THE PRINCIPLES OF THE BORSTAL SYSTEM

Extracts from Chapter 1

The purpose of a Borstal Institution is to teach wayward lads to be self-contained men, to train them to be fit for freedom. It is impossible to train men for freedom in conditions of captivity.... At the back and bottom of this Borstal System of training there lies a fundamental principle . . . . Once upon a time the method employed to deal with them consisted simply in the use of force. The lad was treated as a lump of hard material yielding only to the hammer, and was, with every good intention, beaten into shape. Sometimes there were internal injuries, and the spirit of the lad grew into a wrong shape, for sometimes the use of force produces a reaction more anti-social than the original condition. There ensues a second method which has flourished for fifty years in many schools where boys are trained, and might be termed the method of pressure. The lad is treated as though he were a lump of putty, and an effort is made to reduce him to a certain uniform shape by the gentle and continuous pressure of authority from without . . . but the springs of action lie deeper than the laws of habit or the voice of the mentor are likely to reach, and character is determined ultimately not by the outside shape that has been fashioned, but by powers within that possibly have not been touched. It happens therefore, sadly often, that the lad who has been merely subjected to the pressure of authority from outside will, when exposed to the different influences of a free life, assume quite another shape. In other words, having been treated like a lump of putty he will behave like a lump of putty, and respond successively to the influences of each environment. The third and most difficult way of treating a lad is to regard him as a living organism, adapting itself in external conduct to the surroundings of the moment, but undergoing no permanent organic change merely as a result of outside pressure . . . the task is not to break or knead him into shape, but to stimulate some power within to regulate conduct aright, to insinuate a preference for the good and the clean, to make him want to use his life well, so that he himself and not others will save him from waste . . . . This is indeed the most difficult way, for it passes from the external things that can be seen, which are dealt with so much more easily, to the inner things unseen . . . .

SIR ALEXANDER PATERSON.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE BORSTAL SYSTEM

Extracts from Chapter 2

It is the declared policy of our Service in these times (the 1930's) that we should first get hold of the best men possible, from whatever source they may be found, and then give them as wide a scope as possible. It will therefore be found that our regulations decrease in numbers, while the margin of discretion grows, more and more being left as the system develops, to the judgment of the individual officer. A Service where every contingency is covered by an exact rule tends to attract second-rate men and years of unquestioning obedience may reduce them to the level of the third-rate. But our Service needs the best men, and once they have gained experience and shown their mettle, they should keep fresh by the continual exercise of their own thought and discretion. The Borstal System has no merit apart from the Borstal Staff. It is men and not buildings who will change the hearts and ways of misguided lads. Better an institution that consists of two log huts in swamp or desert, with a staff devoted to their task, than a model block of buildings, equipped without thought of economy, whose staff is solely concerned with thoughts of pay and promotion. The foundations of the Borstal System are, first, the recruitment of the right men, then their proper training and finally, their full co-operation with one another in an atmosphere of freedom and mutual understanding. The good Borstal Officer is a man who enjoys his work, believes in it, and finds it is so suited to his higher instincts, that an offer of a little more pay for less interesting work would scarcely tempt him. He receives a living wage, but his real reward is in the nature of his work. Promotion may seem desperately remote, but the measure of his success is the progress of his lads. So thinks a man who has found his vocation, and such only will be happy and of real service in the Borstal System whether as Governor or as Gate-keeper. The staff will specialise in those virtues that are chiefly lacking in the lads..... The task facing the Staff is so difficult that the only hope of its achievement lies in a full measure of comradeship between all ranks. The abolition of the distinction between "superior and subordinate" was a recognition of this need. Difference of rank must always exist in an organised community. Some there must be who give orders and others who obey. But the structure of discipline is made all the stronger by a free interchange of views and a real friendship between every different

rank. It should be possible to meet freely on the playing fields or in one another's houses. We are as one body of colleagues, intolerant of division by caste or income..... So does each section of the Staff play its part, proud of its share but loyal to the whole, and there arises the ideal Borstal Institution, fitly framed together, designed for a task which requires the impetus of unison and a great harmony of gifts. There is, accordingly, no room in a crowded life for the petty quarrel between one section and another. If we have in proper perspective the magnitude of our task and the insignificance of ourselves compared with it, we shall abandon sectional disputes or petty feuds and get on with the work.

SIR ALEXANDER PATERSON.

