Vol. II No. 8 JULY 1963

PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL

Editorial Offices :
H.M. PRISON SERVICE STAFF COLLEGE, LOVE LANE, WAKEFIELD

CONTENTS

Published by The Prison Department of the Home Office and printed at H.M.P. Leyhill, Glos.

Staff Problems

Mrs. Pauline Morris has suggested (this Journal, Jan. 1963)

- **There is a need for a second look at staff training**
- **need to be aware that the conflict between Staff custody and treatment is not as great as it might appear**
- **Status distinctions should be broken down**
- **Improved welfare facilities are needed for the staff**

In the April Journal two readers commented ; many more letters were received too late for printing. We now present a further, and final, selection.

A. Peckham *(Birmingham)*

THERE IS UNDOUBTEDLY a great deal of discontent in the "locals" and the greater part of that discontent stems from the fact that the staff are confused. Their efforts seem to be to no purpose, and there seems to be no ultimate purpose in the policy of *laissez faire*, often interpreted as blind indifference. Many times one will hear, "For all the good we do we might just as well not be here" or "What's the use; put them up in front of the Governor and they get away with it: Seven days privs. and leave them three in a cell. Not worth the bother".

Morale

Morale is desperately low, and these are the audible symptoms. Yet we are not vicious sadists, but in the main, decent kindly men, fairly intelligent, thwarted by aimlessness and lack of policy in the administration. Men who in face of that aimlessness, seek to formulate and impose a common policy of restraint and no nonsense—who are trying, in the face

of indifference, to enforce that common policy for the common good. We sincerely believe that enforcement of this policy will help both the men in our charge and the administration, and restore some sort of order from the chaos and anarchy that pervades the locals at this time. Perhaps this sounds an extreme view, but nevertheless, a majority of staff would endorse it. The aim is to teach the recidivist to be polite and obedient, to conform to an accepted standard, and perhaps to leave prison a little better man, socially more acceptable than on reception: thereby justifying our existence and in part satisfying the high ideals of modern penology.

Frustration and low morale come from the fact that authority does not endorse and uphold that policy, nor does it offer a suitable alternative. To the officer on the landing and in the party it seems to offer nothing.

Security of employment? The price—frustration and boredom can be too high, and any officer knows at least two simple ways of landing up on the wrong side of the gate. Certainly security of employment is a factor, but a sense of purpose, even of vocation should be an even greater factor in this work. Most of us have either one of these latter in good measure, despite the bitter articles in the *Prison Officer's Magazine*.

Put into their proper perspective, they are inarticulate cries of anguish and frustration. The extreme analogy, surely, is the terrorism of African opponents of Apartheid. The frustration, the lack of satisfactory explanation by authority, the explosive reaction against the arrogance of that authority. Yet in neither case does authority consider itself arrogant or blameworthy. They are actuated by the highest ideals, and do what they consider best for "the native".

But the officer is neither one thing nor the other. To the "native" he is the symbol of authority, and to the authority he is—what? An anachronism? We don't know. We feel like the corn between the upper and nether millstones. All our enthusiasm, our initiative, and our sympathy, both for cause and our charges is slowly, inexorably being ground out of us, and we are afraid of ending up as sub-human automata. Some of the weaker ones are ground right out of the gate. Some (the stronger?) go before they are ground down. But the rest of us struggle, to retain our individuality and ideals. And we are afraid we may lose the struggle. Hence the discontented rumblings of the gate lodge and the officers mess.

The Prison Officer's Magazine is like the gauge on the petrol tank of my car. Not a true meter of anything, but a wildly inaccurate indication that can be used as a pointer of the true measure by an experienced reader. And to extend the analogy, the remedy is simple. For the petrol gauge, a new transmitter; for the service, some new means of communicating the true

state of affairs. Both must of necessity remain remotely controlled. The Prison Department must be remote from the landing officer; the impersonal semi-deified "They".

The regime in the Prison Service must remain authoritarian for the same reason. When the emergency arises, and the chief, or a senior shouts "Jump," we must all jump, immediately and in unison. That is simple, logical, and acceptable to all of us. We are parts of a machine controlled by disembodied intellect, and leave our emotions at the gate lodge with our key tallies. We also accept the paradox of "Use your loaf—obey all the rules" and rely on your own good sense in resolving the conflicts. Reform—rule book—best interests of all. Miracles are a daily occurrence to the average officer. Yet despite this we inevitably arrive back at the eternal question—to what end are we working? Shall we, in any given circumstances, consider the best interests of the prisoner. Bend or break the rigid rule and take a hell of a rocket from chief or Governor. "Mr..... you have no right, etc." Philosophically we do our best, and accept many more kicks than halfpence. But we are human, despite what has been said to the contrary; our training, tact, acceptance of the status quo, all inhibit us from taking a swift kick at authority. It isn't lack of courage, but a doctrine, a dogma, that we must *never* in any circumstances undermine authority, that inhibits and restrains the brief obscene reply, or the reasonable and reasoned reply that could often be tendered. Rarely, except in the formal "Please Explain" is anything in the way of explanation requested, nor is it offered. But we still feel the need for sympathy or of sympathetic guidance, and what more natural than to turn to one's colleagues in mess or gatehouse or branch meeting. Our ego is bolstered, and no harm is done to the hierarchy.

Mrs. Morris covers admirably the basic points in the context of containment and reform, and the further divergence of social service, but she does not sufficiently highlight the many other divergencies and frictions. Perhaps because they are legion, and, again paradoxically, fall under the general heading of "Communication", and are outside the scope of her survey.

I have tried to state the point of view of the average officer both as regards policy and the hierarchy.

In lieu of a policy, we formulate one and adhere to it. It is simple and positive. We recognise a chain of command within the hierarchy and give to it our support and loyalty. Officer, P.O., Chief Officer, Governor—each with its own rights and responsibilities, all interdependent and all working to the ideals of containment and reform in their own way. We expect our charges to recognise and conform to that chain of command, and feel resentful when we find them bypassing it. "Shortcircuiting" with its implica-

tion of damage is perhaps a better word in this context. However, the simplest example is perhaps that of a prisoner, refused extra letters or visits, by P.O., and sometimes Governor too, getting them from the poor old padre or well meaning welfare officer.

We feel that he has obtained these things by guile, and in some subtle way undermined the already crumbling props of authority and autocracy. Often, the prisoner feels exactly the same. A master stroke of one-upmanship. So we take it as a personal slight, and curse the chaplain and the welfare. This does not mean that we hate them, but it does add to the confusing state of things, and to our frustation, to the detriment of the common aim.

I doubt if the promotion system is really a cause of discontent. The grumbling is something of a safety valve. Something that can be sniped at without doing any damage to the system—the hierarchy.

The outstanding "Junior" has his chance of accelerated promotion direct into the governor grade. Any system of promotion has its inherent injustices, and in the main promotion based on seniority, merit and selection, is a fair and reasonable system. The ancient dictum "We can't all be gaffers" is generally accepted.

With regard to entry to the staff course, I must express a purely personal view. Feelings are high on this very delicate subject. Surely though, the main cause of discontent is not that outsiders block the promotion to the governor grade of chief officers and others. It is that we in the service feel that we have sufficient bright promising men in the junior officer ranks to fill all the A.G.2 vacancies from the officer ranks. The idea of grey-haired chiefs becoming junior A.G.2's is, to say the least, ludicrous, but is it really impossible to find the requisite number of intelligent young men to train from the basic grades? Surely the basic material is there: A sense of vocation, a high degree of intelligence, maturity, self-control, flexibility, integrity, and the will to succeed, seem to me to be the basic requisites. And surely, except that the Commissioners are prepared to accept a low standard of educational attainment, these qualities are the ingredients for a successful officer. As to that vexed perennial of the "Country House Test" most officers are convinced that it is designed precisely to test those qualities that Mrs. Morris states that it is not. Social acceptability and adaptability. What should I believe? Will the fact that I can meet the Duke or the Dustman on reasonably equal terms see me through? Or will the fact that I much prefer an after lunch cup of tea to the proferred demi-tasse of Turkish coffee fail me? These are very real terrors to the aspiring perspiring candidate. And though the circular from Horseferry House is a model of brevity, it won't relieve his anxiety. Once again "They" are accused of all the

horrors of the Inquisition. What is the dark secret of the "Country House"?

Another facet of the same problem—why cannot we try the same system that worked so well in the Services in war-time and post-war years? Namely let all would-be staff course candidates do, say, a year on the landings as a basic grade officer, working the landings, the shops, the courts and other duties of the local prisons. It would give him an insight into the problems that beset the staff of these prisons, and an absolutely unrivalled opportunity to study the workings of that peculiar animal—the discipline officer. It would give him something that he may never otherwise earn—the respect born of the knowledge that he knows the other side of the picture, not just the outer office and the centre.

But both this problem and our red herring of the promotion roster, have led Mrs. Morris from the true scent. The blue eyed boy is always a subject for cynical comment, yet most of us admit the fact that at some time or other we all have our brief moments of glory when our flaxen hair and blue eyes ensure us a few plums. As to social relationships outside the service, is the survey a true assessment? People in similar occupations tend to have similar interests, and to band together in social circles. Whether they be millionaire stockbrokers or itinerant tinkers doesn't matter. This may be semi-compulsive but is still a fact. If a prison officer wishes to make friends "outside" it is not difficult. My experience is that as we are so different from our public image, after some initial constraint we are respected for our mature matter-of-fact approach to life and for our maturity, and most people respect our reticence with regard to our work. Again the public image of the work is grossly distorted, but works in our favour. Is there any real harm in taking advantage of this distortion, and being a modest hero? Especially when all sorts of minor problems in the social sphere can be solved by this means.

