

VOLUME VI No. 22

JANUARY 1967

# PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL

*Editorial Offices:*

ROOM 43, HEPBURN HOUSE, MARSHAM STREET, LONDON S.W.1

## CONTENTS

- |    |   |                      |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 2  | THE PROBLEMS OF CHANGE FOR STAFF OF RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTIONS                                | <i>W. J. Booth</i>   |
| 17 | LABELLING THE INADEQUATE  | <i>V. Holloway</i>   |
| 22 | A QUICK LOOK AT U.S.A. PRISONS  | <i>S. F. Johnson</i> |
| 26 | CARTOON   | <i>A. Taylor</i>     |
| 27 | INSIDE MANAGEMENT   | <i>G. S. Dowell</i>  |
| 32 | THE ADMINISTRATION OFFICER  | <i>G. E. Hart</i>    |
| 36 | LETTERS TO THE EDITOR   |                      |
| 42 | JUSTICE AND MERCY—a sermon preached by <i>The Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Croydon</i> |                      |
| 47 | BOOK REVIEW—THE CHURCH AND THE CRIMINAL   |                      |
| 48 | CONTRIBUTORS  |                      |

# The Problems of Change for Staff of Residential Institutions

W. J. BOOTH

CORRECTIONAL RESIDENTIAL establishments often seem to exist for more than one purpose at the present time, and public attitudes towards them are so ambivalent as to place the staffs in difficult and uncertain positions. Whether the institution is called a school, a borstal, a detention centre or even a prison, most staff would want to say that the primary purpose was in some sense a reformatory one. By this they would mean that they hoped that the effect of the institutional process on an individual committed to it would be such as to make him more accepting of social rules and himself more socially acceptable than he was on entry into the system. This seems fairly clear, but to push on from this is to enter the confusion of apparent multiplicity of purpose. To ask for a precise answer to some such question as: "What are you supposed to be doing with, or for, these individual youths?" is often to force the answerer into an account of his limited speciality, e.g., "I am the teacher—the P.E. instructor—the gardener—the farm foreman", or into the unhappiness of insecurity which follows from being unsure of what

he is about. If one is asking the question in a borstal, a detention centre or a prison setting there is an additional set of answers which are different because of the existence of what are often called discipline grades who have no speciality comparable, say, to that of a teacher. Because of this they have no specific technology by use of which they can reassure themselves that their job is being carried out. Perhaps the same can be said of the approved school house-master.

But if the questioner gets his answers from the specialists, he may nevertheless want to point out that if there is a need common to the inmates of the institution, it is not that of academic educational attainment, or vocational skill, nor are the inmates made similar by common urges to acquire whatever may be available in the institution. Usually, the only certainly shared experience is that of having been committed to the establishment by the process of law. It does not follow, therefore, that rectifying their special deficiencies will have the primary social effect which it is the institution's purpose to produce. Almost all staff of

correctional residential institutions recognise this fact in one way or another, if only by complaints about their special contribution being nullified, or perhaps excessively difficult to make, because of the circumstances. Equally, almost all staff would recognise their role as being, at least in part, one of influencing inmates. The discipline staff of borstals and prisons and the housemasters of approved schools have to put this task first and are often at a loss, or not in agreement with each other, as to how this can be done. This, very superficially, is the background against which one must examine change in corrective residential institutions. One begins, as it were, at a higher level of uncertainty than in comparable fields, before one so much as introduces concepts of change.

#### CHANGE

The prospect of change threatens most, if not all, people. It is a prospect which implies many frightening possibilities such as the disruption of understood and accepted situations, the loss of much that appears to be valuable and even the unhappiness of uncontrollable chaos. Fantasies about the ramifications of change seem to link closely with magical thinking, in the sense that those people who seem threatened, from within or without, by the possibility of change, tend to perform rituals of living which seem to have the function of preserving their personalities against the dangers of

flexibility and change. This is to take the fear of change to the neurotic level and to attempt to influence general events by adherence to particular personal stability—in other words magical thinking. Implied by this approach, whether at a neurotic level or kept within more normal bounds, is the feeling that decay is the most likely effect of change. An analogy obviously derived from natural processes.

On the other hand, a great deal is said about the values of change. Change represents healthy growth, or, at least, no healthy growth is possible without change. The notion of growth implies progress towards a better condition, one nearer perfection, and it would be presumptuous to claim at any point that perfection had already been reached.

Being caught in such ambivalences suggests a human feeling that continuous movement is only possible in one direction or another, that there is no alternative to progress or decay and that to unleash the forces of change necessarily takes us in one way or the other. Since it may often seem to be impossible to ensure that the movement occurs in the desirable direction, the attractions of maintaining the existing situation are obvious. In spite, however, of these attractions, and the probable fact that they appeal strongly to most of us, change takes place continually in most spheres of human life and activity. Not only in economic, industrial, scientific and

social theories and practices, but also in primary areas like the family and individual relationships. This emphasises one of the threatening aspects of change, namely, that when it takes place in one area it is difficult, if not impossible, to prevent its effect spreading to others. For example, change in industrial organisation has produced change in family relationships and there are many instances of this, some plain and some subtle; changing socio-psychological theories and practices about the make-up and rights of individuals, produce change in the basis of criminal law, and so on.

This is an important feature of things which must be reckoned with when attempting to assess any change or to understand the resistance to it which often arises.

Given an existing situation, which includes human beings whose inclinations tend towards maintaining its existence, for a variety of reasons, what kinds of factors initiate change?

Any situation described as "existing", in the sense of being permanent and not susceptible to change, is an abstraction from reality and can only be studied as such when artificially conceived as being insulated from realities which might impinge upon it. Individuals within it are always in process of change, as also are material components. Immediately the concept of change is used, the situation must be described as dynamic and it has to be studied

as such if reality is to be preserved. Change, therefore, is inevitable and it may be that our feelings of resistance to it, or our unwillingness to study it realistically, are, in some sense, reaction formations against unpleasant and unwelcome reality.

Problems connected with change, therefore, are always likely to exist and the special problems of residential institutions in this area may be logical developments of the general. To appreciate these special problems accurately we should first examine what meaning can be attached to the notion of an "existing state" in an institutional context, realising, of course, that any description is, at best, an abstraction. In order that the complex organisation can be assumed to be static, we need the further concept of balance. Without this we would be obliged to try to hold in our mind a picture of an unbalanced organisation arrested in movement, and logic would force us to the conclusion that our concept was useless as a tool of examination. In other words, having seen the imbalance we would know that the static state was unrealistic and that we were looking at a point which occurred during the process of change and that nothing could be revealed to us about the cause of change. An earlier state in the process would take us nearer to the point at which change began, and further back still we would reach a point at which no change

seemed to be occurring. That is the point at which the organisation or system was in balance. One might define "system", in this context, as being a complex of means to achieve a given end and entailing the linking of its parts in balancing relationships. While this is the case, there is no tendency towards change in the short run, and equilibrium has been achieved.

Purely mechanical systems can be described in this way and, provided the system is isolated from the world outside, it will continue to function for as long as no internal change develops, i.e., until the fuel runs out or the material deteriorates sufficiently. Our systems are not entirely mechanical, however, the internal factors are both human and material, the former being notoriously inconstant and the latter as liable to organic decay as any engine component. At best, therefore, any equilibrium achieved in a residential institution is precarious and relatively short-lived.

Residential institutions are not the only institutions involving systems of organisation which include human beings and material resources. Schools and factories are obviously others which are, currently, non-residential more often than not. Obviously these organisations also have to deal with change. Is it more or less difficult for staff of residential institutions involved in changes, compared with non-residential conditions? If it is more

difficult what is the reason for this?

As far as one is aware no one can supply answers to the first questions which are incontrovertible, but it seems to be reasonable to assume that residential staff do find greater difficulty. If this is only a feeling that one has, there are, nevertheless, facts about residential institutions which would tend to substantiate its validity, and these facts follow from the nature of the institutions themselves. For both inmates and staff the residential institution is an organisation which absorbs most, if not all, of their lives for a lengthy period. They are "total" institutions in the sense that they claim a disproportionate amount of the lives of the individuals who either work there or are residents there because of some need which compels their presence. Any equilibrium which is achieved has to be much more complex, i.e., must include many more permutations of human relationship and more frequent awareness of the material resources than might be the case in a non-residential setting. For both inmates and staff the normal refuge of living one's life in insulated compartments is not available. Work, recreation, and even domestic living is all undertaken with the same people, or, at least, with sections of the total mass of people. What is done during recreation may have repercussions during the working period and table manners may

determine friendships. Non-residential institutions are comparatively free of this complexity and their members may escape from each other and relax much more easily.

Another element of difference between institutions which can, however loosely, be described as penal, and others, whether residential or non-residential, is often the vagueness of the primary task and the absence of any specific technology which can effectively be utilised to achieve this goal.

Rule 1 of the borstal rules runs as follows:

- "1. (i) The purpose of borstal training requires that every inmate, while conforming to the rules necessary for well-ordered community life, should be able to develop his individuality on right lines with a proper sense of personal responsibility. Accordingly, officers shall, while firmly maintaining order and discipline, seek to do so by influencing the inmates through their own example and leadership and enlisting their willing co-operation.
- (ii) The objects of borstal training shall be to bring to bear every influence which may establish in the inmates the will to lead a good and useful life on release, and to fit them to do so by the fullest possible development of their character, capabilities and sense of personal responsibility."

Rule 1 of the prison rules is similar, if considerably briefer, and runs as follows:

- "1. The purpose of the training and treatment of convicted prisoners shall be to encourage and assist them to lead a good and useful life."

It might be argued that approved schools have the advantage of a

more specific primary task, in the sense that paragraph 2 of the handbook for managers of approved schools outlines the main ingredients as:

"Education (in the formal sense), religious education and guidance, practical and vocational training, attention to health and the use of leisure, social training (how to live with others) and personal casework (help with personal problems)."

In so far, however, as the common feature which is shared by most pupils is similar to that of older inmates in penal institutions, namely, evidence of criminality, there is nothing in these provisions which can be claimed specifically to reduce the tendency towards criminality in a direct way.

The history of most penal institutions in this country, it seems to me, is one of collecting remedial techniques which are apparently intrinsically worthwhile but which are neither clearly related to the task of effecting permanent changes in the attitudes of delinquents, nor are they practically integrated, one with another, to produce a mutually reinforcing effect on individuals.

In the circumstances, what is created in many, if not all, of our residential penal institutions, is an uneasy compromise between the various interests which are separately occupied in dealing with the inmate, whether they are young or old. The resultant form of equilibrium, enables the establishment to achieve some of its secondary objectives but is maintained at the

cost of failure to achieve agreement on the primary task. Lacking such agreement it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to evolve effective and identifiable methods of reaching the main objective and this produces a marked tendency to under-value therapeutic method and an equally marked tendency to over-value personality as a major factor in the exercise of good influence.