Institution, Establishment — or Community

ANDREW A. FYFE

WHAT ARE BORSTALS? Institutions? Establishments? Or Communities? We have officially said NO to *institution*. There are shades of the old poor law, of the workhouse and the bridewell in the word institution as applied to a borstal. So we call them *establishments*. But does it make any real difference to call them establishments and to change to pastel shades of paint? Do we not, anyway, still call them institutions by sheer force of habit? In any case, does the word *establishment* have any real significance—except in a context very different from that of borstal? The question I am asking here is, can we not turn our institutions into *communities*? It seems to me that it was community that Sir Alexander Paterson was talking about and trying to create. If he ever did create it, it seems to me that it has ceased to exist—and we are impoverished if this is true.

Institutions are cold, impersonal, superficial, conformist, obsessional and compulsive, rejecting,

uncreative. Community, on the other hand, has warmth and depth and acceptance, it breaks down barriers and establishes relationships, it is not anxious and obsessional, but relaxed and free, it is not static, but is dynamic and creative. An institution, with its ramification of superficialities stunts and retards and prevents a person's growth into full manhood. It depersonalises him. It institutionalises him. Which is why we reject the word institution as a description of what borstal is. A community, on the other hand, nourishes personal development, helps men to grow, to communicate, to commune, to have communion. What Paterson seemed to want was that borstals should be communities, not institutions.

Catching up with Paterson

I do not wish nostalgically for a return to the "good old days." I would rather that we decided to take some serious and effective steps to catch up with the second half of the twentieth century. But this does not prevent me from suggesting that we begin with *The Principles of the Borstal System*, loaded as that document is with archaisms and Victorianisms, because I doubt very much whether we have caught up yet with Paterson let alone with the second half of the twentieth century.

I believe that what Paterson was after is what we ought to be after, even though we might express it in different ways and try to establish it with different techniques. Our task is not to resuscitate the old ethos in which people could talk, without embarrassment, about "playing the game . . . following the flag . . . standing by the old ship." But when Paterson said, and believed, that there was that in every borstal boy which "will respond to the appeal made to the British of every sort to play the game, to follow the flag, to stand by the old ship" he was attributing, in the very best way he knew how, to every borstal boy, a personal dignity and according to him a personal respect, which would nourish that boy in his growth into manhood. It is this recognition of personal status, of personal dignity, even in 'Teds,' which must become as important to us as to him—though we have to find expression for this in a different milieu and through a different jargon. When Paterson said, and believed, about borstal staff, that "we are one body of colleagues, intolerant of division by caste or income" he may have accepted a vertical hierarchy of rank in which each man knew his station, but so long as a man remembered his station and did not get "uppity" there could be warmth of personal relationship between Governor and Gatekeeper. If we tend to favour, and

long for, a more horizontal structure of consultation and democratic procedure, and are intolerant of feudalism and autocracy, no matter how benevolent the autocracy may be, none-the-less, the common ground we have with Paterson is the need for mutual, warm respect for one another no matter what our function or role may be, and a corporate concentration on the task in hand instead of individual preoccupation with the promotion race, the search for power, for social status or for money—or simply for the security of being a conformer rather than a rebel.

Environment for growth.

In chapter I of *The Principles of the Borstal System* Paterson makes it clear that borstal training is not a matter for violence or threat, neither is it a matter of breaking spirits or of teaching boys to conform. It is a matter of creating an environment for growth, of entering into a personal relationship, of reciprocity, of trusting, of respecting, of sharing, of having faith in other people. It is not the apparatus, but the kind of people we are, that matters. So, naturally, in the second chapter, Paterson analyses the Staff. One may well wonder, in one's worst moments, whether this second chapter of *The Principles of the Borstal System* should not be claimed to be one of the great satirical writings of the age!

The heart of the matter.

Are we as Paterson draws us? Or are we not, in fact, in danger of being consumed by our hostilities, and by our suspicions of one another, and of one another's motives, in our different grades and roles and specialisations? He would be a blind idealist indeed who would claim that we are all working together for the common task, intolerant of division by caste, or income, or role, or specialisation. I believe that it is precisely at this point that borstal training succeeds or fails. This is the heart of the matter, and until the heart is right the rest are mere gimmicks—a superficial toying with the idea of borstal training. Mere cover-ups for the more intense and serious preoccupations of the rat-race. Not, perhaps a rat-race because the rewards in terms of money and power and social status are less than in other more directly competitive occupations. Not a rat-race, but a kind of mouse-marathon, which can none-the-less be pretty nasty in its own little way.

Integrity or disintegration?