The public is even more confused than the administration and the staff about the policies and administration in prisons, especially after the recent spate of sensational literature, and ill informed criticism in sundry newspapers who carry sensation to the point of bigotry. Yet no voice has been raised in our defence, and we have been expressly forbidden to voice any protest. So, once again the gatelodge philosopher is heard, spreading acid criticism of our detractors, and the administrators who force stoicism upon us. C.N.D., the Howard League, almost anything that has to do with us, and has the public ear, is lumped together and consigned to the depths.

This does not detract in any way from our admiration of the idealists in the various movements. But it does enable us to leave the gatelodge for our various tasks in a sane and balanced frame of mind. All of these outbursts should be

recognised for what they are. Emotional carthartics. Their purpose? Simply to save any further crumbling of the facade.

Something of the same applies to the apparent distortion or misinterpretation of the words reform and rehabilitation. I doubt if there is any real misunderstanding. Some very slight distortion may occur at times, but this is often deliberate. Partly a gentle dig at authority, or from a sense of grievance. Occasionally, when taking up a point in conversation, there may be gross distortion. But is this not satire rather than cynicism, or may it not be a deliberately distorted reflection that screens a true image? Deliberate, from the point of view that the speaker would rather not reveal his true feelings to an undeserving authority. A man who hasn't much confidence left and feels "left out".

The remedy is obvious. Give the man a little more confidence in authority. He wants to believe. He doesn't want "Them" to come down and help bang 'em up. That would destroy his illusion, but if he is told what "They" have in mind, and asked to give it a try, and then comment on it, then his confidence is restored in part. If he finds that authority listens seriously to his comments and criticisms, it won't be long before his confidence is fully restored, and the enquirer will see the true reflection of the man and the job and, perhaps an improved end product. We can't give the psychiatrist a chance, nor any one else a chance, unless or until we know what they want a chance at. Meanwhile, we become more and more confused and bitter, because we feel that we are the only ones in step. Or that we are consistent, but "They" have gone soft.

The sir-ing and para-militarism are unimportant. A part of the facade of the autocratic regime. "Jack knows that he is as good as his masters". He touches his forelock, and his tongue is in his cheek. Nobody is hurt, and the facade is kept intact.

With regard to extended welfare, is this an important issue? If Jack has a problem, and a good master, who better to help him. Although if the master suggests another sympathetic ear, it would be pleasant to know that we are all in the same service. I am inclined to accept, with some reserve, that it might not be a bad thing. I might need a shoulder to cry on one day, and if I do I'd rather it was a comparatively strange one, rather than one I might find beside me when trouble comes inside.

Fundamentally, the problems facing us in closed prisons would be resolved by much more informative and informed direction from the administrators set over us. Most of the tensions would be eased, many frictions would disappear, and morale would improve immensely, if we all knew what it was all about, and could all pull in the same direction.

Whether the policy is *laissez faire* or "flog 'em and top 'em"

does not matter so long as we all understood the policy. A man will take a smack in the eye cheerfully, if it furthers his cause. But he gets very angry over the same smack in the eye, and lashes out when he can't see why he shouldn't be allowed to retaliate.

Referring back a little. The plaintive cry "Give the psychiatrists a chance" need never have been uttered—if only someone had explained that we were going to try a new approach thus;—

With the positive link that I envisage between the upper and lower levels of the hierarchy, the psychiatrists could have two chances even. *Provided they make application through the proper channels!*

OFFICERS TRAINING SCHOOL

P. C. J. Prior *(Leyhill)*

THE PICTURE is out of all proportion to the facts. Staff shortage and overcrowding are facts, not supposition. The authorities, and the officers, are well aware of these facts, as many reforms agreed by both sides are held up by this shortage. Most officers start duty early, and the normal working day in the prison is spread over ten and a half hours; evening activities cause a further lengthening of the day to thirteen hours, the intention being compensation of time the following day, but in most cases this cannot be granted because of shortage of staff for Escorts and Courts. This may cause an officer to be further extended in time to cover these; then evening duty; then straight duty. Weekend off? Oh no—called in. Is it surprising that this situation, multiplied many times, causes some officers to be reluctant to accept new ideas. Reluctance not to the principle, but to the practice.

A New Idea

I suggest that some of the well meaning people who say that this or that activity is necessary to the rehabilitation of the offender, should come along in uniform for a few hours each week to assist, and some of the Prison Department's worries would be over, and the hard pressed officer would be able to rest a bit. After all, if a person is interested in the Police, he becomes a Special Constable; Hospital, a Hospital Auxiliary; Fire Brigade, an Auxiliary Fireman, and so on, but Prisons, not a soul. Theories, ideals, but no action, except to add to the officer's day.

Mrs. Morris says, "Policy is not understood by the discipline officer, who is rarely well informed." I think the officer is the best informed, obviously better than Mrs. Morris. He learns that the basis of

his work is Rule 6, and works to fulfil the ideal it states, but the practical application is, on most occasions, the stumbling block.

Relaxed discipline is mentioned, but here many mistakes are made by wrong interpretation of policy, especially when interpreted as it is in this article. Policy and principles of administration could not be more clearly stated than in Rule 29, and every officer is in possession of a copy of this rule.

The training of officers is challenged, and a mention is made of a failure to break down a barrier against progress. This is entirely wrong. The system is progressing and will advance all the time. This can only be with the full co-operation of the staff, but the restriction is only shortage of staff.

Forty-Five Qualities

The study of the new officer requires that the instructors and others—Governors, Chief Officers, Principal Officers—men of vast experience, must find at least forty-five qualities that will be required at some time during his career. We know these qualities by experience. These have probably never been thought of, but let me list them, not necessarily in order.

Honesty
Stability
Leadership
Intelligence
Reliability
Bearing
Obedience
Initiative
Humility
Fairness
Respect
Loyalty
Tact
Common Sense
Wisdom
Humanity
Astuteness
Temperance
Patience
Enthusiasm
Firmness
Aptitude
Dedication
Responsibility
Decisiveness
Alertness
Adaptability
Self-discipline
Disciplinarian
Punctuality
Personality
Perseverance
Security
Control
Courtesy
Benevolence
Discretion
Sense of Humour
Sympathy
Good Physique
Good Education
Durability
Genuine desire to help
Example
Ambition

Material of this kind is the best that can be secured in the country, but only experience will mould all these qualities into the ideal officer, but of course I differ from the writer on the meaning of "ideal". My ideal officer has acquired the above qualities by experience. "Experience" proves itself, especially in security prisons.

What does the writer regard as her "ideal"? Must the officer accept all that research workers, and others of no real experience say, without question? Is he to forget that he has a duty by statute to the public, to keep a man secure? Is he to forget he has to see that the prisoner has an obligation to the community? The object of imprisonment is to punish and to train. Punishment is the right of the courts, and training belongs to the penal system.

What is training? The basis must be discipline. This is seen as saluting, sir-ring and polishing

buttons. To object to the standard of discipline appears to me to be an encouragement to indiscipline, because these things lead to a standard, and an example, and are only the beginning. Discipline means to train. How? To require a correct attitude in the prisoner, to the community, to the work, to law and order, and an effort on the prisoner's part to improve his conduct and deportment. It must be constructive and positive, and this is the obligation that the prisoner must appreciate, then the ability to distinguish right from wrong will be implanted and confirmed.

The Prison Officers Association has come in for an attack from the author. Why? The relationship between the official side and the staff side is in harmony. The writer should read the history of the Association and see what has been achieved. Obviously, articles were used, but no "research" has been made. Grumbling is an occupational hazard, not only in our service but elsewhere. I wonder if the constitution of the association has been read. The objects: — "To promote and protect the interests of the members, and to regulate their conditions of employment with the employing body". This is done, and is appreciated by both sides.

Why quote individual articles? The executive are not necessarily in agreement with the views stated. This is made quite clear and, after all, it is a wonder we have not had more. What does the author think might have been written by a very angry officer about "reform", that once said his children had asked, "Who is the man that comes home at the weekends", leaving home at 6.0 a.m. and getting home most evenings at 9.0 p.m. and 10.0 p.m., therefore leaving before they were up, and getting home after they were abed. So much could be said both ways, but these conditions are well known and the difficulties are appreciated by both sides. I don't think anyone should try to cause dissension when so much is being achieved by use of the accepted negotiating machinery.

Reference is made to the ordinary officer, the average officer, and his difficulty in understanding the difference between "rehabilitation" and "training", and his reference to these as "reform". Why not? After all, "rehabilitation" means reinstating in a former capacity, and "training" means to teach obedience. "Reform" means to change for the better. Who is confused? Any confusion on the part of the staff is, caused by a wrong interpretation of policy, and interference with it by inexperienced personnel and, because of this, training is seen by the offender as leniency and, instead of firmness in its application, which is not incompatible with benevolence, it is allowed to be seen as sloppy sentimentality, but the officer is not confused about the fact that the

offender earns his release by good conduct and industry.

Training of officers is carried out with every essential point in the treatment of the offender covered, but initial training is limited to instruction and examination, and experience cannot be taught. This must be gained as the United Nations minimum rules state, "After entering on duty, and during their career, the personnel shall maintain, and improve their knowledge and professional capacity". Also, I would direct attention to Paragraph 61—"The treatment of the offender should emphasise not their exclusion, but their continuing part in the community." Community agencies should therefore be enlisted wherever possible to assist the staff of the institutions in the task of social rehabilitation of the prisoner, mark the point, to assist, not to obstruct, or to cause differences of opinion, to the detriment of the penal system.

Illegal

As for the Discipline Code, what bunkum to talk of differentiation between one act and another. Cannot the writer understand that what she suggests is against the law? Every act, after all, has a consequence. I wonder if she has any idea where, if the suggestion were adopted, the act would end, and the consequence begin.