Change in residential institutions, therefore, is more than usually threatening and difficult to handle, first, because of the complexity of the equilibrium necessary to maintain a viable situation and, secondly, because of the predominance of staff personalities, as distinct from methods or techniques, as the factors in the equilibrium.

To the question of what causes change in these circumstances one must add the further one, namely:

"What is the effect on staff of any change which is initiated?"

#### BORSTAL X

It may be helpful at this stage to describe an example of change which has taken place in a residential institution. Borstal X was originally planned as a small open establishment to cater for about 90 young men, ages about 19 to 21, criminally unsophisticated and of high intelligence, in fact, the best selection of young men from the borstal system. The trade training to be provided was the most advanced available at that time, namely, motor mechanics and engineers' pattern making, and these

courses, with the usual cookery course and general maintenance work, were expected to absorb most inmates. Education was planned to take place as much as possible outside the institution, using local educational facilities up to any level thought to be appropriate.

It was possible to envisage a great deal of self-reliance, even self-government by the men in these circumstances and the function of staff was primarily to offer guidance rather than rigid control.

The living accommodation was adequate, there being two residential houses in military-type wooden huts and a third building in similar style adapted for general purposes, such as theatre (with TV), library, chapels, classrooms and so on.

The number of staff was quite typical of a borstal institution of this size, governor, deputy (both of whom had responsibilities for another camp), two assistant governors, three principal officers, 14 discipline officers, one P.E.I., one cook, two vocational training instructors, a matron and engineer's maintenance staff.

For several years this institution functioned quietly without any major changes other than those involved in staff moves. These almost always happened singly and were, therefore, tolerable. Some eight years after the opening of the institution a nearby farm was offered for sale and the Prison Department bought it. As a result of this transaction it was decided that the population of the borstal

would have to be increased in order to meet the new work commitments required for the farm. The figure of 120 was decided upon by negotiation between the governor and the Prison Department. In fact, however, because of increased committals throughout the country the numbers of inmates quickly rose to 150.

Apart from the provision of the necessities of existence, i.e., increased stocks of food, clothes, beds, etc., no major alteration in the accommodation was possible in the short run. Each house lost a recreation room as it was converted to a dormitory and for the rest it was a matter of stretching everything to the limit. No increase in staff was made because there is no necessary relationship between population and staffing, such that an increase in population automatically entails an increase in staff. Each member of the staff, therefore, had to undertake a greater task.

Clearly, the relationships which existed in the balanced situation, and on which the function of the establishment depended, were drastically changed in the new situation. In many instances, mere attenuation would be the result, perhaps in other cases there would be neglect because needs were not recognised or were ignored. However, at roughly the same time that these changes became inevitable, the governor of the establishment

was changed, and this greatly complicated the situation. The incoming governor was not, of course, inhibited by any wish to preserve a system of equilibrium which was not even visible to him. His arrival alone would have tended to alter the situation since he could not be expected to be identical with his predecessor and would inevitably have to be integrated with the rest of the establishment in a different way. But, added to any personal impact which he may have had, were the forces generated by different and substantial changes. He was concerned, therefore, to deal with the situation as he saw it and to meet inmates' needs, which were being made clear to him in a testing out period. The situation was fraught with conflict, sometimes seeming to be between governor and staff on a personal basis, at others apparently a professional battle, with social personalities in "good relationships". Staff divisions appeared on quite other lines also, with the usual attempts to enlist the governor on one side or another. All the evils of uncontrolled change were present and, perhaps significantly, a great many staff constantly harked back to the "good old days," usually claiming that the previous governor was more competent and more understanding and so on—he was, of course, always said to have been very capable of keeping "them" in their proper place—"them" being the inmates. The primary



aim of treatment of delinquent youths was either lost in argument about secondary aims, or by simple failure on the part of staff to communicate with one another. Hardly anyone seemed to see that the major change lay in the increased numbers without there having been corresponding increases in resources and, as often as not, the unhappy conditions were attributed to the change of governor and/or the change in the quality of the inmates.

Two points here are worth emphasising:

1. In a process of change there is often a wish expressed to return to what existed before. This wish, expressed as a moral imperative, i.e., what we ought to do, always ignores the facts of change and the impossibility of reversing the movement.

2. Any conflict may be fought out in terms of personalities even when these happen to be more or less irrelevant factors.

In the example given all the symptoms of a sick institution were present. An unhappy and apparently apathetic staff, an unhealthy inmate culture, and the spread of bad staff/inmate relationships affected the whole work of the institution. Violence amongst inmates increased, discipline reports on inmates by staff increased. The more the remedies of either increased control or increased permissiveness were attempted the more they were misunderstood and

the worse the situation became.

The start of change here seems to have been quite determined by external forces and the pattern of change equally determined by past omissions. Because there was no mechanism which involved staff consciously in the change, there was no opportunity for them together to face its inevitability and the need for concerted action to mitigate its worst effects. Basically, the difficulties probably arose from two factors which were mutually reinforcing. On the one hand, the overcrowding caused excessive friction amongst the young men and increased their need to be controlled. On the other hand, the deterioration of the staff/inmate ratio effectively precluded an increase in staff control and drove the inmates back on their own resources.

But it is equally interesting to note that at this new state of confusion and deterioration in staff communication, there is an inherent necessity for further change. Although one can only use hindsight, it is reasonable to suggest that one way or another further change had to take place because of internal forces and conflicts which had been generated. Flight is a solution for individuals, of course, and in the worst development possible all individuals, staff and inmates alike, can depart from an open institution. In the event, deliberate action was taken to

restore the establishment to a working balance, but, failing some such action, it is probable that the situation would have reached crisis proportions.

The incentives to change an unhappy situation are obviously more likely to be shared by most of the people involved than otherwise. In view of the prevalence of confusion, however, the initiation of further change is still fraught with possibilities of conflict. Magical thinking will tend to require the restoration of a previous state and this is the one solution outside the powers of institutions in these sorts of situations. The factor of loss of effective control by the staff has its positive aspects, and the tendency to assume control on the part of the inmates is a feature about which most of them are ambivalent. On these facts constructive effort can be based and since it is staff who are permanent and with whom we are concerned at this moment, it is their development we should now scrutinise.

The essential beginning seemed to be an effort to free communications and to allow all staff to express feelings freely about the situation, before they could work through these to a point where they could together look at effective remedies. At the same time it was necessary to demonstrate to the inmates that their welfare and problems were being taken seriously. An experiment in institutional casework dealt with the

latter to some extent, whilst the starting of regular staff meetings and the involvement of individual officers in rudimentary casework under supervision, did something towards the former. By the time these movements got under way a further development from outside the institution took place and this helped considerably. This was an official estimation that the population would increase by a further 30 and a request from H.O. for replanning of existing resources to make the extra accommodation available. As it turned out, this estimate was very much mistaken, but the complete restructuring, including the provision of a new house, and refurbishing which took place probably made a very beneficial contribution to the improvement of the general atmosphere. Experimentation with casework served the purpose of exciting the interest of staff in more specific treatment methods in which they could all participate and also drew their attention to short-comings in their skills. Demands for further training were soon raised and dissatisfaction frequently and strongly expressed about the roles which many felt they were forced to play in the traditional borstal system. Having reached this level of participation, and linking it with the structural alteration going on, it then proved possible to produce a plan which extensively varied the traditional borstal system and also

to devise the beginnings of training in new skills. These changes, one should emphasise, were undertaken following staff consultation and were, therefore, geared to conscious needs.

This development continued and as skills developed so also did the need for further training and supportive arrangements, but each step followed from staff consultation. Relationships with and responsibilities for the young men of the institution dramatically improved and one could say that this, with better inter-staff communication and understanding, enabled a new equilibrium to be reached. Since this position includes a variety of supportive and consultative features it must be different in quality from that which existed a few years before. If a further change proves necessary, and the governor has already been changed again, it should be an easier and more consciously directed process.

There are many other examples of change in institutions which one could use to illustrate the point that a probable effect on staff is the production of great stress. Perhaps these two examples of change in the same institution will be enough to enable us to project some conclusions on to a hypothetical situation which may arise in the future. These conclusions might be:

1. Stress may become excessive where staff feel themselves to be completely out of control.

2. When stress becomes excessive irrationality rises and impedes understanding of the nature of the change.
3. Movement towards a new equilibrium must take place, whether consciously planned or not, if the institution is to survive. (Disintegration is not a form of survival.)
4. Accepting the inevitability of change increases the scope for planning based on its positive aspects.
5. Planning with staff consultation tends to reduce stress to a point where it can be not only tolerable but lead to learning.
6. A sound institutional equilibrium includes the features which will facilitate necessary change.

#### THE WHITE PAPER\*

That section of the White Paper which makes proposals relevant to our present subject is paragraph 39. Under the heading "Youth Training Centres" it says: "It is proposed to merge and reorganise the present borstals and senior approved schools into a comprehensive system of residential training catering for the wide variety of types coming before the courts. The Home Office would take over

---

\*When this paper was originally prepared, it was for use in the discussion called for by the White Paper, "The Child the Family and the Young Offender". Readers will appreciate that legislation may not follow from such a White Paper, or, if it does, it may not include specific provision for the development discussed here.

the responsibility for the senior approved schools and for the organisation of the comprehensive training establishments. It is proposed that the minimum period of training should be nine months and the maximum two years. Experience with borstal training has shown that the present minimum period of six months is too short to enable good results to be achieved. The actual date of discharge would depend on the response to training of the young person concerned."

There can be no doubt that this paragraph states the intention of the Home Office to "take over" some or all of the senior approved schools. It follows from this that committals to the new youth training centres will be on a national basis rather than a local one and although considerations of regional origin may be influential, in the last analysis it will always be dependent upon assessments of overall need by the central organisation. It seems also that the new sentence is to be very similar to the present borstal sentence, the only change being the change in the minimum sentence. Together, these basic facts seem to me to ensure that the rules which will govern the youth training centres are more likely to be similar to the present borstal rules than to the approved school rules. Even the weight of numbers underlines this. At present the borstal population is probably around 5,200 and increasing, these being housed in

25 establishments, 13 of which are open and 12 closed. Legislation based on the White Paper would increase this number further by the proportion of the 900 young prisoners who would have to be dealt with in other ways than by a short sentence of imprisonment, namely, a Y.T.C. sentence, a D.C. sentence, or a term of imprisonment exceeding two years. Perhaps, then, about 5,700 who would have received borstal training, with the staff it would have taken to run that system, as compared with about 900 youths who would have received senior approved school training, and the staffs involved with them. In terms of establishments, 900 senior approved school youths represents about 10, the average population of senior approved schools being around 88. If it is argued that the wording of the White Paper ensures a complete reorganisation of the whole system, it is probably too much to expect that this can mean anything more than a re-naming of the old borstal system, in the absence of evidence that fundamental rethinking of that system, as distinct from reorganisation, is being undertaken. But, in any case, this would merely add to the degree of change and to the numbers of people involved in it without altering very much the fact that the former approved schools staffs will be undergoing the most change.