This, then, is my main point, and I will return to it, that the fragmented and, indeed, too often embattled staff life of our institutions or establishments must somehow take on the marks of community, of positive, creative, supportive, personal relationships before the task of training can go ahead with any real sense of

urgency or purpose. All exhortations to urgency must come to nothing until we get this right. There must be integrity at the heart of the thing, there must be integration. And we are, in fact, disintegrated. There is confusion, and clamour, and a great deal of personal insecurity at every level Now, putting aside for the moment any over-introspective consideration of our own personal problems and deep, sinister, psychological motivations, and putting aside also the consideration that though all of us would like more money this is, none-the-less, a well-paid job, social-service-wise. I suppose most of us are attracted to the Prison Service because of what we have come to know of the principles and purposes of the Home Secretary and the Commissioners, and of the new attitudes and experiments about which we have learned. It seems to offer itself as a worth-while job. However, having undertaken the work, one might be excused for having a feeling that one had moved backwards in time—a two-fold experience.

The physical anachronisms.

Firstly, there is the experience of having moved backwards in time in a purely physical sense. Much, physically, is still Dickensian. Physically, much seems, to say the least of it, not to have a contemporary aura. I discovered bathrooms being put in staff houses at a time when the social need was for garages to be attached to houses. Some of us, especially in borstal, are privileged to work for a while in pleasant places, but the buildings in which most of us have to work most of the time are "in themselves quite unfitted to modern conceptions of penal treatment, built as they were, one hundred years ago or more, to serve the purposes of solitary confinement, treadmill hard labour, and brutal oppression. They stand as monumental denials of the principles to which we are committed." The particular reference of these words in the White Paper *Penal Practice in a Changing Society* is to the local prisons. They have, however, a wider application. We can become too accepting of the physical anachronisms, not realising how this environment can degrade inmates and staff alike. This physically restricting drabness and oppressiveness, if we come to accept it as a necessary and continuing factor in our work and our lives reflects itself in us and we become drab or even squalid people in our souls. It stifles gaiety and liveliness and puts men out of sorts with one another.

While one agrees with Paterson that is is better to have "an institution that consists of two log huts in swamp or desert with a staff devoted to their task than a model block of buildings equipped without a thought of economy whose staff is solely concerned with thoughts of pay and promotion." —while one agrees with

this, that it is people and not buildings that are primarily important, at the same time, if the buildings and material conditions themselves are physically symbolic of an archaic and discredited ethos of penal treatment, then men become depressed and not uplifted in the doing of their job.

The non-physical anachronisms.

Secondly, one might be excused for experiencing a movement backwards in time in terms of the ethos of the work in practice as opposed to the ethos of the work in theory. It is not simply, or, indeed, mainly, the physical fabric which monumentally denies the principles to which we are officially committed. Even more monumentally denying these principles, it seems to me, is an archaic residue of moral, spiritual, and intellectual attitudes with their roots in the culture of the nineteenth and early twentieth century. Entrenched, troglodyte attitudes stand in the way of advance—attitudes as archaic and squalid as the old prison buildings themselves.

Historical rapidity of social change.

The Prison Service has been in existence for just over a century. Writing somewhere around 1950, the historian, Toynbee, said that the nature of the life of our people had changed more in the previous hundred years than in the thousand years before that. There had, in ten decades, been the most extraordinary change in the nature of men's lives in this country. In the period from the mid-nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries there came to be felt, for example, the impact of the thinking of men like Sigmund Freud, Charles Darwin, Karl Marx. This renaissance, together with an extraordinary increase in technical virtuosity, has radically changed men's lives. The history of the Prison Service is contained within this hundred years of radical change. The history of borstal is contained within the second half of this remarkable period. Yet the ethos in which we do our work, in the field, despite bravely enlightened words from the top and despite the new knowledge coming into our possession from the human sciences, is shot through with traditional prejudices, platitudes, romanticisms, anecdotal futilities and second-hand value judgments.

