoł, lipo, kojo, czaj i już mamy miesiąc maj. Slang, bajer, kłapa zamykają cwanego brata. A brak siedzi niegrypsuje i z cwanyimi czaj buzuje.
- Mówił i ojciec, ojciec mój kochany nie kradnij synu nie będziesz karany. Nie słuchałem ojca, ani porad brata, a teraz w kryminale słucham cwanego brata.
- Kiedy w żelazne skują cię kajdany i w ciemnej celi przykują do ściany. Niechyl głowy na prośby żebracze, bo jesteś cwaniakiem, bo cwaniak ma chonor, bo cwaniak niepłacze.
- Zabrali mi piękną wolkę, zabrali mi młode lata. Przedemną Cwani żołnierze i szamacka więzienna szmata.
- Śpi cwaniak w ciemnej celi, bo tak gici pewnie chcieli my te kórwy zajebimy, i na wolkę z tąd wyjdziemy.

- Gdzie choryzont zaczyna się na niebie, gdzie się kryminału krata przecina. Gdzie Cwan dla cwanego jest droższy od brata, tam ja spędzam me młode lata.”

Other “dodger” poems:

- „Cwaniak „XX” – wieku, wychowany jest na mleku, Lecz na szlugach i na winie, na Imprezach i zadymie!
- Dyskoteka się zaczyna, popijawa i zadyma. Wszystkie mordy rozjebane no i kórwy wydymane!
- Już niedługo na peronie, znicz wolności mi zapłonie. Dzisiaj gniotły mnie sprężyny, jutro piersi mej Dziewczyny!
- W ciemnej celi siedzi cwaniak o dziewczynie ciągle śni. Dni zakresła w kalendarzu, może liścik gryźnie mi!
- Nie bój się brachu więzienia szarego, bo cwano będziesz wychodził z niego!
- Nie wiem co myślę, nie wiem co chcę, Wiem tylko jedno żem cwany jest!
- Każda dupa ma ochotę ze cwaniakiem stracić cnotę!
- Kiedy wyjdę z więzienia i starszy wiekiem będę, a z oczu zniknie mi krata. To brachu powróci we mnie życie Cwaniaka!
- ‘Przyjaciół’ – Cwanego to ten co przychodzi, gdy cały świat odchodzi!
- Są bracia i chwile o których nie można zapomnieć C.K.!”

„WIERSZ DO UKOCHANEJ CWANEGO!

Nadejdzie w końcu taki dzień, kiedy będziemy kochać się. Będziemy zawsze we dwoje i będę tulił ciało Twoje. Ty niemartw się w krutce mnie wypuszczą zza więziennych krat, popędzę w tedy do Ciebie jak wiatr!”

„WIERSZ DLA RODZICUW OD SYNA!

Tu bezradność zżera mnie w tym więzieniu jest mi źle. Ciągłe tylko kabaryna, suchy chleb i margaryna. Boże czy Ja wyjdę z tąd i zobaczę jeszcze dom. Czy zobaczę Ojca skronie, pomarszczone Matki dłonie. Ta co zawsze mnie tuliła no i zawsze przy mnie była!”

To conclude the considerations about the “dodger” environment it should be emphasized that the article probably does not provide a complete image of them as a specific body of people involved in specific subcultural dependencies. However, it may become a specific plane for showing the informal prison world in an extended composition, including convicts outside the traditionally understood subcultural tripartite division. Subculture in the penitentiary space has been undergoing transformation for a long time, the main direction of changes is determined by money and the financial wealth of the prisoner, which is thus reflected on the consumption relationships between persons deprived of their freedom. So sometimes the boundaries of divisions are blurred within the camps forming the “second life” in prison, who were until now antagonistic towards each other. In this subculture discourse the fraction of “dodgers” is included, numerically insig-

nificant, but strong ideologically. It tries to anchor its sometimes single drifting in some prisons or detention centers to sow the seeds of “dodger” thoughts and beliefs. It is impossible to predict, however, much less design, the path that “dodger” prisoners will follow. Will they find a larger crowd of their supporters to make their voices heard in the informal institutional structures, or maybe we will notice them only as a kind of curiosity of the incarcerated world without much impact on the prison mood? The future holds the answer...