Referring back to what has been said about change in general, it has

to be assumed that the present senior approved schools exist in their own condition of balance or equilibrium. This is more or less stable and in the ordinary way would only be changed within the context of the system, e.g., a new headmaster, major changes on the school management committee, or an unexpected rise in the population, and the new equilibrium would also be found within the same context. But the change which must be seen in prospect for the schools is of a different order, it originates further outside the system than that kind of change which we examined earlier in Borstal X and it is not easy to see what might be the eventual resolution of the situation.

It is worth speculating on whether this new move constitutes a change in the way one would define it for one establishment within a reasonably constant system. Perhaps it could be argued that this is too much of a change to be a change and that really this means the ending of one system and the creation of a new one. Certainly this could be said if the matter could be reduced to taking over buildings with the former staff being disposed of by distribution to the remaining approved schools. There are problems of individual change and integration involved in such a move which will be serious enough for those concerned, but not of a comparable magnitude to

those following from the alternative of incorporating, say, ten former approved schools into a centralised Y.T.C. system probably similar to the present borstal system. At present there are no adequate clues indicating which way the problem will be tackled and whilst the basis of the new system is there its effects are largely hypothetical because of these uncertainties.

The basic difference between an existing approved school and any borstal is that between local and central responsibility. In the approved school the Home Office influences and advises, perhaps exercising an ultimate control through financial provision, but the power seems really to be in the hands of the management committee. Their terms of reference lay down that:

1. They stand *in loco parentis* to the boys.
2. They are responsible for premises, including new developments under advice.
3. They are responsible for finance, estimating, spending and accounting.
4. They are responsible for the appointment, suspension and dismissal of the staff at the school.

In all these respects the Home Secretary will assume responsibility on the take-over and the power will be exercised by the department set up to administer Y.T.Cs. (this may simply be the

existing borstal administration under the Prisons Board). Some of the responsibilities will be delegated of necessity to governors of establishments, as they are now, but local autonomy is likely to be drastically reduced. Any approved school has, presumably, included the powers of the management committee within the working equilibrium it has achieved. The removal of the power will drastically alter the balance of the institution. What effects will this have? It may be, for instance, that the old management committee will be asked to constitute something similar to the present borstal board of visitors in the Y.T.C. as it will become. Remember the powers which were previously enumerated and compare them with those given to boards of visitors in the Borstal Rules, as follows:

*"75. General Duties of Boards.*

(1) The board of visitors for a borstal shall satisfy themselves as to the state of the premises, the administration of the borstal and the treatment of the inmates.

(2) The board shall inquire into and report upon any matter into which the Secretary of State asks them to inquire.

(3) The board shall direct the attention of the governor to any matter which calls for his attention and shall report to

the Secretary of State any matter which they consider it expedient to report.

(4) The board shall inform the Secretary of State immediately of any abuse which comes to their knowledge and shall have power in any case of urgent necessity to suspend any officer until the decision of the Secretary of State is known.

(5) Before exercising any power under these rules (other than Rules 50 and 55) the board and any member of the board shall consult the governor in relation to any matter which may affect discipline.

*76. Particular Duties.*

(1) The board of visitors for a borstal and any member of the board shall hear any complaint or request which an inmate wishes to make to them or him.

(2) The board shall arrange for the food of the inmates to be inspected by a member of the board at frequent intervals.

(3) The board shall inquire into any report made to them, whether or not by a member of the board, that an inmate's health, mental or physical, is likely to be injuriously affected by any conditions of his detention."

Such a comparison illustrates dramatically the changes involved in this centralisation. On the one hand the management committee is exercising a clear responsibility for management in all its ramifications, on the other hand the board of visitors is performing a safeguarding function largely intended to protect the inmate against arbitrary injustice.

No doubt, in many approved schools the real power is wielded by the headmaster, and his committee is content to take ultimate responsibility. This is an almost inevitable development since the management committee chooses the headmaster (with Home Office approval) and if they have chosen a competent man who gains their confidence they are not likely to try to do his job in detail for him. It can be said, therefore, that the headmaster exercises the powers of the management committee, or a substantial portion of them. For example, he probably decides or substantially influences the choice of staff, and this seems reasonable. How does his position compare with that of a governor in these respects? Generally speaking a governor of a borstal has to deal with three elements, the provision of which he cannot control. These are:

1. The buildings and material resources.
2. The staff resources.

3. The young men sent to him from an allocation centre.

He is free, of course, to make comments, suggestions, even pleas, and to advance arguments and make out cases, all bearing on these elements, but he does not and cannot control them. The headmaster who becomes a governor will have to accept, for instance, that with a few very minor exceptions, all his staff are established civil servants with career prospects and expectations related to a national service. Recruitment, transfers and promotions are decided by centralised methods which use wider criteria than the immediate good of the local establishment in establishing their priorities.

Both these examples are of reduction in power following centralisation, but there are other probable aspects of the change which are worth noting. The change in methods of administration, for example, cannot be brought about by merely providing a new rule book and substituting one set of books for another. Inevitably, the executive and clerical grades in the civil service will have to be introduced and, equally inevitably, part of their task will be the negative one of telling ex-approved school staff that former methods are no longer open to them. It might be also that other grades, concerned with training and treatment, such

as assistant governors and basic grade officers, will be added to existing staff for the purpose of facilitating change and similar negative aspects will show as they attempt to set up the system with which they are familiar.

It would be tedious to go on illustrating the point that such a move as this creates conditions in which stress on staff is increased to a point where it may become intolerable. Little or nothing has been said of the young men for whose benefit the organisation exists because of this primary concentration on the staff position. The danger is, of course, that the irritation inevitably arising from the necessity of changing ways, escalates and is projected upon living people who are held to represent either the old order or the new. The man who has to say frequently that things cannot be done is held to have a personal interest in obstruction. Once this sort of conflict is generated it attracts feeling which ought to have been extended in other directions. Many institutions fight out the wrong battle at the wrong time and between the wrong people. In penal institutions the usual effect is the minimising of training and treatment, in other words, the trouble continues at the expense of the inmate.

The fact that the future problem can be indicated or outlined ought

to mean that action is possible to reduce its significance even if complete avoidance is unlikely. Staff consultation is a vitally important step to take in any attempt to control the onset and spread of stress and since more than one kind of staff is involved the consultation should be as much between them as between the Home Office and the separate staffs. Full control of the change cannot be invested in any institutional staff since its origin is in the legislature but the acceptance of that fact realistically will help to control the effects of change. Irrationality and fantasy can only be diminished by the provision of opportunities to match these against reality. The ex-borstal staffs need to understand that their new colleagues are undergoing profound strain, the ex-approved school staffs need to understand that the organisation is weighing on them rather than malignant individuals.

Failing some action like this I suspect that the new Y.T.C. system will reverberate with fables about difficult people; both the approved school system and the borstal system are already prone to produce such fantasies. There is a practice which always ought to be followed when dealing with so-called difficult personalities. It is simply to discount the tales about character until one has had a very objective look at the demands which their organisation is making upon them.



# Labelling the Inadequate\*

VERNON HOLLOWAY

SOCIETY seems to be making a terrible mistake in the way in which it wants to label people, and some of this it does through us in the penal system. It will have been noticed how easily one slips from attributing something to someone, to labelling that person because of the attribute. To take an example, psychopathic behaviour is observable in many individuals; we start to study psychopathy of this kind and soon the psychopath exists as a type of person. Similarly, we start with inadequate behaviour in some area, we focus on inadequacy and suddenly the inadequate is with us. I wonder how long it will be before we are using words like feckless and immature as nouns to denote classes of people.

The concern felt about these effects is probably very similar to the concern being expressed in education about what we do to children in consigning them to 'C' streams in secondary modern schools.

---

\*Based on a talk given to the 1966 Borstal Assistant Governors' Conference.

May I first of all express my own feelings of distaste for the concept of inadequacy. This kind of labelling has, during the last few years, made me feel about this more than most socio-ethical problems that it is urgent that we clarify what people are doing and what they think they are doing in employing such terms.

We must ask why we want to do this. Many of the words used in the Prison Service are half-descriptive, half-judgmental. Half the time we are saying something meaningful about the person and half the time we are betraying our own need to see those people as basically something different from ourselves and the label perpetuates the distinction. The nightmare prospect, belongs to Aldous Huxley in *Brave New World*. The mistake is to confuse something which is probably a continuum from most to least inadequate in various respects with some kind of disease entity like measles or more appropriately leprosy. The logical absurdity of this confusion was reached in a short letter to *The Guardian*—I think in July 1964. The writer had discovered that

many people in prisons had been described as incorrigibly inadequate and advocated that all these should be put elsewhere, in order that the rest could clearly be regarded as entirely responsible and presumably receive something more vigorously deterrent, within the prison system. Just as if we could divide our inmates in this way; just as if we could award permanent alphas and gammas for inadequacy. Yet perhaps we do try to do this, and what does it do to the inadequate to find that he has been so consigned. A simple answer in terms of social philosophy is that society must not be allowed to do these socially divisive things without at least being made aware that it is doing so and also considering what it must offer in return.

This leads us out of the area of moral examination and disapproval into the more cautious area of establishing criteria for the justifiable labelling and segregating people in this way. I would suggest that these criteria are twofold. The first criterion concerns whether we are able to identify a clinical group with unambiguous symptoms which would lead to a distinguishable outcome; of course this criterion alone could still permit the unfortunate social results I have outlined, especially if the diagnosis was then used as a basis for social separation. The second criterion is much more specific: it requires us to measure a concept like inadequacy in terms of the extent to

which it facilitates meeting the needs of the people concerned. By looking at inadequacy against these two criteria its usefulness may become apparent.

de Berker\* has made one of the most significant contributions in this area. In examining the concept of inadequacy for the Prison Medical Officers' Conference in 1959, he summarised much of the work being done and discovered that different theories used the concept of inadequacy in different ways. He had previously circulated a number of psychological and psychiatric colleagues seeking their views about "inadequacy", he discovered the repugnance for the concept which I have already expressed, but also the fact that most people still found it necessary to retain the label for a very large residual group of passive, ineffectual offenders after more specific diagnostic groups had been separated out.