The Prison Service, coming into existence when it did, had its physical and ethical roots in the more static millenium before 1850. It was a development of the end of an epoch. Borstal coming into existence when it did, after the turn of the century, when the momentum of change was gathering speed, had its roots in a less static situation. It was, none-the-less, a very different situation from the one in which we find ourselves now. It was, on the face of it, a much less complex situation, in which values and judgments were more assured. Borstal was created and

built up by men of stature and vision and vigour and remarkable insight, but in many ways their task was easier than ours because the ethos in which they worked had a recognisable framework and they stood on what seemed to be solid ground : not upon a quicksand of changing habits and changing values. On this point, Richard Hoggart has written :

"If we look back to the activities of those who were concerned with social problems at the turn of the century, at the sureness with which prospects were assessed and expressed, often in statements which were classics of their kind, or in new social agencies, we are likely to decide that there must have been giants in those days or to wonder whether their problems were simple. Perhaps social and economic needs were in some way easier to decide. It is easier to see a hole in a shoe than to assess the outlook encouraged by the television set which the emancipated worker has set his eyes to. No doubt these earlier documents were given vigour by the more plain relations, to both author and audience, between evident needs and assured or assumed values. But I think they remain vivid and memorable chiefly because of their great intellectual and spiritual energy and breadth."

Now, I think it would be fair to say that we have not noticeably been producing men with the kind of intellectual, spiritual, and practical energy and breadth of insight that Paterson had. But this is not, I believe, because we in our generation are an inferior breed of men. The intellectual acuity, the vigour, the vision, the spiritual depth, the practical idealism are in our midst—but they are straight-jacketed by the very nature of the apparatus itself which seems to force us to live at second-hand, accepting, for practical purposes, stereotyped assumptions, traditional formulations, and this forces us into a kind of hypocrisy, a kind of lip-service which we pay publicly to a scale of values and a way of life which privately we reject.

The relevance or irrelevance of religion.

Take religion, for example, which still officially has pride of place in all borstal training. Paterson says, "All (religious) teaching must relate the great truths of life to the little details so that faith becomes pivotal, the unconscious basis of every act, the colour of life itself..... it should be awarded first place amongst all forms of character training." Many of us might say Amen to that, and yet feel privately and wistfully that we ourselves are missing out precisely at this point. That faith is not pivotal for us, that it is not faith which colours life for us, and we are bored or irritated by the irrelevant, weekly formality of compulsory worship and glad on our week-ends off to stay away

from Church. Many of us might feel that it would be good if our own lives had this solid basis of living faith which could give direction and purpose and meaning to all that we do, but we know that our own lives do not have this. Our lives are coloured by other influences, and we have doubts and hesitations and reservations and faith is not pivotal at all but marginal. Bible-reading, praying, church-going are not our personal cup of tea, but we go on, rather uneasily, paying a pathetic lip service to it in borstal training hoping that it is doing good for the lads somehow, though we can't quite see how.

Some of us quite sincerely reject the religious basis and say so—some who are sincere enough not to prejudice their own integrity by the cant and humbug of lip-service to a basis of training which they cannot accept.

Some of us have a real and deep conviction which *is* pivotal — a twentieth century kind of conviction. But for such, the conventional apparatus of religious observance which is built into training does not offer a satisfactory outlet for the living of their faith, and their state is the most difficult and uncomfortable of all.

Some—few, fortunately—while having no effective conviction themselves, can regard religion in training as a kind of threat, a kind of supernatural penal sanction, a kind of glorified Governor's Report with threat of an eternal Reading at the end of the line!

What is important, I suggest, is not that we should all suddenly go religious, but that we should become honest and stop striking attitudes in public which privately we reject, and stop hypocritically pushing religion as something which is good for the wife and kids and for borstal boys, but of no earthly relevance for ourselves—and start sincerely looking for something which might be good for all of us.

Nostalgia.

The real danger is that we try, nostalgically, to go on living on the expended capital, spiritual and psychological, of the past: that in our confusion we fall back for security upon stereotyped assumptions and second-hand value judgments. The danger is that we become nostalgic for the golden age; for the days in which there seemed to be a stability of purpose and effort and method, rooted in a clear-cut common ethos, a common understanding of the task in hand. The "good old days" in which words which still fascinate us, like loyalty, duty, decency, patriotism, right and wrong, morality, leadership, discipline, obedience, vocation, were precise and meaningful and totally acceptable, and had not got blurred at the edges—when they did not have the ambiguity and ambivalence that they have now. The danger is that we try to hug closer to

ourselves the nice familiar old pattern, now, in fact, formalised and static, grafting on to it here and there such new things as seem to hold some promise: putting new wine in old skins, mending old cloth with new patches, souping-up old Model-T Fords with overdrive and disc brakes. This way we produce nothing but further confusion and frustration, and the new spiritual energy and vision and sincerity which mutedly exists amongst us is not expressed properly because it has very little in common with the old ethos which provides the detailed pattern of the very structure of our service.