Mrs. Morris refers to prisoners considered as "difficult". I would refer her to the report of the Franklin Committee, where it will be seen that officers of experience in prisons, were fully aware of what "difficult" prisoners were, and the Committee accepted their recommendations for special establishments, and I don't think she will deny that these establishments have assisted and are assisting in the treatment of the offender.

The question of promotion is used to insult officers with regard to their standard of education, but apart from this, the officer knows and the Directors know that the best man for the Governor grade is the experienced one, the Chief Officer, but most of these men are reaching retiring age by the time they reach C.O. rank, therefore there is no career value to them to be raised to this rank. The idea of direct promotion from the ranks on merit has been discussed and as far back as 1948 we endeavoured to agree on a scheme acceptable to both sides. The idea was to promote younger officers by merit, by accelerated promotion. The Association could not accept this, because it could not be guaranteed that officers promoted to Principal Officer, and to Chief Officer, would secure appointments to Governor rank. This would cause a blockage in the higher subordinate ranks to the detriment of the older officer.

The picture is not so bad as Mrs. Morris would make it, and when coloured properly, and in the correct perspective, it is quite good. I see a healthy system emerging, with the officer in a professional capacity.

R. J. Evans *(Wandsworth)*

I FEEL COMPELLED to write and express my thanks for a magnificent article from a person who has obviously studied the subject with meticulous attention. The editorial board, too, deserves the highest praise for being so open minded in allowing such a controversial article to be printed.

One would not presume to try and improve on the article, but I believe there is room to amplify certain points raised. 'Staff problems', she says, 'are never very easy to resolve', but this is far from true. Most of the problems that arise and cause friction and resentment are very often brought about by the method of administration, albeit a benevolent one. When decisions are made mainly on the grounds of expediency, discontent, insecurity and apathy follow naturally. In this modern age expediency seems to be paying a greater part in all our lives, sometimes to the exclusion of integrity.

One must agree with the views of the Chairman and the late Sir Lionel Fox regarding the training and effective use of staff and the high priority given to them. However, Mrs. Morris faults the service when she observes that what is taught at the college falls short of what is actually carried out at many establishments. It would seem that all training should be carried out with a view to putting into practice what has been taught and all establishments should carry on and broaden out the ideas and teaching already given. This means to think and discuss creatively should be encouraged without fear of censure; in this way a real diversified staff could come into being which would surprise many people with its awareness of the penal problems. Everyone is capable of contributing something if only our morbid concern with keeping our 'noses clean' was substituted for something more constructive, then perhaps we shall have a service in which 'unity with diversity' is a working reality.

Having attracted and trained new officers, the next step, if we are to use them effectively, is to retain them. To do this the building or acquiring of new quarters needs to be given a priority too, so that all these officers fully realise that they are necessary to the service.

Referring to our lines of communications, these should be one of the main props of our service. All should participate in the effective running of the establishment, all should have the 'know-how' of what is going on or about to be introduced. Ideas and opinions should flow constantly, and our conception of always playing 'safe' radically altered.

Her observations on promotion and the suspicion she mentions are an indictment on the service. Whether real or imaginary, it is essential for good relationship that this doubt should be eliminated.

I feel sure that this article by

Pauline Morris was intended as constructive criticism and we should be 'big' enough to accept it as such.

P. M. Burnett. (*Pentonville*)

IT WAS IN this "maximum security" prison, I believe, that Pauline Morris did a large part of the research on which presumably her article was based. And in this prison, housing a population and services half as large again as it was built 120 years ago to house, no doubt it would not be hard for the discerning eye to pick out a number of things for valid criticism. But the picture of staff presented is scarcely a fair one.

Self praise being no recommendation, I have hesitated to write, but living and working here, one cannot forbear making a comment. And, anyway, who else is going to make it?

While not all may share the views of the Avant Garde, the staff today, as a body, are modern, patient and understanding in their handling of prisoners. They do not have to rely on uniform for their quiet authority. Their good man management leads to an equally good relationship with all but the lunatic fringe. And this good human relationship is more valuable than any gimmicks or "pie in the sky" schemes. They know this and consequently morale is high.

But how much better the PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL is for a little provocative controversy—provided it is not too long.

L. F. Beale. (*Portsmouth*)

HAVING READ only excerpts in the National Press from the articles by Pauline Morris, I was amazed when I read the full article as it was published in the Journal. I must confess to a feeling that the lady knew very little before I read the Journal, but she has obviously made a very careful study of staff problems and is to be congratulated on her fine survey. As one of the officers who has reached the point of frustration that makes it necessary to leave the service in the near future, may I offer a resumé of personal experience of a period of nearly five years.

After over twenty years as a marine engineer and having been involved in both civil and service social welfare work for a number of years, the urge to consider some sort of social service as a career after leaving the sea led me to studying the recruiting literature for the Prison Service, and applying for an appointment. I pass hastily over the initial training period, where a man must sit with tongue in cheek and acknowledge that he is learning, and therefore ignore

the fact that he intends to be regarded as a complete idiot. This is accepted as part of the training, and after all, success at the training School being all important, both humility and tact must be exercised. Promotion prospects are assured in the literature so one will not always have to be quite so servile. Promotion! Here I would cross swords with Pauline Morris, and would go further and say that very few of the uniformed staff know sufficient about it.

Having joined as a uniformed member one finds that one has to wait two years before being allowed to sit an examination for promotion to the Assistant Governor grade. One can however apply to be considered for the Open Competition at any time, so the "back door" is available to serving officers as well. Qualifications are of course necessary in order to be selected for interview in this competition and I would refute the statement that the prison officer is usually at a disadvantage educationally. It implies that an educated man will not join as an officer in the first instance, and while this may have been the case a few years ago, it is certainly not true of the Service nowadays.

Having been selected for interview however, the officer is in open competition with outside applicants to undergo an interview of some 35 to 45 minutes. I found this interview to be conducted on a very fair basis generally, by people who were primarily Civil Servants, until the questioning passed to a member of the Prison Service. Previous questioners had asked the normal questions one expects in an interview of this sort, but the opening gambit of the Prison Service official and his follow up went thus:

Q. You are a Prison Officer. (There are many ways of making this short statement, but the scorn attached to it had to heard to be believed).
A. Yes sir.
Q. You are serving at ..... Borstal?
A. Yes sir.
Q. What job are you doing there?
A. I've spent the past few months as gatekeeper sir.
Q. Oh! Now I went to a prison once and rang the bell at the gate—a small peep hole opened and a face appeared. The owner of the face yelled, *"AND WHAT DO YOU WANT"*. Do you behave in this manner?

It appeared perfectly obvious to me that I might just as well leave the room, but I naturally attempted to answer his method of questioning to the best of my ability. It came as no suprise however to be informed a few weeks later that I could not be accepted. The following year, having successfully completed two years service, the opportunity presented itself to try for promotion within the Service as well as attempt to be interviewed for the Open Competition. In preparation for this, evening classes

at a Technical College studying Social Service seemed to be advantageous. Working on a shift system however, the onus was on myself to be able to attend every lecture, by seeking the co-operation of fellow officers to exchange shifts with me every other week. This was extremely difficult and consequently some lectures were missed, but in spite of this, reasonable marks were obtained for test papers set at intervals, and a lot was learned. With this added knowledge, plus a further year of experience as an officer as well as the same qualifications that permitted my being interviewed the first year, it came as some surprise to be informed that I would not be accepted for interview again. Nil Desperandum—try the Service approach for promotion. Here the pattern differs.

Like Mrs. Morris, the Prison Department consider the officer educationally retarded, and instead of only filling in an application form and being selected for interview, an educational exam is set as a first hurdle. Success in this entails being summoned to Wakefield for 48 hours and this is what I presume is referred to as the Country House Test. During this time one is interviewed personally by officials, and subjected to group discussions in the presence of a band of invigilators. The outcome of this can be the opportunity to commence a six months' course with those selected from the Open Competition. Here of course the serving officer is in direct competition with the 'outsiders'. There appears to be something drastically wrong with the serving officer when one considers that in 1962, of those who sat the educational exam some 39 passed, and yet after the 48 hours at Wakefield only five were accepted to commence the six months' course. Only five officers suitable for promotion out of a total of over 5,000. I would not subscribe to the thought that the failures lacked social adaptability and confidence, but would suggest that having these officers already in the service, there is no necessity to promote them when the Governor grades can be recruited by taking men who would not consider the service as a career in a subordinate rank, even though promotion prospects are advocated. Let us consider the prospects of a man who like myself has made the maximum of two attempts allowed and been unsuccessful. The only promotion left is, in the first instance, to the exalted rank of Principal Officer. Ten years' service is the first qualification before being allowed to take the necessary exam. If successful, one's name is placed at the bottom of a roster and at present wait from four to five years before being upgraded. So a wait of from fourteen to fifteen years is unavoidable. The wait of ten years before sitting the exam is a comparatively new innovation, as previously one could pass professionally after three years. Of course one receives a rise in pay now on being successful in the ten year test, and in order to get this, the man who had passed

the three year must requalify. There now exists a state of affairs whereby a man can sit the ten year test in company with one who has already passed the three year—the three year man fails but is still promoted before the other chap who may have passed! The P.O.A. executive who give this state of affairs their blessing and insist on promotion by seniority and so called experience, are obviously at fault. The fact must be faced that the semi-literate Principal Officer is still with us. This is no derogatory remark, as without doubt the man could probably quote rules and regulations and is a very useful chap but outside of this .... what? The dice are heavily loaded against the man joining the Service today with ambition, and it would appear that he is fated to spend a long number of years as a turnkey.