Other prison psychologists, notably Marcu† in his dimensional study of the Wakefield prison population, and Taylor‡ in a study of the P.D. population, have done significant work in this area. D. J. West§ in his book *The Habitual Offender*, refers to all three of these papers in developing the argument that one can probably contrast the two groups, the active aggressive versus the passive inadequates. The general opinion seems to be that the first group, the active aggressives, is more likely to be

regarded as psychopaths and demand a disproportionate amount of attention, whilst the latter group may well be the more persistent offenders. Lest it should be thought that any terminological clarity is emerging yet, it is pointed out that some people reserve the term psychopath for the aggressive, active, preying individual and regard the inadequates as another group, whilst others merely separate aggressive psychopaths from inadequate psychopaths. Also, another problem among many remains unresolved, namely, whether many inadequates are in fact long-term neurotics, whose conflicts have gone unresolved for so long that a surface of indifference has emerged, concealing the underlying anxieties.

This need not be pursued too far. Suffice it to say that some people have found very important characteristics which distinguish the group they have described as inadequates and it is likely that there are a number of heterogeneous groups mixed up in this somewhat rag-bag classification. Too much certainty cannot be expected here and the label "inadequate" cannot be regarded as being a diagnosis such as scarlet fever or schizophrenia.

Recently, at Feltham, some members of staff carried out a survey of the population with specific reference to the boys' needs. Among many other questions we asked: "To what extent have they suffered

from inadequate personality or inadequate relationships"? and the answer was obtained that this heading affected three-quarters of the population and in half of those cases it was the prime diagnostic consideration. We tried to break this down in a number of ways, particularly by examining how the relationships fell short, for instance—with regard to affectionlessness, deprivation and passivity. However, the important point is that the term "inadequate" in the lay sense gets used very extensively in describing some of our most problematic and persistent populations. The clinical picture of inadequacy is confused through lack of precision whilst the lay concept of inadequacy seems somewhat wider than the clinician would use. Its prime purpose has been to draw the attention of people generally to the pathetic state of large numbers of people in our charge. It is a sad comment on the functioning of our society that when it designed a long-term sentence, largely in order to prevent chronic offenders from preying on society, it actually managed to attract to this sentence many who regarded it as a protection against society preying on them.

Let us now consider the more important criterion from the point of view of allocation. This suggests that we are only justified in segregating one group of people from another if thereby we are enabled better to meet that group's needs

to an extent which overcomes the damage caused by the segregation. For example, if everyone suffering from various fevers were isolated from the general population in order to safeguard the general population and this was all that was done in the way of classification, the sufferers might well feel that they had been ostracised and condemned to catch each other's fevers without the non-sufferers caring. If, on the other hand, we further sub-divided the fevers down to the specific groups so that each got the appropriate treatment, this would be more profitable and more socially acceptable. I believe that the allocation problem is analogous with regard to inadequacy and other similar concepts, although we may not expect the same kind of clear-cut divisions between diagnostic groups.

The argument for present practice, as I understand it, is that those who cannot cope are segregated in order to protect them to some extent, perhaps to apply more gentle pressure when necessary and perhaps not to slow the pace of those in other units. But the inmates concerned seldom feel it in this way; they are conscious of the ostracism, are not often aware of measures to help their specific inadequacies and, indeed, may suffer from the artificiality of such a social climate. It may well be that by dealing with the problem at this level we are coping more with our own inadequacy in tackling the problem properly than

with the needs of the inadequates themselves.

Now let us subdivide further. Consider what kind of people they are and the nature of some of their needs.

(a) *Affectionless people* are often classed as inadequates. Their emotional growth is stunted and frequently they are unable to develop satisfactory relationships; if they do they are vulnerable in giving way to others' demands of them. More often they become isolated. Their need is for security and something permanent with few demands—if anything at all works. How do we provide this?

(b) *The over-institutionalised* is closely related to the "affectionless" inadequate. Some of these may never have known the normal outside world. Perhaps their need is to introduce them to it very gradually with plenty of practice whilst support is slowly withdrawn.

(c) *The intellectually dull*. Many intellectually dull may be described as inadequates, although there may be other complicating features. Here the need may be to find a role in which the inmate can feel that he is making a contribution with the best use of his limited talents.

(d) *Unresolved neurotic conflicts*. It is suspected that the neurotic with unresolved conflicts may settle into a state of apathetic underachievement to deal with his anxieties. Today's raging disturbance may be next year's passive

inadequacy if the disturbance is not dealt with in time.

(e) *The over-anxious*. Almost the same group is the large number of chronic, diffused anxiety-ridden people who have withdrawn in the face of too many all-round problems. Some of these are among those we notice as having potential which they have never used. Perhaps this is the group of whom it has been said: they forego the chance of success in order to avoid the pain of possible failure. The needs of both of those allied groups may be in the short term, to have their anxieties allayed, and in the long term to be brought back to any specific conflicts which might have been better resolved before being covered by long-term defences.

(f) *Post-mental illness*. A group whom lay people regard as inadequate perhaps more often than the clinicians do, is the small but significant number of those struggling to regain proper balance after severe mental illness. These probably need an undistorted social environment, without threats and dangers of acquiring unfortunate identities whilst recovering, which they did not have before. (By undistorted I refer essentially to the way in which other disturbed people around them may unduly influence their precariously balanced personalities.)

(g) *Specific inadequacies*. There are many other groups, particularly the ones with specific inadequacies such as an inadequate marriage or

an inadequate adjustment to a deformity, alcoholism etc., each of which has specific as well as general recommendations which can probably be made.

This is not intended to be an exhaustive list but rather to indicate that it is the proper function of allocation to break down its operational concepts until it arrives at some fairly clear-cut needs of inmates which it can then try to match with the available facilities in the field. There is not much sign that allocation has been very successful in doing this, and this may be one of the reasons why it has not been possible to discern the specific opportunities which have to be provided in the training field to meet these needs.

In summarising the concept of inadequacy it appears that first of all there are some fairly repugnant and socially destructive features about using a fairly crude global concept on this kind in a way which is more related to segregation than to meeting specific needs. Secondly, if one concentrates on discerning these specific needs then one will probably find that the term becomes redundant for most practical purposes.

#### REFERENCES

- \* de Berker, P. *State of Mind Reports: The Inadequate Personality*, Brit. J. Criminology, 1960. 1, 6-20.
- † Marcus, B. *A Dimensional Study of a Prison Population*, Brit. J. Criminology, 1960. 1, 130-153.
- ‡ Taylor, R. S. *The Habitual Criminal*, Brit. J. Criminology, 1960. 1, 21-36.
- § West, D. J. *The Habitual Prisoner*, MacMillan, 1963.

# A Quick Look at U.S.A. Prisons

S. F. JOHNSON

CASTING AROUND after taking up my appointment as tutor organiser I was quite shattered to find how little was known (at least at local level, by *all* ranks within the Service) of other prison services or their equivalents; of experiments in process; of methods in or out of vogue elsewhere. There were, it is true, a number of vast generalisations about "what happened in X-land", but they were but very occasionally (coincidentally?) true. I was therefore determined to find out something of the wider implications of the aims of the task which now confronted me. Even the fairly few academic establishments dealing in any way with "criminology" were not especially helpful. What remained was thus a personal do-it-yourself study. I read books and theses and pamphlets.

I wrote personally to all European countries having embassies in London—the result of the latter was at once heartening and soul-searing. They were helpful . . .

could scarcely have been more so: but many wrote in terms that "this is the first enquiry we have had on this subject (treatment in penal establishment of males in age group 15–21) that we have received in x years".

The next step was to "see for oneself". What help was available? None. No, this was not quite true: a tutor organiser has since been to Russia with *some* aid: but it was nearly true. Where should one visit first? U.S.A.

A teaching organisation helped to arrange the travel within a charter group—thus virtually halving the fare return to New York City. I gave up my leave (and thereby my wife and children gave up a year's holidays!) . . . I wrote to friends, and to friends of friends in U.S.A., and in July 1965 flew out of Gatwick still scarcely able to believe my good fortune.

It is not a part of this note to describe the U.S.A., far, far better pens than mine have produced

travelogues—whilst there, one covered by road (bus and car), rail and plane, well over 8,000 miles; a tiring performance in itself, *but* never has travel proved more worthwhile. The soft North American intonation “thank you for travelling Greyhound” and the response of “you’re welcome” to “thank you” became a part not only of speech but of life. The more lurid patterns of American life etched by television and cinema were not in most instances apparent. Although I did, for a short while, become a kind of unlucky mascot, arriving in Watts (Los Angeles), Chicago and Washington D.C. on each occasion to coincide with the renewal of racial strife.

Visits included San Quentin, Salt Lake City Prison, Alcatraz (now mercifully closed), Tracey Vocational Institution, Cook County Gaol (Chicago), New York City Gaol, the Magistrates’ Night Court in New York City, the great campus prison north of Los Angeles, F.B.I. Headquarters in Washington D.C.

San Quentin—reputed to have its origins in the wreck of a prison hulk drifting from its moorings in San Francisco harbour 110 years ago—presents a granite front to the newly completed Richmond motorway bridge itself pointing an accusing finger from the mainland to the gaol. Four thousand-plus prisoners—an approach through rose gardens to a waiting-cum-visiting room (manned by prisoners) . . . airy and full of works of

art and the famed *San Quentin News*. Selling these items provides virtually the prisoners’ only income. Cigarettes on issue in an endeavour to defeat the tobacco barons; superb vocational training shops and classrooms, *not* circumscribed by fixed-period courses and frequent follow-up by placement in industry on release. Union and management alike represented on the allotment board to give the parolee a “card” and a job.

Eighty or more men in Death Row . . . the State Governor against the capital sentence but the State Legislature not ready to repeal the legislation; the men thus political pawns, possibly still to die if the Governor were not re-elected. The men at long bench tables facing a “stage” in two massive dining halls, and afterwards mooching around, sullenly like caged animals, in the great exercise yard featured in so many films—armed guards watching from on high.

Tracey Vocational Establishment (known generally as D.V.I.—a joint venture between the youth authority and the adult authority . . . and this obviously leads to some friction because of the two types of sentence imposed). Some 1,600 inmates work and train within a full security regime, thus producing the nearest U.S. equivalent to our borstal system.

Elementary and academic courses run side by side with

vocational training, the latter being on a continuous belt system rather like that in Ministry of Labour re-training establishments in U.K. There is thus irregular entry to fill vacancies and the possibility of students remaining on the course sufficiently long to benefit at either end of the scale; because they are slow learners but have the enthusiasm to see them through, or because they progress well and ought to remain participants long enough to take external examinations!

An organised counselling system within the establishment includes a reception/guidance centre within which the twin aims are of vocational alignment and purposeful training. Job placement for release on parole is dealt with by a 100-strong trade advisory council—with management, union, and parole representation.

Strong counselling has been part of the programme for many years. Recently, however, new approaches through this treatment have been added by the inauguration of special group counselling for narcotics users, for those with persistent adjustment problems and for those (inmates) who volunteer and show serious intent towards better self-adjustment and improvement in living.