Ethical confusion.

"Fings ain't what they used t'be." Winds of change have been blowing strongly for a long time and have created a new human situation which will not be pushed back by all our nostalgic longings.

Our own conventional moral standards, the moral standards of our society, the adult, acceptable standards, are not amongst the things of which young people growing up in this uncertain age can be in any sense sure. Their heritage is not a glorious one, ethically speaking. It is confusion. Everything has changed and is changing —the pattern of the family, the use of leisure, the place of religion, the nature of work, the use of money, the status of young people and of old people, the place and function of women. Through the confusion of the changing of the old order, there is making itself more obvious a new moral tone, a new, developing, social ethos. It is not altogether a change for the worse, nor even mostly a change for the worse. It is, on the whole, if we can see it without nostalgic prejudice, a positive and dynamic and creative change. Our task is to look within the new situations for the growing-points and to define them and develop them without nostalgic reservations. To quote Hoggart again:

> "It is a matter of re-assessing our own view of ourselves, our own depressingly false formulations and romanticisms . . . to take stock of our own lives for growth."

Attitudes and relationships.

I come back now to the point I made earlier (and that Paterson made many years ago) that the heart of borstal training is in the kind of people we are, the attitudes we take, the relationships we have with one another, the common ethos of our purpose.

That there are tensions, and disgruntlements and suspicions and jealousies and intolerances within the structure of our Service we are aware. We are all involved. There are, of course, tensions throughout the whole human situation—within families, amongst neighbours, in industry, between nations, in the Churches. Tension is part of the human situation, with which we

have to go on living. It can be made positive and creative and purposeful if it is used properly—if our attitude towards it is a purposeful attitude. *Apathy* cannot supply a growing-point, and there is apathy in our service. Apathy can grow when hostilities and disgruntlements and suspicions and jealousies are not being discharged in positive, creative ways and there seems no way left except to opt out of effort. They can be discharged, to some extent, by a good hard game on the football field (for those who are fit) or by a bout of hard drinking in the club (for those who are well-to-do). But that is not creative discharge. It solves no human problems. Nor do gossiping or privately grumbling to one another. Nor can keeping people at arm's length or setting up new barriers against them solve the problems. Nor will cynicism or a retreat into simple authoritarianism which puts every man tidily in his place again.

Our work is in dealing with *people*. It it all the more important, then, that we should not be out of sorts with one another and do nothing constructive about it. Staff problems, problems of inter-staff relationships, are more troublesome, more pressing, more intractable than inmate-problems, and sap our energies more. We are, ourselves, institutionalised.

Horizontal relationships.

Activities like camping, canoeing, hostelling, tend to be popular with the staff and lads alike. Not because of any particular virtues these things have in themselves. It is particularly naive to imagine that lads from Liverpool, or Limehouse, such as we have committed to us, just because they happen to have enjoyed five days' hostelling, will rush around the day following their discharge trying to find the Youth Hostel Office to join up: or after five days' camping or canoeing go in urgent search of shops which sell rucsacs and anoraks in preparation for a country week-end. They will not, because of the social situation in which they are rooted. These activities are popular, I suggest, because they break down for a period, the institutional barriers. There is a release of tension, a relaxation, a development of more human, natural, horizontal relationships, a new field of real responsibility and possibility of choice and decision (denied normally both to staff and inmates, despite what Paterson said) and a freedom from the anxiety-creating ramification of rules and regulations which inhibit sincerity and spontaneity. This is their real value, that for once in this training process there is a development of some kind of community. Group counselling, still tending to be gimmicky, seems to take us a stage further as it is an attempt to break down institutional and hierarchical barriers *within* the institution itself, and to create greater sincerity and responsibility of relationship on a longer-term

basis. It is an attempt to create community of some kind within the apparatus itself. These things help to release people from bridled, compulsive, and obsessional behaviour and from play-acting roles .They therefore help boys and men to grow, but things like this must not just be grafted anxiously on to the old pattern then cut out when they threaten the stability and tidiness of the traditional structure. They have, in their full development to replace the old pattern. So I believe.

Asking the right questions.

It is easier to analyse and criticise than to formulate answers. I am not sure that we really have *any* answers. I think that we must first start asking the right questions. We have built so far on a massive ignorance of the true nature of human behaviour. We are only beginning to know what it is that makes men tick. Man has taken a long time to begin to look at himself objectively. The human sciences are still embryonic—but men *are* beginning to ask the right questions about the nature of their own behaviour and we have the beginnings of knowledge to set against prejudice and dogmatism.