Now this expression has long since passed away, but in the main, the Prison Officer's job is just that. The treadmill has been superseded by the mail bag or mat making, but the officer's job is primarily security, and outside of open institutions, the locking and unlocking of doors occupies the greater part of the working day. A recent check on the number of times my own key turned in locks during one shift—and this at a Borstal— reached 150 before I gave up keeping account. During the shift on no less than six occasions the wing was checked and each inmate accounted for visually. I do not doubt the necessity for this, and only narrate it to emphasise the role of custodian.

The officer-inmate relationship has of course improved a great deal in recent years and many reasons are put forward for this, but might I suggest that the principal reason for this is the junior officer. Tradition dies hard for the old timers, and it is the newly joined man who succeeds most in improving relationships. The prison psychologist might suggest that group work has somehing to do with it, but I find this difficult to believe. Having been privileged to be present in a group at the Henderson Hospital where group work can be seen operating at maximum efficiency, no comparison exists in the Prison Service. Personal experience with the borstal inmate reveals their topic of conversations as mainly sex and filth, followed a close second by a warm hearted discussion directed as a personal attack on a member of the staff. Benefit gained appears to be nil and personal problems are strictly infra dig. Or is it that I find myself lacking in the role of group counsellor! With the tendency to run establishments on psychological lines and the flooding of the service with both professional and pseudo psychologists, it would be interesting to see the results obtained were an establishment to be completely staffed by these people. For all deliberate breaches of necessary rules, an hour on a psychiatrist's couch might be a greater deterrent than

loss of privileges or remission. Or would the recidivist go to greater extremes to remain in the safe keeping of the prison walls?

The amount of money being spent to improve the lot of the inmate is incredible. At my establishment (built 1875), a new gymnasium has been erected at a cost of some £1,200, a recreation room modernised at considerable expense to include a full size billiard table and other amenities, and all inmates' rooms (not cells nowadays) being redecorated in pastel shades. This is all probably long overdue, but the officer who has the duty of sleeping in the institution at the gate, is provided with a room that has not seen paint for years, a disgustingly hard bed and a roof over his head that has no respect for rain. In this he spends the night, on call at all times and has to rise to let into the institution a member of the governor grades who may decide to pay a night visit. This could happen not once but twice, and for this duty the officer is rewarded with the princely sum of 6s. 6d.—surely the cheapest night watchman in the country!

The question of pay however is always a subject of controversy. In very few walks of life is a man contented with his earnings and he will always attempt to obtain an increase. When a man asks for a reduction in the hours he works, he doesn't wish to work for less hours—his object is to be paid at overtime rates for the hours worked over a basic number. The P.O.A. executive would disagree with this statement on principle, but it is nevertheless true. One need only look at the case of Chief Officers to prove it. Until they were put on a fixed salary the hours a number of them spent at work were legion, but with the advent of the fixed salary an 84 hour fortnight is almost rigidly adhered to. In the absence of the Chief Officer the senior Principal Officer assumes the role and doubtless puts in hours that are totally unnecessary, which raises his wage invariably to above that of the Chief's salary. I must emphasise that this may not be general but is a personal observation. Similarly, other Principal Officers assume a higher status on the slightest pretext and work hours as they wish. However, in an institution that is happily, completely staffed, the discipline officer is simply compelled to work on a weekend that should be his free time, as his only overtime. For this he is then forced to accept in part payment, hours off duty during week days. I cannot see that a Saturday or Sunday spent on duty can be compensated by hours off during the week. If a man asks for it and can be spared then there is no argument, but if he feels no necessity to take the time off, then payment in full should be allowed for the overtime worked, in the same way as Principal Officers prefer the money to the time.

Petty authority is rife in my experience and one of the biggest hazards one has to contend with. The senior officer who is acting as Principal Officer and the Principal

Officer who is acting as Chief Officer or even takes the guise of acting as Housemaster or Assistant Governor, is a positive menace. The armed services have no comparisons with these men—a complete change has come over them—their knowledge remains static but the role they play has to be seen to be believed.

The question of quarters is a good subject for discussion. In my own case, and I have no doubt that in a number of other cases, a man joining the service is already installed in his own house. He must be prepared to be mobile when he joins if he cannot be appointed to an institution near his home. Having spent a number of years paying mortgage and interest rates this presents something of a problem. On being posted away—a distance of some sixty miles in my own case and with no hope of obtaining quarters—the situation was accepted and a move into bachelor accommodation with casual journeys home also accepted. This is not good enough though, as an allowance is paid to compensate for the separation only as long as the effort is made to reunite the family. One is asked why one's house is not sold and a new one bought in the new area—the difference in the price of property in the two areas is not taken into account. Again, if one has teenage children in the throes of G.C.E. exams who may be seriously affected by a change in schools—this is not considered. One must make every effort to bring one's wife and family to the vicinity of his employment in spite of the Departments' difficulty to provide quarters. One can and does, fill in the necessary forms with white lies while attempting to be posted nearer to home. One is infinitely better off financially in quarters, although there are naturally compensations in buying one's own house, but without doubt the arguments concerning quarters will be with the service for a long number of years to come.

As a very junior officer in length of service, these then are a considered view of some of the frustrations that leads one to seek other avenues in life and return to voluntary work in the social field.

ROUTLEDGE AND KEGAN PAUL are to publish *'Prison'* a symposium edited by GEORGE MIKES. Announcing this, they say, "This may be a unique generation, which has so widely felt the full range of suffering. It is common in London or New York to spend evenings in the company of people who were prisoners of the Japanese, of Hitler, of the Hungarian Communists—or of their own stress and breakdown. Prison, in some form, is the symbol of it." This book is an attempt to discover what has been learnt, by those who have known it, of this whole range of prison experience—taking prison to be any form of enforced separation from the world of normal life. Thus there are chapters on mental asylum and hospital, as well as political prison and concentration camp. And the emphasis is on the return rather than the experience. What is the lesson of that time of separation? Having travelled to the end of fear, was it the death of fear—or its exposure? That is the question each author was invited to answer.

Future of Preventive Detention

R. S. TAYLOR

THE ADVISORY COUNCIL on the Treatment of Offenders who, in a recent report recommended the abolition of Preventive Detention, drew heavily on evidence supplied by members of the Prison Service, Home Office Research Unit and Cambridge Institute of Criminology, as well as other sources. Reports by H.O.R.U. and Dr. D. West (Cambridge) were published shortly after the A.C.T.O. findings had been made public.

In place of Preventive Detention the Council suggests that (1) the Courts should be able to pass a sentence of up to ten years imprisonment on persistent offenders; (2) the Prison Department should provide a new type of institute, catering particularly for offenders of inadequate personality and (3) that homes or hostels should be set up where persistent offenders might live on discharge.

The Home Office Research Unit report is based on an analysis of all offenders who were eligible for P.D. in 1956, only a small proportion of whom (one in eight) actually received it. Far from including a high proportion of difficult and dangerous prisoners, for whom maximum security and close control are essential, (as stated in Prisons and Borstals 1957), it is notable that these men rarely commit the most serious crimes; robberies, large scale frauds or serious violence being almost entirely absent. Yet when Preventive Detention was first introduced, the Home Office had explained that it was not the intention for people who were a nuisance to society rather than a danger to society, to receive the sentence.

This study recognises three distinct groups of offenders who have been given Preventive Detention; the largest group being the persistent petty thief; secondly those responsible for breaking and entering and lastly a mixed group of violent offenders together with the big-time property offenders.

There is a school of thought which considered that P.D. served as a deterrent but the rate of reconviction shows no decrease at the point where a further sentence could make the offender liable to P.D. Furthermore, there is no evidence that P.D. differs in effectiveness from either short sentences or long sentences often given to persistent offenders; the overall reconviction rate for all persistent

offenders regardless of length or type of sentence being about 70 per cent.

After making a comparison between those men who received P.D. and those who were eligible but received other sentences, the report examines the effectiveness of the Advisory Board, sitting to determine whether the offender should enter third stage and be released after serving two-thirds of his sentence, the last few months being spent in prison hostel, or remain in prison until he has completed five-sixths of his sentence. The purpose of the Board was to select those who are less likely to commit crimes again but in practice it was found that the men who were released after serving two-thirds of their sentence were at liberty for slightly longer periods than those who did not get an early discharge, but that in the long run the failure rate of both groups was similar, being approximately 70 per cent. The Advisory Board would have done no worse had they drawn the names from a hat. It is a sobering thought that for those of us who believe that successes and failures can be predicted, such predictions are likely to be no better than chance. It was noted that behaviour in prison was found to bear no relation to a man's progress on release.

The Cambridge study is complementary to that of the Home Office Research Unit. Dr. West's work is based on a careful enquiry into 50 P.D.'s and 50 recidivists who were not serving P.D. but who had comparable records. The non-P.D.'s had in common that at some stage of their criminal career they had been at liberty for four years. An extensive interview was carried out with each inmate and a social worker visited the closest living relative of all but ten men who refused to give their consent. Most were glad to see the social worker and were eager for advice on how they should behave towards the prisoner. Dr. West found that amongst the non-P.D.'s group 20 out of 50 men had successfully evaded detection, whilst the remainder had genuine gaps. The predominant feature of these men was that they were very dependent, inadequate men who did reasonably well in a protective, sheltered environment where there was someone who could act as a friend and guide and in some cases as a lover. There were a few men who were so solitary as to be quite unable to form any relationship.

In the P.D. group the majority are of the passive-inadequate type, feckless and ineffective in every sphere, who see crime as a means of avoiding the difficulties of life rather than as a deliberately anti-social way of life. Very few men were seriously violent or had aggressive personalities. An undue proportion were seen to be prematurely ageing and there was a high incidence of mental illness. It was Dr. West's opinion that one-third of the group would have been taken on as patients had they

presented themselves at a psychiatric clinic; and the incidence of real insanity was also high. Similarly the incidence of physical illness and disability was much higher than would be expected amongst a population of working men of similar age.