The inmates with the more serious problems of maladjustment may spend part of their time in the adjustment centre. This unit provides segregation—but also treatment programmes—for those

inmates who for various reasons do not fit into the general inmate population.

Some two dozen different trades are taught, and some courses (e.g. aeroplane engines and aeroframe maintenance) are empowered to issue Federal Board licences.

F.B.I. Headquarters in Washington D.C. is familiar to all who have watched the T V programme based on F.B.I. records. A great queue of visitors stretches along the entrance corridors awaiting "the tour".

The F.B.I. was formed in 1908 to oversee criminal investigations throughout the U.S.A.—as a federal rather than state agency: in 1924 the then Attorney-General appointed a young unknown to be director, J. Edgar Hoover.

Now the "G-men" have the largest collection of fingerprints in the world—modern laboratories of all types; a training school for special agents with courses in law, in accounting, in searches, in interview techniques, in firearms, etc.

There is a hair and fibres unit; one specialising in spectography; another for petrography and metallurgy; one for firearms technology; and so on.

The "night court" in New York City is listed as one of the tourist attractions (free!); every weekday evening the law is administered almost within sight of the Statue of Liberty and it is administered at breakneck speed. A single



magistrate and a harrassed desk sergeant consult on charges, give (free) advice on pleas, tell the accused of his/her rights—and the magistrate then either passes sentence or remands in custody or on bail to a higher court. In any single evening an unbelievable stream of human flotsam and bewildered inadequates pass from the waiting room, before the court, and then either out to be lost again in the great city or to be incarcerated in the adjacent City Gaol.

I was fortunate enough to be invited jointly by the New York Correctional Association and the Osborne Association of America to the 95th Annual Congress of Correction held in Boston, Mass., at the Statler Hilton! During the six-day conference (I attended two) over 100 meetings and lectures took place and the 26 major sponsoring bodies (federal, state and voluntary) represented some hundreds of local organisations and thus *in toto* many thousands of police, prison staffs, probation and parole officers, churchmen of all denominations, educationalists, psychologists and doctors.

At the end of a brief note such as this one ought perhaps to tie together all loose ends and produce a conclusion. This I find myself unable to do. All that I would wish to say is:

- (i) (obviously!) it is a large area of the globe, and thus quite impossible to cover, even inadequately, in six weeks;

- (ii) without an overall pattern and standards, or even a salary and recruiting patterns, the *men* used in correctional services vary from place to place (presumably at least in part because of the economic call of widely differing scales of pay) in attainment and in potential;
- (iii) *But* a great many people in the U.S.A. do care;
- (iv) and all to whom I spoke were conscious only of shortcomings (as were all pleased that Alcatraz, the last of the federal establishments, had been closed and was to be demolished to allow a memorial to the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco Harbour); no one spoke with pride but rather with humility—all sought information.

May I end with two postscripts?

P.S.1. One could write a book about the attitudes to, and endeavours to fight, drug addiction. It is a cruel problem, stemming from the under-privileged negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexicans, but spilling over into the teenage cults.

P.S.2. The various "help-the-family" booklets, sent to next of kin or others nominated for prisoners who have longer than six months to serve, are a very real attempt to *involve* the family.



*"Am I to take it that you have a complaint?"*

# Inside Management

G. S. DOWELL

IN HIS ARTICLE entitled "Managing to Govern" in the July issue of the PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL, the author appears to have presupposed that an acute ailment afflicts the local administration of penal establishments and to have made an inaccurate diagnosis to justify his supposed remedy. It would be unfortunate if the article were allowed to create the impression that the condition described is widespread and cannot be eradicated except by such drastic surgery as is prescribed. It is unfortunate also that an article which evolves into an essay on prison management should do nothing to add to the dearth of information on, or contribute towards a better appreciation of, the role of the administration officer in a penal establishment.

It will be my aim, therefore, to rectify the omission and to show how, with adequate consultation and a proper realisation of the functions of the various members of the team, the present structure can be effective in furthering the objectives of the department and the establishment in particular.

It is unsatisfactory to refer, as your previous contributor has done, to the existence of a struggle

between governors and administration officers without giving the reader any indication of its nature except by its inclusion in the context of a discussion which implies that self-contained departments are to be found engaging in activities against the common interest. It is most certainly unreasonable to suggest that the participants would engage in such a struggle in such a way as to allow their own interests to impede the declared object of the Service, "to encourage and assist convicted prisoners to lead a good and useful life". I believe that most governors would reject the idea of a "struggle" or even peaceful co-existence, and would indeed acknowledge that they receive the full support and co-operation of their administration officers. There may be occasions of differences of opinion as to methods or the extent of the governor's authority, but obviously the administration officer must co-operate in carrying out the governor's directions, even though the matter may be one which directly affects the work or reflects the efficiency of his (the administration officer's) department.

We do, in fact, refer to the administration officer's department

for there are many functions, principally concerned with cash and stores accounting, where the administration officer presently exercises authority on behalf of the governor. It is this situation which gives rise to such controversy as has arisen, but, for the purposes of examination and to be charitable, we should concede that those who advocate delegation of authority in certain matters in direct line from the administrative and executive hierarchy at headquarters to the executive grades at outstations do so, first and foremost, in what they consider to be the interests of efficiency.

In considering the structural patterns of Civil Service organisations, it is usual to regard the general Civil Service classes as line, and the professional or specialist grades as staff. The line and staff concept of management is clearly in operation above outstation level, at which point, however, the pattern is broken by the introduction of a functional system, which may be perfectly proper from the custodial and treatment aspects but which (it has been suggested) should not necessarily be perpetuated in regard to the whole range of administrative functions.

Proposals like this are merely variations on the theme that a revision of the structure is necessary to enable governors to concentrate their attention on matters affecting their prime responsibility

for the custody and treatment of offenders. It in no way follows that assistant governors should take over the purely managerial functions relinquished, for surely they will better assist their governors, and incidentally fit themselves for their ultimate tasks by taking charge of specific cultural or recreational activities for the whole establishment and/or by supervising the life of a wing or house where they may effectively use their qualifications and training in developing treatment techniques and engage in the type of contact work for which they are recruited without concerning themselves with administrative detail, which may properly be left to the staff employed for this express purpose. It would have been useful and illuminating if the Royal Commission on the Penal System had survived to pronounce on these matters after assessing the overall situation in establishments, for there are certainly variations within the existing framework, and, while there may be some establishments where sectional interests appear to predominate, there are others where the team spirit produces a harmonious and effective working relationship.

I would not, therefore, presume to draw any conclusion as to whether a drastic reshaping is necessary or whether the requisite overall increase in efficiency can be achieved by minor modifications or by the universal application of techniques which are at

present found within the Service to be most effective. Before proceeding to elaborate the alternative, however, it is appropriate at this point to say a little more about the work of the administration officer's department. In short, it is to conduct the day-to-day business of the establishment, or, as "Penal Practice in a Changing Society" briefly but cogently puts it, "the steward and his executive and clerical staff help everybody by ensuring the smooth working of the prison management". This, surely, broadly implies administering to the needs of all departments. To illustrate how this is achieved in detail would result in a catalogue of executive and clerical duties, varied and interesting enough by Civil Service standards to the civil servants who perform them but of only incidental interest to those for whom the service is provided. Suffice it to say, therefore, that they are generally recognised as falling within the following broad categories: pay, cash accounting, industries and stores, staff and discipline wherefrom the role of the administration officer emerges variously as that of accountant and finance officer, purchasing and supplies officer, personnel officer and secretary.

If comparison is to be made with the Hospital Service, similarities will certainly be found between the role of the administration officer in a penal establishment and that of a hospital secretary, who is

responsible (to the group secretary) for the day-to-day management of an individual hospital or a subgroup of hospitals. Hospital administration, however, is recognised as a profession in its own right, its members represented by a professional association, the Institute of Hospital Administrators.

Administration officers are officially appointed from members of the executive grades in the Home Office and, in practice, officers are selected with considerable experience in the type of work which they will supervise. In this respect, perhaps, the post may be regarded as specialised, but we must beware of using the term, "specialist", as it would be equally logical to argue that, in the usual Civil Service sense, of all the staff employed in penal establishments the executive and clerical grades are the only non-specialists.

The inescapable fact is, of course, that all are civil servants who, in performing their particular tasks, operate within the circumscribed limits of rules, orders and procedural instructions. That this may at times lead to frustration or temporary setbacks is understandable, but regulations are necessary in any government department to secure uniformity or for other good reasons, not least of which are to safeguard against the introduction of ill-considered schemes and to prevent the indiscriminate use of public money. It is in this

connection that the three watch-words of the administrator: policy, precedent and finance, are to be observed, but they need not stifle initiative or enterprise altogether, for, in the first place, an efficient administrative machine provides for the flow of inspiration in an upward direction and, in the second place, there is a wide area of discretion left to local management decision.

It is, of course, a mis-use of resources to fail to allow the expression of expert opinion where this is available. No governor, I think, would make up his mind on a works matter, for instance, without consulting his senior works officer; on a medical matter, his senior medical officer; or on a finance matter, his administration officer. This may be done by discussion with the individual concerned, by internal memorandum or—and this seems to be the current trend—he may raise the matter at a meeting of heads of sections, who, on their part, may wish to bring up for discussion other matters perhaps falling outside their normal routine or when the interests of other parties are affected. Differences of opinion, of interpretation, or of emphasis do indeed arise at local level and it is often advantageous to have these aired in a group or committee atmosphere rather than by conducting a series of separate interviews with staff concerned. There evolves from such meetings, without any radical change in the structure or

drastic role reappraisal, a management system the merits of which are being increasingly recognised.

In many establishments this has arisen from the logical development of the "knitting party" which took place each morning, originally with perhaps only three or four participants, for example, the governor, the administration officer and the chief officer, but which, with the advent of so many specialist grades, has profitably been extended to make the optimum use of consultation as warranted by the particular type of establishment.

At my own establishment, for example, if I may be forgiven for quoting it, such a meeting takes place daily under the chairmanship of the governor (medical superintendent in this case) and usually attracts 10 or more heads of sections or their representatives and, because of the special treatment situation at Grendon and the frequent need to discuss cases of special interest, the chief officer in charge of the hospital and usually three or four of the wing principal officers will also attend. Occasionally any official visitors who may be in the establishment are also invited. The morning meeting does not displace the close liaison which is normally sustained between governor, administration officer and chief officer, nor does it supersede any of the more usual avenues of consultation. Decisions may be deferred for further consultation between interested parties, or

matters referred to a fortnightly uniformed staff meeting, monthly general staff meeting or quarterly consultative committee meeting if appropriate. The proceedings are informal, attendance is not compulsory, no minutes are taken and the meeting does not pretend to reach unanimous or even majority decisions. The governor, in fact, retains the over-riding authority and final responsibility as, of course, he must do under the existing formal structure.