## Literature

- [1] Bałandynowicz A., 2010, *Dehumanizacja kary pozbawienia wolności*, [in:] *Niebanalny wymiar resocjalizacji penitencjarnej*, (eds.) Przybyliński S., Wydawnictwo Edukacyjne „Akapit”, Toruń.
- [2] Braun K., 1975, *Drugie życie wśród skazanych młodocianych*, [in:] *Negatywne przejawy podkultury więziennej – środki i sposoby przeciwdziałania. Materiały z Sympozjum [...] w Popowie k. Warszawy w dniach 16–17 grudnia 1974 r.*, (elaboration) Braun K. et al., Warsaw.
- [3] Brejtenbach G., 2003, *Cwaniak to ma git życie*, „Forum Penitencjarne”, no. 12.
- [4] Ciosek M., 1996, *Człowiek w obliczu izolacji więziennej*, Wydawnictwo Stella Maris, Gdańsk.
- [5] Dobromilska H., Dobromilski J., 1994, *Dynamika i zakres zjawiska podkultury więziennej wśród skazanych recydywistów, a warunki odbywania kary pozbawienia wolności – na przykładzie Zakładu Karnego w Sztumie*, [in:] *Materiały (referaty, sprawozdania) z Konferencji nt. Podkultura więzienna w Aresztach Śledczych i w Zakładach Karnych. Kalisz 17–19 października 1994 r.*, Kalisz.
- [6] Górski J., 1984, *Podkultura więzienna a problem resocjalizacji skazanych*, [in:] *Problemy współczesnej penitencjarystyki w Polsce*, vol. 1, (eds.) Hołyst B., Wydawnictwa Prawnicze, Warsaw.
- [7] Kalisz T., 2013, *Skazani szczególnie chronieni. Uwagi na tle problemu zapewnienia bezpieczeństwa osobistego skazanych w polskich jednostkach penitencjarnych*, [in:] *Postępowanie z wybranymi grupami skazanych w polskim systemie penitencjarnym. Aspekty prawne*, (eds.) Kwieciński A., Wolters Kluwer Polska, Warsaw.
- [8] Kornowski T., 1986, *Problematyka podkultury więziennej w Zakładzie Karnym w Iławie*, (unpublished internal materials of ZK Iława; typescript in the author's archives), Iława.
- [9] Kosewski M., 1985, *Ludzie w sytuacjach pokusy i upokorzenia*, „Wiedza Powszechna”, Warsaw.
- [10] Loos J., 1933, *Więzienia w Polsce. Cyfry i fakty*, Warsaw.
- [11] Machel H., 1995, *Orientacja w funkcjonowaniu podkultury więziennej a skuteczność kierowania zakładem penitencjarnym*, „Przegląd Więziennictwa Polskiego”, no. 9.
- [12] Machel H., 2006, *Sens i bezsens resocjalizacji penitencjarnej – casus polski. Studium penitencjarno-pedagogiczne*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków.
- [13] Moczydłowski P., 1988, *„Drugie życie” w instytucji totalnej*, Uniwersytet Warszawski, Instytut Profilaktyki Społecznej i Resocjalizacji, Warsaw.

- [14] Moczydłowski P., 2002, *Drugie życie więzienia*, Wydawnictwa Prawnicze, Warsaw.
- [15] Przybyliński S., 2005, *Podkultura więzienna – wielowymiarowość rzeczywistości penitencjarnej*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków.
- [16] Rabinowicz L., 1933, *Podstawy nauki o więziennictwie*, Gebethner i Wolff, Warsaw.
- [17] Szaszkiewicz M., 1997, *Tajemnice grypsarki*, Wydawnictwo Instytutu Ekspertyz Sądowych, Kraków.
- [18] Śliwowski J., 1975, *Dyskusje*, [in:] *Negatywne przejawy podkultury więziennej – środki i sposoby przeciwdziałania. Materiały z Symposium [...] w Popowie k. Warszawy w dniach 16–17 grudnia 1974 r.*, (elaboration) Braun K. et al., Warsaw.
- [19] Wawarczyk W., Wawrzyniak L., Różański Z., 1994, *Charakterystyka i struktura grup nieformalnych w zakładach penitencjarnych i Rejonowym Areszcie Śledczym w Katowicach*, [in:] *Materiały (referaty, sprawozdania) z Konferencji nt. Podkultura więzienna w Aresztach Śledczych i w Zakładach Karnych, Kalisz 17–19 października 1994 r.*, Kalisz.