Whilst 40 per cent had been to Approved School and/or Borstal, a similar proportion had been free of juvenile offences and had only started their criminal life at a comparatively late stage. Very few came from criminal backgrounds. The proportion of unmarried men was very high, reflecting the low capacity of these men to form any kind of satisfactory relationship.

About one in eight might be classified as a reasonably socialised normal person. These men who were well-adjusted to a criminal way of life might be called professional criminals, in that they plan and execute their crimes carefully although they get caught soon after. Of the remainder the largest group (52 per cent) were the passive inadequates who are so immature that they have never started to learn to live with other people effectively. They tend to be habitually non-participants in life—contracting out, as it were. Not surprisingly a large proportion of the sex offenders were found amongst this group. The active inadequates (30 per cent) do in fact attempt to take part but in an inept and inappropriate fashion. For short periods such a person is good company and he can be a model prisoner but it is as if he has to play-act the part of an adult rather than living up to adult standards.

The following comment of Dr. West is especially pertinent: "As things are there are many inadequates who find their way to high security prisons where they languish for years at a high cost to the State and become increasingly institutionalised and increasingly dependent. Although a great nuisance they hardly constitute all dangerous menaces. If a hostel regime suffices to keep inadequates under control it perhaps encourages them to try and make a way in honest work. This would seem a better solution for all concerned."

All three reports stress the importance of hostels for the inadequate persistent offenders, recognising that whilst this offers a much better prospect of success it is only to be expected that the failure rate will be high.

These three reports are to be welcomed because of their objectivity. Many myths about P.D.'s which have grown up over the years, have been effectively dealt with. Chief amongst them is the belief that there is a stereotype habitual criminal. In fact many different types of individuals are included. Some are skilful criminals, others are petty thieves. Some come from good homes and some are the products of broken homes. Some have never worked at all, whilst others have been in steady employment for many years before

committing their first offence. Perhaps the one factor which they share is that over the years they have become lonely social derelicts. It is now recognised that detention in custody for a long period is not an effective way of dealing with such people. We shall look forward with interest to the development of the new prison at Blundeston, catering for recidivists of inadequate personality.

Of these three reports Dr. West's *book is especially recommended to the general reader who wants to learn about the kind of people who have become recidivists and he provides some stimulating suggestions as to how these people might be dealt with.

The Habitual Criminal *
Cambridge Study in Criminology
Macmillan. 25s. 0d.

Institute for Social Research

THE INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH has as its primary function to sponsor and engage in both theoretical and practical research of sociological interest. This involves carrying out surveys, either qualitative or quantitative, and also setting up experimental projects. The Institute also undertakes some work of a commercial nature.

The Institute has been engaged, for the past year, on a community study project designed to isolate and analyse special problems which confront people living in newly developed areas. The location of the project is a housing estate in South East London.

An intensive Medico-social Survey involved fairly lengthy interviews, mainly with housewives, who were also asked to keep weekly diaries recording their day-to-day activities. The questionaires used were designed to reveal any problem of estate life and their effect on the mental and physical health of the housewife. Similar interviews were employed with smaller samples of old people and teenagers.

In the Community Activation Program housewives were encouraged to come to the project H.Q. and a number of groups were formed. These were mainly for social and recreational activities, but they also had therapeutic side effects. Members were encouraged to take over the organisation of the groups, and at the same time were brought to see the processes and value of community development, so that they might take a more active part in the life of the community. They would also be responsible for a number of social services: for example, Old People's Luncheon Club, Day Nursery, and friendly visiting of the home-bound. It is hoped that the creation of reference groups in this way will have the effect of reducing the frequency of psychological and social disorders and "Estate Malaise".

In addition, the project grew and became involved in a certain amount of case work which led to the incorporation of action-survey techniques in the overall project. For this aspect of the work a qualified social worker was employed.

Such "commercial" work as is undertaken by the Institute is that which is commissioned by industry (both management and labour), publishing houses, radio and television, local authorities, statutory and voluntary organisations.

Conferences and Seminars for discussion and comparison of current work are organised from time to time by the Institute. In June there was a conference in London, the theme of which was "Special Problems in the Treatment of Family Disorders." Among the speakers were: Dr. J. G. Howells, Director of the Department of Family Psychiatry, Ipswich, and Dr. Derek Miller, of the Tavistock Clinic.

PASSIVE INADEQUATE DEVIANTS

The report of the sub-committee on P.D. spoke of the majority of them as being "Passive Inadequate Deviants".

A P.D. replies: —

So I'm a passive inadequate deviant,
I don't quite know what it means,
But to my faults I hope you'll be lenient,
For I'm not quite 'with it' it seems.

So I'm feckless and feeble and futile,
Ineffective and—no—I'm not tough,
I simply can't cope yet awhile—
'Stop the world—I want to get off'

"To protect the public, my duty is clear"
Said the Judge, gazing sternly at me,
"You're a menace—the sentence I fear,
Must be heavy—in fact, it's P.D."

No one told him how dim and how harmless
How ineffective a villian was I.
No one said—"Protection is needless—
This fellow won't damage a fly!"

Was the Judge right or was he mistaken?
Were the sociologists out on a limb?
How can I be an unholy terror
If inadequate, futile and dim?

Maybe I'll upset the statistics.
Maybe I'll prove I'm 'all there'
Even develop characteristics
Of an actively adequate 'Square'!

" If I'd only listened to my mother I would never have ended up here — her plan for robbing the bank was much better than mine....!"

Reprinted from the *Katholieke Illustratie*, Haarlem, by kind permission of Captain T.L. Green, R.A.E.C. (retd.) Locarno, Switzerland.

Absconding at Dover Borstal

J. O. CARTER

DISCIPLINARY break-downs of any kind interfere with the running of institutions. As an expression of significant conflicts they may have value but they may also cause a heavy diversion of staff time and energy from other important work. The offence most able to cause waste of time and energy and public expense is a successful abscondence. Measures approaching full precaution are also very expensive. In addition the waste of the inmate's time and the set back to his training is also, though not invariably, severe. The staff of Dover borstal, like staff at any other establishment, frequently discussed these problems. As discussion was busiest after the most recent abscondence the overall pattern was not easily perceived. It was overshadowed by details and sometimes by the activities required by pursuit.

Mr. K. Whetton, Deputy Governor at Dover from its opening as a borstal in 1957 until early in 1961 began to collect information about abscondence in 1960 to discover whether we could perceive any pattern which would enable us to make prevention and understanding easier. Subsequent work on the information he collected brought to light some patterns from which we were able to profit and led us to believe that a more detailed survey of absconding in 1961 would be worthwhile.

What follows is mostly drawn from a much larger paper, prepared mainly for circulation amongst the staff at Dover, and which comprises the results of an analysis of all occurrences of abscondence during 1961 at Dover borstal.

Attempting and preparing to abscond are also sufficiently obviously relevant to be included. We also included Home Leave non-returners, and non-returners from Compassionate Paroles, since they also involve the intent to absent oneself from training and are disciplinary offences.

What follows has been drawn from a chapter of the original paper which contained the summary of the findings of the

research. Most of these have some statistical backing, and in some cases conclusions have been drawn as a result of applying simple tests.

Research was based on schedules completed by housemasters as soon as possible after the occurrence, and our thanks are due to them and to officers who act for them in their absence, for the trouble taken in completing these schedules. Thanks are also due to the Chief Officer, Mr. Price, and the Administration Officer, Mr. Macadam, who both helped considerably with the section on the cost of absconding.

The project was in no way intended to be exhaustive and indeed with the time available it can only be a pointer to what could be achieved by a more comprehensive study of a problem which has long worried penal administrators. Much of the work was done for local reasons, in the hope that we might be able to reduce abscondence, or at least understand the problem better, so many of the findings have a purely local significance, but we do feel that some of the results may apply more generally, and it is for this reason that we have felt justified in asking the PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL to publish our results, in the hope that this will stimulate more examination of the problem in other institutions. So far as we can discover no one has examined absconding from either Prisons or Borstals in this country before, though since the original paper was written we have been able to examine findings from New Zealand,* and it may be that these findings will have some relevance to conditions in this country.

The Setting

Dover is classed as a medium security institution. During the period under review there were six houses each holding between 40 and 45 boys approximately. The institution is in an old military fortress, which stands above the modern town of Dover in a commanding position, and was designed to hold several thousand troops as a stronghold against invasion from the Continent. The main buildings date from the Napoleonic era, including the great dry ditch or moat which surrounds the institution and provides the main security line. It is at least 30 feet deep and more in width and consists of vertical brick walls on each side with rough land in the bottom. During the day parties work under supervision outside the ditch ; mainly within a wire security fence, sometimes right outside all security lines. Football and many other activities are carried on outside the security line, but restrictions on boys taking part in such activities are applied by using the grade system. Certain lads, who are considered serious abscond

* Absconders from Penal Institutions, Department of Justice, Wellington, New Zealand, 1961.

risks, are not allowed outside the ditch.

Some figures, from the original survey started by Mr. Whetton, were available and some of the findings are related to changing trends in absconding at Dover between 1960 and 1961.

Fewer lads (59) were involved in 1961 as compared with 67 in 1960, and this decrease was almost entirely accounted for by the decrease in the number of lads involved in more than one offence.

Offences allied to absconding, never common, decreased in 1961 to such an extent that it was no longer possible to analyse them.

Home leave failures were nearly twice as common in 1961 as in 1960, but the total number of lads sent on leave increased and the change is not significant.