This is perhaps a long way from what advocates of the management of penal establishments by boards of management have in mind, but it is at least a method of employing the management technique of co-ordinating the views of individuals affected, and a means of ensuring that the whole picture is seen by all, so that each may readily identify his allotted place and assume no pretensions to expertise outside his true assignment, even though he will inevitably acquire a measure of appreciation of other professional techniques which may assist him to inform his own judgments. In an establishment practising novel methods of treatment involving a high degree of inmate participation and in an exceptionally permissive regime, it has been thought essential to counter the resultant stresses on staff and organisation by the maximum consultation and dissemination of information that time and the staffing situation allow, so that involvement in the therapeutic

principle affects all grades, and we have a situation where it becomes as automatic to consider administrative acts in relation to their effects on treatment as treatment proposals in the light of their administrative consequences.

Although Grendon is an exceptional case, there will be other establishments where similar considerations apply in varying degrees and some where it could be claimed that effective management has been achieved under the existing structure similarly adapted. There are, of course, disadvantages associated with committee systems and, in the result, the efficiency of any system of lower or middle management may be judged on the wisdom of the decisions made within its discretion and the constructiveness and feasibility of its proposals.

One's own view is apt to be influenced by the methods and attitudes adopted at one's own establishment, and it would not be proper to impose my own conclusions. If it is accepted, however, that there is a need for change in the local administration of penal establishments and that the climate is right for it, then it is necessary to be aware of its present actualities and potentialities. It would certainly seem to be a prerequisite to any change, to dispel some presently held misconceptions as to role and function. It may then be simply a matter of appreciating how the present resources can be properly applied to their full effect.

# The Administration Officer

G. E. HART

THE ARTICLE by Mr. Lee entitled "Managing to Govern" which appeared in the July issue of the PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL provokes me to take up my pen to challenge his views. May I, therefore, as a former administration officer put forward my personal views on the status and functions of the administration officer and the part I see he has to play in the management of Prison Service establishments in the 60's and beyond.

I must refute categorically the suggestion that there is in any way a power struggle between the governor and the administration officer. What is often mistaken for such a struggle is an effort to determine and establish lines of demarcation within the rules as they exist today. Nowhere can one find in concise and explicit form the duties of the executive grade in penal establishments, particularly the duties and responsibilities of the administration officer. One has to peruse the relevant passages of the 1933 Standing Order Book, the ensuing circulars of three

decades and the manuals. Difficulties arise between governors and administration officers on the interpretation of these rules or because of the absence of any rules at all. As Mr. Lee rightly points out, the difficulties are no less great from the governor's point of view in determining his responsibilities. In a small establishment, say a detention centre, the warden may consider certain jobs are his, whereas in a larger establishment, the same jobs are done by the administration officer. The higher the governor rises in the Service, the more difficult it is for him to deal with detail, indeed if he tries to do so, it can only be to the detriment of his overall responsibilities. Moreover, at the large establishments, the administration officer is a senior executive officer with a substantial executive and clerical staff; he is not a junior executive, he is both capable of and expectant of more delegated responsibility, being paid a salary commensurate with this. But the issue remains, should the



division of duties be arbitrary and dependent upon local determination? If, for instance, it was clearly laid down that the administration officer should be responsible for the opening and distribution of post, then this would ensure that the ridiculous and time wasting ceremony that takes place in some establishments each morning was put on a proper business-like basis. Some governors have tried this and found that executive staff are quite capable of handling paper knives and can be relied upon to bring to the governor's notice all papers of an important or interesting nature. In terms of Treasury costings, the morning post-opening and associated "knitting" session is rather expensive and I commend to Mr. Lee and others the Treasury booklet *Costing as an aid to Management*. I personally, would delegate the post routine to an executive officer or to a clerical officer and save the valuable time of the administration officer. I understand the position may be improving as a result of the introduction of the non-returnable minute, but my much laboured example is no less valid if happily it is disappearing.

The solution of the problems which beset the management of prisons does not lie in the direction pointed by Mr. Lee. At the outset, he must appreciate that the assistant governor, class II, is no more than a basic training grade and the

analogy of having the governor's keys in his back pocket is no more relevant than the private with the field-marshal's baton in his knapsack. It can equally be claimed that each clerical officer is a potential under-secretary of state. The solution lies in the commonsense distribution (i.e. delegation) of managerial functions. It lies in the appreciation that no longer can prisons be run on pre-war paramilitary autocratic lines. Gone are the days when the main qualification for being a prison governor was an army rank and for being a steward, many years faithful service balancing the cash-book. Governors require to be professional students of penology and criminology with a suitably varied apprenticeship in the lower governor grades; to this I would add training in management. Likewise the administration officer must be a professional civil servant of high educational attainment, proved ability and experience gained by a thorough training in all aspects of administration. I hear outraged cries that this is the current state of affairs and the declared policy, but I venture to suggest that old practices die hard and that here and there the ghosts of the past still lurk in our penal establishments.

I suggest that the governor's role in modern terms is analogous to that of managing director. His

fellow directors are the medical officer, chaplain, deputy governor, administration officer, chief officer, senior works officer, tutor organiser, welfare officer, industrial manager and perhaps other senior officers depending upon the staffing complement at certain establishments; but not assistant governors. Their position is clear, they are the junior executives of the firm with certain responsible but circumscribed functions. In time, they may be elevated to the board of directors and with luck and ability one day may take the managing director's chair. Mr. Lee must be content to learn his trade in the only possible way, by devilling for his governor and accepting such delegated functions as the governor determines, but none which encroach upon the functions of the local heads of departments. To expound the analogy of the prison as a business unit, I see each director responsible for a separate function of the establishment, their collective responsibility being to the governor and through him to the Home Office. Within this framework, I can see Mr. Lee's dilemma as this puts the assistant governor, class II, in an anachronistic position. Either the A.G. II grade is largely superfluous to the efficient running of an institution or it must be acceptable on its present terms, namely as the "housemaster" grade, or as I

prefer to think of it, as the training grade.

I have been amused to read in several places references to primary and secondary goals. What nonsense this is! I am reminded of a nautical story of the captain who considered the engineer's job to be an easy one and the engineer who thought his the harder and more skilled job. They agreed to change over for one voyage: when the engines eventually broke down, the captain in the engine-room reluctantly asked the engineer for assistance, whereupon the engineer on the bridge replied that it was too late, they had just struck a rock and were sinking rapidly. The duty of each member of the staff is to render efficient service in the job for which he is paid. Let there be less nonsense talked about vocation by some grades with the inference that others work for the money and therefore have different goals. All animals are equal but some are more equal than others, said George Orwell; how true this appears to be with regard to assistant governors and executive staff. How often is the executive officer regarded as just a clerk and the administration officer as the senior clerk by some assistant governors. This leads to the reciprocal view by some administration officers that assistant governors are merely the governor's messenger boys and issuers of table-tennis balls.

Both grades must achieve a better understanding of their complementary functions and a more positive lead from the top is required. A governor friend of mine once told me that the advice he received from a senior officer on his first appointment as a governor, class III, was "make sure you're the boss and not the steward". I hope this is as isolated as it is improper and totally unwarranted. The administration officer fully realises he has a duty and loyalty to his governor. He has, nevertheless, a wide range of varied duties to administer. I do not propose to catalogue them but the extent and variety is formidable. His position is analogous to that of company accountant and secretary, plus his special responsibilities for industries and the employment of prisoners. In this position he is the confidant and adviser to his governor on all matters for which he is responsible. Where this is fully appreciated, and this is generally the case, there is a happy relationship between the governor and executive grades.

There is no room for complacency about the present situation, a great deal needs to be done by way of in-service training, conferences and consultations, encouragement from top management, clear directives, etc., to foster goodwill in the hearts of prison staff of all grades. The future may hold many surprises in the development of penal

institutions but whatever they are, there must be one officer in charge. The governor must govern, manage and serve his masters too. He must be assisted by experts selected and appointed for their special skills, ability and experience. They must be welded into a team, skilfully directed by a man of real ability and understanding. The administration officer must be a key member of this team as the business manager of the establishment—in support of this view I quote from the "Introductory Factual Memorandum" submitted by H.M. Treasury to the Fulton Committee regarding the role of the general executive class, paragraph 302 states: "the responsibility of the general executive class may be summarised as the day-to-day conduct of Government business within the framework of established policy, including for instance, the higher work of accounts and revenue collection and the management of regional and local offices". As prison administration becomes more complex, the governor must be free of all routine duties and must delegate freely to his senior staff. The administration officer and the executive staff are capable of accepting and discharging many of these duties, leaving the governor free to devote his specialist talents to the rehabilitation of the offender.

## Letters to the Editor

# Senior Managers and Junior Governors

*To the Editor,*

PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL

SIR.—The article in the July issue entitled “Managing to Govern” written by Mr. J. R. C. Lee contains some references to which objection has been taken by members of my branch which covers those of the general executive class who work in penal establishments. It would also be misleading to members of the public who read your journal who may not be aware that an administration officer can be a Home Office senior executive officer, a grade described by the Treasury as senior management, while an assistant governor, who Mr. Lee would like to see in charge of this administration officer, is the junior grade of a departmental executive class.

We are also at a loss to understand what he means by his reference to “the struggle which exists between administration officers and the governors”. We are aware of no evidence to support such a statement. Throughout the penal service governors and administration officers work harmoniously

together and differences are surprisingly few for a Service of our size and complexity. Indeed, governors generally, and in particular those ex-governors who have reached high rank in the Prison Service and the Home Office, continually pay tribute to the assistance and support they have received from administration officers.

Mr. Lee’s blanket reference to the “clerical department” is also unhappy, since he is apparently using it as synonymous with the term “administration officer’s department”. Indeed it is not clear that he is aware that this department, as well as including our indispensable colleagues, the clerical officers and typists, includes executive officers, higher executive officers and in the larger prisons senior executive officers, as well as specialist officers such as technical officers grade I who would hardly want to be regarded as inferior in status to assistant governors. Mr. Lee may not like it, but the administration officer’s responsibilities must place him in

a key position in an establishment. I cannot quote Royal Naval analogies but in military terms he combines the role of adjutant, quartermaster, and paymaster among many other duties. He is also responsible (*vide* Standing Orders) for the employment of inmates. It is laid down that he is responsible in the performance of his duties to the governor, i.e., the governor in charge, and this does not mean to any other junior member of the departmental class of governors. Mr. Lee's mention

of a communication and administrative task force with an assistant governor in charge is nonsense. It shows a complete lack of knowledge of the task of the administration officer and of his responsibilities to the governor of a penal establishment and to the Home Department.