I feel that we are engaged in such a fever of "doing things" that I am reluctant to suggest that there are certain things we might be doing. I feel that we need to relax a bit and stop trying to justify ourselves by a multiplicity of works. We need to ease off a bit and become rather less intense about "training" and get down to some basic thinking.

I suggest that we might have a better look at *ourselves* and our *system*

Staff attitudes.

We need, I think, a responsible study on *Staff Attitudes* on the lines of certain study done and presented to us on *Inmate Attitudes*. The two are interlinked in the very nature of the thing. There is a great deal of research going on into the nature of delinquency and crime, and this is good. We need more and more responsible research. But we need research also into the nature of our present penal apparatus and indeed into the whole sociology of punishment so that we may learn more than half the truth. It is more comfortable for us to look at and to analyse criminal or inmate attitudes than it is for us to look critically at our own. We must, however, learn to ask the right questions about ourselves, about our own motives and actions, as well as to ask the right questions about "them."

Roles and functions.

We need some kind of working committee or group to look into the questions of roles and functions and relationships of different members of staff. As Housemasters we have good reason to be anxious

about our task, because increasingly we are not at all sure what it is. If the psychologists are taking over from us the task of character assessment, the statisticians taking over from us the task of prognosis —and both doing it better than we can—and if Tutor Organisers are taking from us the business of education and Physical Education Specialists are pushing us out on the fringe as far as physical jerks and all that kind of thing is concerned, what is left for us? What is our role and function? Within what areas can we attempt to make judgments, responsible decisions, and serious contributions to the task in hand? The whole thing has become so much more complex since Housemasters were invented, that it seems as though a new definition of function and role is necessary—even though that definition should turn out to be that Housemasters are no longer necessary.

Church and community.

The Church, if it is to justify its established intervention must do more to offer us a better pattern of community. It was the Church that gave us the pattern of prison, taking it over, muddle-headedly from the monastery. This monastic pattern, given by the Church for the compulsory reformation and reclaiming of errant men never worked. Gift horses should not be looked in the mouth—but this particular gift horse of the Church should have had a full orthodontic examination. The theology of plucking brands from the burning has been replaced in our time by a more complete theology of community and of relationship, and of the interdependence of men. The Church has much more to offer than the pattern of compulsory public worship and communicants classes. It has much more to offer at a deeper level. If only from repentance for having so terribly blundered in giving us once the wrong pattern, the Church must help now in the creation of a better one.

A new symbolic experiment?

If I may finish on what may appear to be a note of fantasy—I press that something as imaginative, as dramatic, as symbolic, as the Lowdham March is needed at this point—to get us out of the rut. A going out, a setting up of a new kind of place. Preferably not as a march, but on fast transport along a motorway to give it a sense of contemporary urgency. Even perhaps, a convoy of Model-T Fords with overdrive and disc brakes if we could find nothing better. This would require a project—a project of building, most likely, but not, please not, just the building of another institution. The project would need to be staffed by volunteers representing the different grades and specialisations within the service—free, on site, to find their own functions and relationships. These volunteers would be

told that if, at the end of five years, the thing was a dead duck, or if earlier it had become a shambles, they would be looking for other jobs outside the service and would lose pension rights. This would separate the men from the boys amongst us more effectively than anything I can imagine! Their purpose would be to try to create a new kind of community of life and work, in which tasks and experiences were shared, as on the pattern of the Lowdham experiment but at greater depth. To find ways of breaking down the barriers which now divide us from one another, the invisible walls which ramify even in our most open institutions, and to attempt to create or rather, to allow to emerge, new, freer, more positive, more relaxed and more creative types of relationship.

There is vigour, imagination, spiritual vitality, idealism and practical maturity enough, waiting to be released. The volunteers would be forthcoming. We might then move on, without reservations, to the third way Paterson suggested for dealing with "bad lads" and we might become, at least in promise, the kind of people who are, "one body of colleagues, intolerant of division by caste or income .... abandoning sectional disputes and personal feuds and getting on with the work."

A work which could be, and should be, enormously worthwhile, and its own chief reward and satisfaction.

Dear Sir,

This issue carries four letters from readers. Considerable interest has been aroused by Mrs. Pauline Morris's article and some replies have had to be held over until next issue as they were received too late.

Your comments are welcomed by the Editorial Board and should be sent to the Editor by

Wed., May 1st

500 of your words can make a page