The average time in training for leave failures decreased between 1960 and 1961 by over two months; these lads tend to have bad records, and almost without exception to be ex-approved school or detention centre lads, as well as having to a great degree a known previous history of absconding. Almost without exception they have been committed to borstal for offences involving unlawful enrichment. (Mainly larceny and breaking). They appear to be conformers within the institution, as they take very little longer than expectation for a normal lad to earn senior grade and the consequent home leave.

There were two failures on parole in 1961. There were no failures on local parole due in main to the almost complete withdrawal of this privilege.

There was considerable variation in the absconding rate between months with a noticeable drop during the summer, but a rapid rise in the early autumn. The theory that absconding comes to an institution in patches was broadly confirmed.

Time and Place

More than half the absconds occurred on Monday and Tuesday, and two thirds of the successful absconds took place on these days. Friday is no longer popular, due to the rearrangement of routine which took place at the end of 1960.

The number of absconds from labour has decreased by half, though the proportion of successful absconds among these remains disturbingly high.

Little change has occurred in the escapes from day recreation, and these seem to be the responsibility of long term lads who find difficulty with institutional life.

Evening absconds remain the most popular, apart from those going from labour, and the hours of darkness are preferred, though this may largely be explained by the lack of absconds during the summer months with their long light evenings. There is a distinct shift towards their being more successful, as also are the begin-

ners' grade, though there has been a marked decrease in the number of those who went. A higher proportion of training grade lads went, and whilst this may be accounted for by the earlier grant of this grade, many of them had been at Dover for such time as would have in any case entitled them to this grade in the light of average progress. Training grade lads were noticeably less successful than last year and also less successful than the beginners grade lads despite the greater freedom accorded to them. This shift may denote a general decrease in the level of casual attempts at absconding, coupled with some waiting for promotion to training grade and its added freedom, and it may be that an apparent shift is due in some measure to administrative action.

The timing of absconds as related to promotion boards was examined, but of the sample of 47 only seven could have been attributed to disappointment over board results, and this table largely reinforced the view that failure to get grades was conspicuous by its absence as a reason for absconding.

The trend during 1961 has been for the lads to go in groups of increasing size from within the security line; no lad succeeded in crossing the moat on his own; most lads who went alone went from outside the security line.

A higher proportion of lads successfully negotiated the moat, and to do this some aid, nearly always sheets or rope, with grapple of bent poker or strip iron found on the estate, was used.

One may conclude that absconds from within the institution may be becoming better thought out, more determined and more organised, and as a result more successful, or that attempts to abscond are only being made by those who fully intend going, the more casual effort being discouraged by increased difficulty or easier dissipation of discontent.

Of those who went in the evening the gym has been used in many cases as the excuse to get out of the house; lads who went direct from the house were all caught within the precincts. As last year, most escapes from labour are successful, and so were all escapes from outside recreation.

Of the successful arrests a higher proportion were arrested locally, within a range of about ten miles, and the staff share of these arrests is rather more in 1961 than in 1960, though this is attributable to lads who went from outside the security line, which seems to imply that though the staff still have not been able to prevent such escapes they have been rather quicker off the mark once a lad is missed.

It was difficult to assess the reasons for leave failure; reasons for absconding seem far more connected with difficulties in the institution than at home. Far fewer lads abscond to a situation which they think has become unbearable

unless they can be present, than go from a situation within the institution which has got to the stage which they can no longer stand.

It is clear however that no simple analysis of the reasons for absconding can be made, and the problem offers scope for a much deeper investigation than that possible within this survey.

The attempts were recaptured most rapidly, followed by the absconds from outside the security line, and lastly those from within the security line. There is a very clear difference in speed of arrest between the three groups. Lads who stayed out for more than a day were all drawn from the group who went from within the security line, apart from three lads who went from outside recreation.

Most of the lads who went from outside the security line did not commit further offences, whereas the majority of those who went from within did do so, which is in keeping with the comment above that these absconds are becoming better thought out and more determined.

Punishments

For those lads punished at Dover a fairly clear tariff emerges, invariably involving loss of time—usually one month for those who were successful; unsuccessful absconders were often only removed from house, though the majority lost a month as well. Those who commit further offences are more heavily punished, as might be expected. Absconding does not seem to be heavily punished considering the inconvenience caused, as well as expense.

Difference between individual houses was not marked; Hastings had the worst record and Walmer the best. When the houses were considered in pairs, according to allocation policy, differences showed clearly, and the reception board seems to have had some successes in putting the better risks in Rye and Walmer, the two houses with least security. Romney and Hythe, with an allocation of lads with institutional history, showed a pattern of distinctly greater success in getting away.

Only a small proportion of absconds occurred within a lad's first month at Dover, and the majority occurred after the lad had been at Dover for at least two months.

The vast proportion of the absconders were not on a trade course, though in many cases they may have been at Dover long enough for them to be considered for a course, or at least for it to be clear whether or not they would get a course. This apparent failure to get on a course is not through lack of intelligence; very few of the lads concerned came in the D or E streams.

Lads seem to be giving the institution a try, but one may surmise that one of the underlying reasons for absconding is that lads get fed up because they feel that they are not getting any benefit from their time at Dover.

The lower intelligence groups tend to be more successful at absconding than the A or B streams.

Absconders are in the main drawn from lads committed to borstal for larceny, breaking offences and dishonesty generally, and the ratio of absconders to the total population convicted for similar offences is highest for this group, and lowest for those convicted of taking and driving away only.

Absconders tend to be drawn from those with high Mannheim Wilkins prediction scores, and the leave failures even more so, and the same pattern is shown in their criminal records; in particular leave failures had a great number of previous convictions and almost all had been either to approved school or detention centre.

An appreciable number of absconders had no previous institutional experience and this group was markedly less successful at getting away. A high proportion of leave failures had previous history of absconding, but amongst the absconders previous absconding, though quite common, does not appear to make them any more successful.

More lads registered as C. of E. abscond or attempt to abscond than one might expect, as compared with other denominations.

There does not appear to be any direct connection between the assessment of the home and absconding, which bears out previous comment that absconding seems to be more related to the institutional situation of a lad than anything else.

Counting the Cost

The extra cost to public funds, directly attributable to absconding during 1961 was of the order of £150. This does not include any estimate of indirect cost which must have been much greater, and no attempt was made to assess the loss of time by already hard pressed senior staff which may well be of greater importance. Attempts cost much less than absconds, and any effort or expense which results in more lads being arrested within the precincts would be worth while.

The sample available for analysis was quite small, but was sufficient for a number of trends to emerge quite clearly. In a number of cases a comparison with a control group of non-absconders would seem to be called for, but it could not be easy to select such a control group, unless it were possible to take out data for the whole institution. Such a project would be much bigger than could be undertaken without a full time research worker and mechanical aids for analysis.

There are a number of points on which information might usefully be collected if the project is to be continued and revised. A much

closer look at the training plan of individual lads, and whether or not they had been turned down for a trade course must be of interest. If the theory that lads abscond because they feel that they are not benefitting from their time here, and as a result are becoming fed up in the broadest sense, is in fact true, then I think we must make some attempt to assess not only the excuse given for any particular abscond, but also the underlying reason. Similarly it will be important to take a closer look at the institutional situation of individual lads. Such assessments can only be made if housemasters are in agreement over the points to be examined and it will therefore be important to have a much greater degree of consultation if progress is to be made along these lines. Such consultation is time consuming, and whether it is worthwhile for such a project is difficult to say, though it should prove an illuminating exercise.

Further research about the actual means of absconding should be fairly easy and this may provide some information which will be of use in preventing the availability of aids and in more speedy arrest when the alarm is given.

It does seem possible that a number of factors might emerge as being predictive either of absconding or stability. It may be possible, with a much larger sample as well as a survey of non-absconders, to find a number of factors which are either predictive of good or bad risk for absconding given certain institutional conditions. Many of these may be related to the existing Mannheim Wilkins system for it is already known that absconding is correlated with poor prognosis on release, and this seems to have been brought out in the present study. If this can be coupled to an objective assessment of the institutional system then it should be possible to predict bad risks within the institution and make arrangements accordingly.

*Construction of prediction tables will however require far more exhaustive and elaborate research than can be carried out on a part time basis in one institution, and whether it is really justified when account is taken of the expense

---

* NOTE.

Since this was written I have been able to study Chapter IV of the New Zealand report, which deals with this specific point. The New Zealand study covers both prisoners and borstal inmates and a prediction scoring system was derived from six factors found to differentiate absconders from non-absconders, but it turned out that these largely differentiated the men from the boys. The New Zealand study was far more exhaustive than the Dover one, and it is clear that the construction of predictive tables for absconders is going to require detailed research far beyond the scope of a local study.

involved is difficult to say. Absconding does cause great concern to the public in that it is apt to attract comment from the Press, but it will never be possible to prevent it completely in a penal establishment and it may be that the money would be better spent on devising more constructive means of training inmates rather than taking direct preventive measures against absconding which are more likely to accentuate the problem.

Absconding does seem to be concerned with the benefit in the broadest sense that a lad thinks he is getting, even if only unconsciously, and it may be that if we wish to prevent absconding the best way is to try and improve our training methods, and to see that the intentions of the statutory rules are being implemented, and especially to help the lad to take part in the construction of a specific realiseable training plan.

. . .

I have been asked by Mr. Carter to be a cosignatory of this report. It is true that a few of the words are mine. I also had the pleasant duty of working over the proofs of this report and the main work on which it is based. The whole project was a joint one and involved many of us. However, the report is almost entirely Mr. Carter's work and, while I am extremely glad to be associated with it, it should be known beyond question as his work.