Yours, etc.,  
J. W. CLARK,  
*Chairman,  
Society of Civil Servants,  
Prison Department,  
Outstation Branch.*

---

## Social Workers or Managers

*To the Editor,*

PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL

SIR.—In your July 1966 issue were two articles expressing views on the role of the assistant governor, or housemaster in borstal. "Managing to Govern", by J. R. C. Lee and "Borstals and After-Care—Post-A.C.T.O.", by T. R. Carnegie, which illustrates the dichotomy in the present role of the assistant governor, a dichotomy which is reinforced by the syllabus of the Staff Course at Wakefield.

Mr. Lee says "... A.G.s will need to have a *basic* (my italics) understanding of social casework techniques so that where applicable they can introduce them, and

support their growth within an institutional structured programme. But far more they should be concerned with management principles and practice, institutional relationships, the psychological aspects of organisations, with the practice of research and development. *For these are the areas within which they should be operating as governors.* (My italics.)

Mr. Carnegie thinks differently. He clearly wants A.G.s to be high powered social workers dealing directly with inmates and acting as a link with the inmates' future outside associates.

Both these arguments have

validity. However, I feel that Mr. Carnegie would quickly isolate the A.G. from areas of decision-making which must be his within the scope of his house and the remainder of the institution. Mr. Lee rightly says that perhaps the principal officers should undertake the role examined by Mr. Carnegie. I would agree wholeheartedly. From my limited knowledge of borstal institutions I have noted a clear lack of involvement by the P.O.s, not always voluntary. The present system does not allow them this involvement. The same argument applies to senior officers. They feel out of touch. This causes

low staff morale and I am sure is one reason for the present loss due to resignation of many of these men.

I agree with Mr. Lee when he says we are making the change, albeit slowly. Must it be slow? The Service has the means to make the change if it so wishes. The Staff College provides this means. Has it the will? We cannot stick with tradition in this fast-moving world. We are already behind, and losing ground.

Yours, etc.,

J. L. UZZELL,

*A.G. II, Feltham.*

## “Suspended” Sentences

*To the Editor,*

PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL.

SIR.—The White Paper, “The Adult Offender”, is a realistic attempt to put into effect many aspects of modern thinking regarding penal reform in that it aims to overcome the deleterious effects of long terms of imprisonment, and to offer a positive inducement to convicted prisoners to co-operate in matters of reform and rehabilitation to a degree hitherto not achieved.

With these aims and aspirations,

most people connected with the training and treatment of the lawbreakers will no doubt agree, and yet, one wonders if it is in fact the most effective and economic formula available.

Given the present economic state of the nation and the fact that in any event the cost of the penal system must be kept within reasonable grounds, other far less costly and possibly equally effective methods are available without, of course, losing sight of the aims set out in the White Paper.

It would be wrong to generalise

when attempting to assess the manifold effects a long term of imprisonment can produce, but the fact remains and only the effect differs in direct relationship to the character and outlook of the person concerned. Experienced prison officers are well aware of this, and can note the effect that imprisonment is having on the individual concerned, they are also quick to note changes in the person's sense of values. As a prison officer, I have over the years endeavoured to assist and advise men trying to adjust themselves to face long periods of detention, and have found it most difficult at times to deal with men whose basic attitude to life and crime has been completely changed by the shock of imprisonment and the thought of the many years they must spend behind bars. Yet this frequently happens. The officer who is in daily contact with these men is in a unique position to observe this; and equally to observe when the initial shock wears off and the years in prison leave their mark. To see the visits of his wife and family grow more and more infrequent (often to cease altogether), to watch them become accustomed to prison life and to accept new standards of behaviour, often lower than when first convicted.

I would illustrate this with an actual case: a man with whom I have almost daily contact. He is a very intelligent and ingenious man who committed a whole series of

crimes (shop and warehouse breaking). He thought himself more efficient and intelligent than the police but was brought to book. It was his first appearance in Court and he was sentenced to ten years imprisonment. About three years of the sentence has now been served. In his present state of mind he would be unlikely to offend again; unfortunately, however, a bitterness toward society in general is now becoming apparent and it requires little imagination to anticipate that when he is eventually released this bitterness will dominate his mind and will be the spur to further activities outside the law.

The effect of the new proposals will tend to improve the situation, the unfortunate part is that they do not go far enough; they assume that all men released on parole will need the assistance of the parole officers. This is not so, and to compel this would only serve to inflate the cost of the new proposals out of all proportion to the results obtained. The scheme does not carry on the deterrent value of the sentence after the date of release, i.e. when his period of parole has passed and he has effectively discharged his sentence.

What alternatives are available? The ideal would surely be a scheme whereby a man's sentence could be suspended at any stage when it was thought that he would be least likely to offend again. It may arise at the time the committed person

is sentenced and in the judge's opinion unlikely to offend again; it may be much later and under the direction of the Prison Department.

Such a system would go a long way towards breaking down the present attitude of long-term prisoners, in that it would to a greater or lesser degree—

1. Continue the deterrent effect of a sentence indefinitely in that the unexpired portion of a sentence would be re-imposed at any subsequent conviction.

2. Encourage men to co-operate, to a degree not generally achieved now, with the prison departments concerned with his welfare, training and rehabilitation, in order to achieve an early suspension of sentence.

3. Give the judiciary power to "suspend sentence" in any case

where it was felt that the person was unlikely to offend again.

4. Encourage any person so released to give his whole-hearted co-operation to the probation service on a voluntary basis in order to steer clear of further trouble. This would give added impetus to the probation service.

5. Prevent the break-up of many marriages and the ensuing bitterness against society generated thereby.

6. Enable a man to be released from prison whilst the shock of his sentence is still very much in his mind, before the worst influences found in prison life have had appreciable effect and at the time when the deterrent value of imprisonment is at a high level.

R. J. ELVY  
*Wakefield*

---

## Who Leads Who?

*To the Editor,*

PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL.

SIR.—Being an officer who is interested in "extending my professional life" I was keen to read the recent article by J. E. Thomas: "After-care and the Prison Officer".

This keenness unfortunately waned and finally left me with the same feeling that the majority of

such articles create. That is, the hierarchy of this somewhat antiquated Service is reluctant to carry out any positive planning, and is even more reluctant to accept ideas from the minions who serve under them.

The department and N.A.D.P.A.S. must obviously have agreed on welfare officers coming into



prisons. The manner in which it was implemented must surely be condemned. They simply appeared, unknown to anyone, apparently on the basis of "Large oaks from little acorns grow".

Several welfare officers to whom I have spoken have agreed with me that they are little more than a voice in the wilderness. They have no plan of campaign (although I agree, one would be difficult to evolve). The greater tragedy is that there is little or no link-up between themselves and the staff around them. Neither side knows what the other is doing, so relationships are strained, while heads of establishments look on with benign smiles of indifference. They too have their limitations which one imagines leaves them on the proverbial "fence".

It was written in 1934 by a then retired senior medical officer that the Prison Service had never been organized, it had merely evolved.

Can anyone take pride for any real advancement since those words were written, or must it be agreed that the Service is still evolving in its own slow, inimitable fashion?

The answer surely lies in the hands of the prison directors. It is up to them to plan an amalgamated service. This would co-ordinate welfare, probation and social workers with their own experienced officers; they know more about their charges than anyone.

Pool all ideas and let a ground level committee sort them out. Our "Sirs" and "Lords" really don't know the problem, although I would hasten to add that they would prove an invaluable guide through the maze of the Service slow coaches.

One of the prime requirements of a prison officer is leadership. We know whom we lead—who leads us?

A. J. MARSHALL  
*Pentonville*

## *Your Letters*

should be addressed to

The Editor, The Editorial Board  
Prison Service Journal  
Room 43, Hepburn House,  
Marsham Street, London S.W.1

# Justice and Mercy

*A Sermon preached by*

THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF CROYDON  
*at a Special Service at Westminster Abbey during the  
celebration of the 900th Anniversary of its Consecration  
26th March, 1966*

MATTHEW xii, 18-21: "Behold, my servant whom I have chosen, my beloved with whom my soul is well pleased. I will put my Spirit upon him, and he shall proclaim justice to the Gentiles. He will not wrangle or cry aloud, nor will anyone hear his voice in the streets; he will not break a bruised reed or quench a smouldering wick, till he brings justice to victory: and in his name will the Gentiles hope".

"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The earth was 'tohuwa bohu'—in a state of chaos—and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters." That is how the Bible in the Book of Genesis describes the world upon which God moves out to take action. The Bible begins the story of God's creative work where we always are at every moment; for at every moment chaos, anarchy

and formlessness threaten to engulf us. The neglected garden turns to weeds and then to jungle; and the story of the "Lord of the Flies" tells us what human nature can be like when the hand of custom, tradition or law has been lifted from it; and the growing volume of crime with which our police force try valiantly to cope is evidence of the same truth: that there are demonic forces which pull us down and pull us apart individually and collectively. Chaos is the result of a power which has to be withstood until it can be overthrown; and it is always just below the surface of our life, and never far away.

Why this is so has no clear answer. In any case the question is not our concern this morning. What matters for our purpose today is that the Bible, in beginning its story with this ever present fact, does so in order to tell us what is

God's relation to it, and what he does about it. And therefore first of all the Bible proclaims that God *resists* it, because he is a God of righteousness, justice and law. For the Jew, as later on in the Bible we come to see, this disclosure of God as a God of justice and law was a cause for wonder and gratitude. The Law of God was something worth meditating on:

"Lord, what love have I unto thy law; all the day long is my study in it", says the Psalmist. (Psalm 119 v. 97.)

For the Jew that law was the moral law: the law which revealed the righteousness of God himself, and which in man's obedience to it secured for him a freedom in his relationship with both God and man. Long before the law of God was seen as a judgement or as a warning, it was loved as a gift and was constantly the subject of thanksgiving, wonder and delight.

"Thy statutes have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage." (Psalm 119 v. 54.) A man's hope was anchored in the justice and righteousness of his God.

But of course, God's justice and God's law could never be known or loved in abstraction. They were known because they were expressed in the laws and customs of his people. For that reason men had to meditate upon them and study them, for what we call law, whether of Church or State, is chiefly regulation; and regulation can never be more than provisional. The perfect justice of God has constantly to

be re-interpreted in the light of fuller knowledge both of God's requirement and of man's need. That is why as we all come together today to acknowledge God's justice, there must be represented amongst us those who meditate upon our laws in order that they may ever be more just; those who interpret and administer them that justice may be more perfectly done; and those who watch to see where they are disobeyed that they may be made effectual. To all of these whose concern is with the law St. Paul has applied the very word which belongs chiefly now to the clergy: they are God's "ministers" attending to the justice of God, ministering it to us all. (Romans xiii, 16.)