A. GOULD.

EXCERPTA CRIMINOLOGICA

A documentation service in the social sciences: *Excerpta criminologica** which has now completed its second year, is a bi-monthly survey of articles and books published in many countries on the study of crime in the widest sense. It covers factors that precipitate crime (psychological, medical and environmental), studies of different types of crime and criminals (from murderers to traffic offenders), the treatment of offenders, crime prevention, legal aspects, and the problems of victims of crime. An item from the issue for November/December 1962 is summarized on page 36.

**Excerpta criminologica* is published (in English) at 119-123 Herengracht, Amsterdam-C, The Netherlands, and distributed in Great Britain by Excerpta Medica Foundation, 67c New Bond Street, W.1.

Work and Vocational Training in Borstals

G. EMERSON

IN THE JOURNAL for January, 1962, there was an article on "Work for Prisoners", that being the title of the first report of the Advisory Council on the Employment of Prisoners. At the end of the article it was stated that the Council had begun to study the employment of borstal boys with particular reference to vocational training. The results of that study were published last February in the Council's second report, which was entitled *Work and Vocational Training in Borstals (England and Wales)*. In a Parliamentary statement the Home Secretary welcomed the report and expressed his intention of developing work in borstals on the lines suggested.

While the report is, of course, of particular interest to those who are concerned with borstal training, much of what is said in the report has a considerable bearing on the training carried out in other types of penal establishments. Many of the prisoners whose training and treatment constitutes the most difficult problem facing prisons have been through borstals. The rehabilitation of offenders of different ages ought not to be regarded as distinct and unrelated problems.

The report is not revolutionary. It does not recommend that we scrap our present methods of employing and training borstal boys and substitute something quite different. Nor does it suggest that our approach to the whole problem is based on wrong general principles. The Council found much to praise but also some grounds for criticism, and they have made a number of important recommendations.

In Section III of the report the Council set out what they considered to be the objects of providing work and industrial training (including vocational training) for borstal boys. These are likely to command general approval and the Council would not claim to have done any original thinking here. They say that the objects should be:

"(a) to prepare them for getting a job on release;
(b) to develop their latent skills, perhaps hitherto unrecognised by the boys themselves;

(c) to make them appreciate communication;
(d) to teach them how to live in social groups and accept their disciplines;
(e) to enable them to see what contribution they can make to society."

In Sections IV, V and VI of the report the Council give their findings about vocational training. It will gratify many, though hardly surprise them, that the Council are strongly in favour of vocational training, that they consider it to be well organised, and that they highly commend the work of the instructors who carry it out.

It is against this background of general approval that the comment and recommendations of the Council must be considered. They gave a good deal of thought to the selection of boys for vocational training courses. They asked themselves (and many members of the Prison Service) whether the right boys are being selected; whether too many or too few boys take courses; whether the methods of selection are efficient; and how far boys get the courses for which they are most suited. They came to the conclusion that under the present arrangements there is little risk that boys who can benefit from courses fail to get them. They thought that the only danger here is that a few of the boys who are put on courses have not enough natural ability to meet the intellectual and other demands which a vocational training course makes.

The Council found that it is a difficult problem to give every boy the course for which he is most suited. There is a wide variety of trades which are taught throughout the borstal system, but a course in every trade is not to be, and cannot be, provided at every borstal. And, since different borstals take different types of boy—according to their ages, intelligence, degree of criminal sophistication, and so on—the borstal which, on these criteria, is judged most suitable for a particular boy may not run a course in the right trade. The Council therefore came to a paradoxical conclusion: the needs of most boys will best be served by restricting, not enlarging, the variety of trades taught. The point they made is that, to the extent that each borstal goes in for courses in the less widely popular trades, it cannot run so many courses in the more popular ones.

The Council were unable to consider in detail whether existing courses in any particular trades should be abolished and their advice may well be more appropriate to future developments than to present arrangements.

One final point on vocational training must be mentioned. The Council were emphatic about the need to relate a boy's work throughout his stay in borstal to the vocational training course he takes. "As things are at present", they say, "a

boy spending a year or so in a borstal may, after an initial month on the house cleaning party, spend two or three months on the works party, six months on a vocational training course in engineering, and the remaining three months on farm work." (Paragraph 55 of the report).

The Council regarded this as a failure to make the most of vocational training. They realised the difficulty of providing production work in borstals in many of the trades taught, but they urged that everything possible should be done to obtain it for the boys, either inside or outside borstals. They specially advocated follow-up work after the completion of courses in order to sustain the interest already aroused.

The second half of the report is concerned with employment and industrial training for boys—the majority—who cannot meet the demands of vocational training. It is here that the Council make what is probably their most important comment on existing arrangements. They say, in effect, that, as things are, most boys not up to vocational training are merely put to unskilled labouring, whereas they might well be capable of the type of semi-skilled work which is so common in industry today. The Council make the point by saying (paragraph 68): "some of the boys who at present get labouring jobs [on release] might have got semi-skilled jobs if they had been given training and experience in more skilled work in borstal."

It is generally agreed that, if an ex-borstal boy can get a good job on release, he is less likely to revert to crime than if he can only get casual, unskilled labouring work. As regards boys who do not take vocational training courses, we do not, in the Council's view, do enough in our borstals to prepare them for the best kind of work of which they are capable; and they recommend that more semi-skilled work and training be provided.

Here they make a point similar to that which they made in connection with vocational training: complete changes from one type of work to work of a completely different type should be as infrequent as possible. The aim should be to train boys in a specific type of work and as far as possible he should be kept on that work throughout his period in borstal. The Council draw attention to the practical consideration that an instructor to whom a boy is allocated, and who is responsible for getting some necessary work done, will be encouraged to take the trouble to train him only if he knows the boy will probably remain in his charge for a considerable period.

The report concludes with a brief mention of employment on release, with particular reference to the possibility of further consultation with employers and trade unions about facilities for further training for boys who have com-

pleted a vocational training course in borstals. The Council have been in touch with both sides of industry and are aware of the difficulties. Most of these stem from the fact that the majority of borstal boys are too old on release to complete a period of apprenticeship by the age of 21, even if account is taken of the training they have received in borstal. The Council nevertheless recommend that an approach be made to the national joint organisations concerned with apprenticeship and training in the different trades.

The report—that is, the booklet containing it—concludes on the outside of the back cover with words which are not the Council's own, but which are nevertheless of interest to the Prison Service: "Printed in England for Her Majesty's Stationery Office at H.M. Prison, Leyhill". It will be agreed that the quality of the printing and production compares favourably with booklets printed commercially.

Crime in Africa

TSOTSIS are the teddy-boys of South Africa. An article from *Lumen*, 'the voice of the Catholic African leaders', (reprinted in *Excerpta Criminologica*, 1962 November/December), describes their behaviour and its causes. They spend a lot of time gambling, drinking and smoking 'dagga'—the local variety of reefer. They occasionally work for short periods, but generally live by theft and extortion. They are violent: they have been known to kill another African by throwing him from a moving train—for the offence of wearing a necktie and therefore looking like 'one of them', that is like a conformist or goodie-goodie.

What makes them like this? The African author mentions four of the reasons. The first is overcrowding. Many places have no recreational facilities. Even in the Government's new housing estates, boys and girls in large families often have to share a room. Girls who live on their employer's premises are easily accessible to young men: in Alexandra Township, 75% of the children are illegitimate. The author also spells out the effects of poverty, unemployment, and the disintegration of the closely-knit African community.

The article ends on a mildly optimistic note: the church and its members can help by supporting clubs and football teams, by providing a library in every parish, by helping youths to find jobs.

M. WRIGHT.

Magistrates and Prisoners

G. M.

THE FIRST of these books is a study of variations in magistrates' policies; the second is a comprehensive study of the short-term inmate himself.

Both represent laudable attempts to place criminology on an up-to-date scientific foundation and, as far as methodology is concerned, both inquiries are generally sound (though Dr. Andry does not seem to the reviewer to have allowed sufficient time "at risk" for his data on re-conviction to be of great significance).

It is to the conclusions of the investigations that criticism may mainly be directed. Thus Mr. Hood's statement that short-term imprisonment meets no more succes than does "fining or probation for the majority of offenders" tells us nothing about how to discover which offenders form this majority, nor does it allow for the possibility that lenient forms of treatment may well "recruit" more offenders in the first instance. It is commonplace that criminals often regard probation as "getting off". Moreover, the fact that prison provides a useful means of preventing offenders from being "at risk" ought not to be forgotten.

Dr. Andry's conclusions, though still open to similar criticisms, are less sentimental. He recommends "Reconstruction Centres" plus heavy fines as a combination of treatment, deterrence and recompense. Here again, the tragedy is that the taxpayer would often have to meet the fines imposed, not to mention the cost of building, running and staffing such centres recommended for the "leisure-time treatment" of offenders not sent to prison.

Both books are very well-written and presented. Their importance would seem to lie in their fact-finding roles and in their ability to serve as models for future research. There are as yet too many "imponderables" in the field for firm conclusions to be drawn. As modern penal practice shows, ultimately the will to reform must come from the offender himself; apart from prevention, detection and deterrence, only marginally are treatments of inmates successful.

Sentencing in Magistrates' Courts
ROGER HOOD
Steven & Sons. Price 20s. 0d.

The Short Term Prisoner
R. G. ANDRY
Steven & Sons. Price 28s. 0d.

The Chaplain's Place in the Prison Scene

STANLEY PEARCE

IN AN ATTEMPT to give an accurate impression of the Chaplain's place in the prison scene, it will be my endeavour to present, first of all, the historical background, before passing on to consider his integration within the membership of a prison staff in modern conditions, with perhaps a few observations, if I may be allowed, of my own personal interpretation and views.