There are also with us today our brothers who have been brought here from prison. I feel therefore that I must now go on to ask the difficult but important question: what is the *purpose* of law and the administration of justice? I suggest it is two-fold; it is to secure for the individual what are his rights, and to require of him what are also his duties. I have put the emphasis here where I believe the Bible tells us where it has to be: upon the relation of the law to the individual. This is not, however, where others would place it. In the White Paper on the "Adult Offender" of last December the Government says this:

"Whilst every effort would be made to reclaim for society the

prisoner capable of reform, it still remains the primary consideration that society must be properly protected against the wrongdoer" (par. 18). In its context, namely that of the treatment of long-term prisoners, there is force in what that says. But has it a wider reference? Does it state what is seriously held to be the primary purpose of justice? Is society or the individual the primary consideration? The answer to this question has, I believe, a decisive influence upon the meaning of punishment. How do we look upon "society"? Does the individual exist for society? Or is society a fellowship of individuals? If the first is true, punishment is for the protection of society from the dangerous individual, and is some kind of social hygiene or even surgery. If it is the second, punishment is concerned primarily with the rights and with the duties of the individual. That does not exclude that justice shall be done to the rights of society; but what it does do is to secure that the rights of the individual, and of the individual offender, shall be neither belittled nor overlooked.

What rights has the offender? There will be no doubt in anyone's mind that he has the right to be understood; to be treated as a person—a real person—and that often means a person with a family; and that not only shall he not be injured, but that he shall be helped. And about this I will speak again in a moment. But

there is one thing that the Bible, in its great reverence both for the law and for the law-breaker requires: that he shall be given the opportunity for making an act of reparation. Contrary to most present-day thinking on the matter, in punishment there should be an element of retribution. This does not mean that there must be a retributive equivalence—an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth—otherwise we should not have been right in doing away with the death penalty, which was precisely that. It means that an offence must be regarded as an offence, and an offender as a person.

I have allowed myself to use some highly controversial and indeed greatly misunderstood words: reparation, retribution, to which we can add expiation. They all mean the same. None of them has anything to do with vengeance. Nor have they to do with forgiveness. Reparation is not a condition imposed by someone aggrieved before he is willing or able to forgive, otherwise it is plainly not forgiveness which is being either given or received. Reparation is to be seen rather as a correlative of guilt and as a requirement of penitence. Nor do I understand reparation to be the same as restitution. Reparation is paid to the law; restitution is made to people, and is a debt which may or may not be required even where it is possible for it to be required. Reparation, retribution, expiation

are related to one's guilt, and the capacity to feel guilty is a vital aspect of true humanity. To be able to feel guilty for real wrong done betokens a healthy mind and ought neither to be despised nor destroyed. Today it is the habit of many to belittle guilt and to allow the *mens rea* to wither away from contempt. But I think that guilt and reparation still must stand as witnesses to the fact of law and the fact that we are responsible for obeying it.

Yes: I believe that this is true. But of course what I have said works two ways, not one. Over the last 18 years I have been privileged to know a great number of men and some women who have served prison sentences. I have perhaps been able to know them more intimately than many others have had the opportunity of doing. Out of this knowledge, limited though it is, I should have to conclude that few people are ever the sole cause of their crimes. Prisons and prisoners are the symptoms of a sinful and sick humanity. They are the local and particular manifestation of the poison in the blood-stream of the whole body of society. Where then is the guilt? It belongs to all. And from whom has retribution in justice to be required? Equally, from us all. With that far-reaching truth to sober and to solemnise us, we shall have to go on to consider when we impose publicly a punishment, particularly that of imprisonment,

upon an offender, in what way reparation has to be made to *him*. The tendency today is to speak of punishment as being rightly devised to reclaim the prisoner for society. Is it not equally right to ask how society can be reclaimed for him?

But there are others here today besides judges, policemen and prisoners. There are probation officers and other welfare officers, counsellors of one kind and another, and the clergy. Why are we here? It is because of what follows from what I have just been saying. It is because justice requires not only that retribution shall be required, but that restoration also shall be brought about. Justice is only a *regulative* principle; it can hardly be regarded as a *creative* one. A state of justice is not necessarily a state of harmony. And what God works for in His mercy and love is what in His justice alone He could never achieve: the perfect liberty of the children of God in the one family that bears His name. When Cain killed Abel, God asked him this question: "Where is Abel your brother?" And he said, "I do not know; am I my brother's keeper?" And the Lord said "What have you done?" Yes, what had he done? He had repudiated all responsibility for maintaining and preserving the most fundamental relationships of all human society: the relationship of the neighbour and the brother. And that is how it is with all of us now: for some more

terribly true than for others. And so it is that God in His mercy gives us once again to one another to repair for one another the ravages that have come from the absent brother and neighbour. It is in these real relationships between man and man and person and person that God reaches out to us all and begins the new creation at the point where we meet Him in one another. It is in Jesus Christ we see without doubt that our God is a wholly merciful God, who reaches out to us to save and to restore us. But He does so chiefly through the presence beside us of the merciful neighbour. Are we all, are we always, that merciful neighbour? For "he will not break a bruised reed or quench a smouldering wick, till he brings justice to victory."

Finally, we are all here today standing before God and standing beside one another, simply as people, as ordinary human beings. We do not have to be professionally concerned in order to find ourselves involved in the securing of justice and the showing of mercy in everyday life. We have all to play our part, and what is our part we may not leave to someone else. We are all responsible at times for making judgements and reaching decisions which affect the lives of other people. As a doctor, as a parent, a foreman, a supervisor, a redband in prison, or simply as a neighbour, we have to make responsible decisions.

May I then end by drawing attention to two attitudes of mind, the one anaemic and the other vicious, which equally are the enemies of both justice and mercy in life?

I refer first to that failure of nerve which refuses to take the risk of painful and personal decision in case we find ourselves held responsible for consequences we would rather avoid. The result of this attitude of mind, as a recent case at the Middlesex Area Sessions has shown, can be that great injustice is done to an individual because she is caught up into an organisation where no one is either able or willing to take the responsibility for personal decision.

The second attitude to which I refer is the readiness on the part of some people to blame, even to prosecute, a responsible person who acted responsibly, or who, because of the unremitting weight of responsibility failed at a single point of decision, and when in each case the consequences were sad. Ought not mercy to be extended to all whose task of making important decisions is a delicate or a heavy one when it is plain that when something goes wrong it is not a man's integrity that is in question but his human infallibility? Ought not the scales of justice to be tipped in his favour? Who in the end will have the courage to make honest and dangerous judgements if there is no mercy for him when he seems to fail?

# "The Church and the Criminal"

by

Rev. J. A. HOYLES

(EPWORTH PRESS 16/-. postage 9d.)

*A review by Rev. L. L. Rees (Chaplain General)*

IN THE FIELD of practical work on behalf of the offender, individual Christians in this country have a fine and honourable record. A large number of prison visitors, after-care workers, prison and borstal governors, assistant governors and officers, probation officers are motivated by their Christian concern. But for a long time many of us have been conscious that in the sphere of thought, of philosophy and research in this area, Christians have tended to contract out of discussion and those who describe themselves as humanist, agnostics or even atheists are to the fore. Even where Christian insights have been expressed they have been expressed in isolation from the diverse and often unintegrated insights of others. A request I made about four years ago to the librarian of the Cambridge Institute of Criminology for books on criminology written from a specifically Christian standpoint produced a very short list, mostly of brief references—some not more than a paragraph or a page—in some general books. Yet if the Christian claim is total and comprehensive, wherever a judgement is made that reflects upon a

human situation comment by Christians should be forthcoming and any survey of human behaviour which recommends certain habits, attitudes or principles of conduct are answerable to the morality of Christendom. Without the contribution of the theologian the insights are incomplete.

The Reverend J. Arthur Hoyles, already known to many within the Prison Department as the Methodist visiting minister at Grendon and Spring Hill and as the co-ordinator of our Methodist ministers, has done us a considerable service in the writing of his latest book *The Church and the Criminal*. In the words of the publishers "this book expounds the proposition that Church and State must work together in finding the answer to crime. Because the treatment of criminals by the secular State has been unpalatable to the Christian conscience, the Church has been tempted to contract out of the administration of justice. Some of the questions discussed are: Can Christian morality be adequately expressed in the law of the land? When a person is guilty before the law, is he also

guilty before God? How can punishment be reconciled with the Christian injunction to forgive one's enemies? What is the relation between evangelical conversion and psychiatric treatment? Can there be such a thing as a Christian prison? Although there is perpetual tension between the Church and the State, a working partnership must be maintained. Sometimes Christians have to compromise their principles. The Church's duty is to transform secular justice so that its own insights may be enlisted in the rehabilitation of the criminal."

There is an interesting foreword by Dr. Leslie Davison, whose own essay on "The Principles of Penal Reform" finds its place in the extensive bibliography which reflects the wide background reading that has gone into the preparation of this book. I found the chapter on "Guilt and Culpability" and the

one on "Punishment and Forgiveness" particularly relevant to current thinking, whilst this chapter on "Correction and Conversion" should do much to disarm the suspicions of our colleagues from other disciplines. On page 110 he quotes Dr. Stafford Clark as saying "it is a red herring to assume that modern psychology rests upon a determinist and materialist basis. Pain, guilt and failure are inevitable aspects of the human situation and although they may be mitigated by medicine, they demand a religious solution".

The book pleads for a working partnership between Church and State, between the sociologists, the psychologist, the philosopher and the theologian. This will not be possible until dialogue between them produces understanding, and understanding produces respect and charity. Arthur Hoyles' book will do much to stimulate and contribute to such a dialogue.

## CONTRIBUTORS

STANLEY F. JOHNSON, tutor organiser, Wellingborough Borstal, studied at the Universities of Calcutta, Manchester, Leicester and externally for Oxford University certificate in social studies.

GEORGE DOWELL is administration officer at Grendon Prison. He joined the Prison Service in 1939; has previously served at Durham, Bedford and at Head Office; he holds the diploma in government administration.

W. J. BOOTH is deputy principal of the Prison Service Staff College, Wakefield.

G. E. HART, formerly administration officer of Blantyre House Detention Centre, Maidstone, Wakefield and Holloway prisons; at present with the

Home Office and Metropolitan Police Joint A.D.P. Unit.

THE RT. REV. J. T. HUGHES, Lord Bishop Suffragan of Croydon began his involvement with prisons in 1952 when as Canon Missioner of Southwark he was invited to conduct a mission at Dartmoor. The relationships initiated led him to maintain contact with men both in and out of prisons. He has been much in demand as a Conductor of Missions in prisons.

VERNON HOLLOWAY, M.A., joined the Prison Service in 1954 after studying psychology and philosophy at Oxford. Has recently returned to Wormwood Scrubs as Principal Psychologist.