There is no need to detain you with a surfeit of historical detail. It is sufficient to recognise the root from which we, the Chaplains, stem. From the inception of the prison system and administration under the Prison Commissioners in the latter part of the last century, there were only three persons, apart from the custodial and uniformed staff, responsible for the control and welfare of prisoners. These were the Governor, the Medical Officer and the Chaplain. The roles of the first two were obvious: that of the Chaplain was multifarious. It demanded an evangelical vigour and fervour which assumed that what prisoners needed most of all, to aid their personal betterment and social adjustment, were moral reproof and spiritual exhortation, together with, as Christian charity might demand, some effort to assist their general education and to encourage the humble acceptance of the general principle that those who have and those who have not could yet live in law-abiding and divinely ordained co-existence.

In a harsh and regimented prison regime, the Chaplain had presented to him, ready made, a situation in which he could shine as an angel amongst demons, the only hope of a frustrated and rebellious, or cowed and subjugated, prison population. It was not difficult for supposed virtue to thrive in this atmosphere.

To-day, the Chaplain has a sterner task to face. His status is not automatically guaranteed to him by the structure of the system. He must be prepared to justify his existence, either in competition or in collaboration with those who have relieved him of many of his

extra-spiritual functions: these include the Tutor Organiser who is now responsible for education; the Welfare Officer whose concern is that of welfare in its widest aspects; also the Assistant Governor who, naturally, finds himself in some complexity of role. Called to be an administrator and having a disciplinary function to perform, he must yet feel, very properly, that he has a welfare interest in those inmates for whom he is responsible. To this array one might add a newcomer to modern therapeutic advance in the person of the psychologist, in whose diagnostic wake follows the psychiatrist. I would not minimise the value of these services, but he would be prepared to admit, I believe, that he possesses no magic-answer to divergent behaviour, the possible solution being dependent upon the co-operation of the patient. This, of course, has always been the difficulty of the Chaplain in his attempts at moral and spiritual reclamation.

It would be unrealistic if the Chaplain were to regard himself as possessing a monopoly in welfare interests and humanitarian attitudes. These, in a real sense, should reside in every member of the staff. The practical problem is of definition of actual function. It would be equally unrealistic if it were demanded of the Chaplain that he should confine his work to purely spiritual activities. There is no such thing as a "purely spiritual activity". Spirit and body in man are inextricably woven, and in touching the physical and material needs of man one can also utter an unspoken language to his spirit.

What, then, is the Chaplain's function? What is he expected to *do?* By virtue of his office, as an ordained man, a minister of God, he is charged with the responsibility of offering the ministrations of the Church to those inmates who wish to avail themselves of that ministry: that, technically, is the ministry of the Word and Sacraments as in the churches outside, and it is on this pattern that, as far as possible, the Chaplain will conduct services inside prison. He will also organise other activities, from time to time, such as Bible Study Groups, Religious Discussion Groups, and Confirmation Classes in preparation for Confirmation by the Bishop who will make a special visit to the prison for the purpose.

Of the work of the Chaplain's Department in the prison routine, few specific directions are laid down by Prison Rules and Regulations. The Department may consist of a single Chaplain, possibly two in larger prisons, or of a Chaplain and a Church Army captain, as in a number of prisons, including Wakefield. The Church Army as you may know is a Church of England Society, and its Captains and Sisters, as they are called, are commissioned lay-evangelists working in parishes, hostels, prisons, moral welfare and

old folk's homes in this country and in other parts of the world. In the prison routine, then, the Chaplain's Department is expected to see all men on reception and discharge, to keep in daily contact with the hospital and those on punishment. It is represented on most of the prison boards and committees, such as induction, home leave, the pre-release hostel, staff consultative committee, and so on. It is also the responsibility of the Department to arrange the inmates' programme of films and to attend to their booking. This comes under the heading of entertainment, which is still one of the Chaplain's responsibilities. The organisation of the system of Prison Visitors, whereby they are made available to the inmates, also resides with the Chaplain's Department.

At Wakefield the Chaplain has the valuable opportunity of introducing himself to each new batch of inmates as they are formed into groups on the induction wing. This will be followed at a later stage by private interview in the Chaplain's office.

From that time on, the inmate knows that the Chaplain is ready and willing to see him and to share any difficulty or problem he may have. It is important that the Chaplain shall be readily accessible to those who would seek spiritual counsel and advice. But it is rarely that a man who is not a convinced Christian will seek the solution of a spiritual problem (as such) in isolation from a practical concern over some domestic or material difficulty. In an atmosphere of understanding and personal interest, an inmate may be helped to come to terms with himself and his environment. It may be that he will begin to discover a new respect for his own potential worth and value on the basis of the Christian belief in God as one of life's fundamental realities. This, indeed, may involve a new orientation which bears within it the seeds of self-fulfilment, not only in himself, but in his social attitudes and relationships.

In this regard the Chaplain sees himself as fulfilling his part in the implementation of Rule 6 of Prison Rules, which reminds us that "the aim and object of the training and treatment of convicted prisoners shall be to encourage in them the will to live a good and useful life on discharge, and to fit them to do so". It will be noted that the Rule speaks in terms, not only of usefulness, but of the quality and virtue of goodness.

Even those without religious or denominational loyalties might, perhaps, be expected to welcome and accept the Chaplain's contribution towards the achievement of this common goal and purpose. In this regard, I believe, most Chaplains would gratefully acknowledge that they are the recipients of considerable support and encouragement. This, for the most part, has been my happy experience over a

period of nearly ten years in the Prison Service, at Wakefield. But we must be realistic and recognise that the acceptance, or otherwise, of the specialist activity of the Chaplain depends very much upon personal and deep-seated pre-conceptions. Chaplains, therefore, can be vulnerable to the unhelpful attitude of those who have a distaste of the absolute and possess no theory of human personality.

In practice, the Chaplain's position and standing within a prison present certain features. He is dependent upon the goodwill of those with whom he works to give substance and relevance to the reality of what he has to offer. He needs lines of communication, which are practical and real, with the inmate population. He needs also a design of prison programme which will give scope for those activities which are generally described as "spiritual". In other words, the Chaplain needs, on the part of the prison Staff from the Governor downwards, to be consciously and deliberately integrated into the prison scene and working day, as a relevant partner, not only with other specialist officers, but with the discipline staff.

Here the Chaplain must be prepared to accept a challenge. The question as to whether or not he is so integrated may depend largely upon his own attitude and abilities. The Chaplain hopes for acceptance, but cannot demand it. In this he must be seen as being in a weaker position than that of any other member of the staff. His activities are *less* defined, and his *actual* function as a staff unit is not predetermined merely because he is an ordained man with the title of Chaplain. In fact, the system does not demand his integration for its effective working. Although he has statutory authority for his place on the prison staff, this has by no means assured the preservation of his old historical status as No. 3 for the prison keys, and even at Wakefield, by contrast with the situation existing within my memory and experience, the Chaplain's keys are now No. 12! This is not a complaint. It is an indication of a trend, a shift of emphasis. It certainly emphasises the challenge. Sentimental theory and hard practice are not necessarily identical in their effects, and I believe that there is a current of opinion within the modern theory of therepeutic treatment which would regard the Chaplain, not so much as essential or necessary, but as a conciliatory concession to the "establishment".

So, then, let us return to the matter of the challenge this situation brings to the Chaplain. His role must be enacted within the prison scene which is essentially a disciplinary one, in the sense that a prison imposes necessary restricon an inmate's social liberties and freedom of self-expression. Those restrictions are for social security in the widest sense, and for the internal ordering and regulation of prison life, which shall ensure its

smooth running and also equality of treatment. In this kind of situation, which must necessarily present many contrasts with the liberties and enjoyments of life outside, the Chaplain may falsely envisage himself as the humanitarian in an otherwise inhuman system. He may rush around, with false sentimentality, and with personal enthusiasms of a dangerously independent kind, to temper the wind for the shorn lamb, and with the implication that divine love and compassion are to be recognised, if not in active disregard of prison rules and regulations, nevertheless, in the subversive suggestion that prison discipline is basically evil: that he is "for them" (on the side of the inmates) and against the "set-up". This is an attitude which Chaplains (and, if I may say so, Prison Visitors) must resist. When the Chaplain, in his somewhat exclusive and independent position, is seen to recognise this situation he may hope to win confidence from a staff who are charged with a very responsible and imposed discipline themselves. We abuse the system if we set up our own personal interpretations of what should, or should not, be done. Only within defined limits is this possible.

This situation the Chaplain must uphold with the inmates in their own interests and as part of their training. We do not claim that the system is perfect or that it cannot be improved. This, along constitutional lines, we are continually trying to do. It is part of the Chaplain's task with inmates to encourage the acceptance of the system as a self-imposed discipline, with moral and spiritual values attached. We do a disservice to them and to our cause by "whitewashing" the situation in which they are placed, by pretending that it is not self-imposed, or by suggesting that those who are charged with their custody have no regard for the basic humanities.

I have already spoken of some of the ways in which the Chaplain becomes involved with other members of the staff, through boards and committees. Let us now turn to an involvement where his active interest in the welfare of prisoners is shared by other members of the staff. This applies particularly to a modern triangle of mutual interest, and even competitive activity, in the persons of the Chaplain, the Welfare Officer and the Assistant Governor. Their contact with the inmates, if not on identical lines, is at least on similar ones, with consultation and advice, assistance in working through matrimonial or domestic problems, and, in addition, the possible securing of financial or material aid. No one would reasonably contend that the Chaplain should retain a monopoly in this field. As with education, welfare has increased in scope and content, and demands the service of a specialist officer.

Quite naturally, however, the Chaplain is bound to maintain an interest and concern. He is fre-

quently expected by the inmates to be actively involved in their practical problems and difficulties. These are lines of communication which the Chaplain would not like to see closed. Indeed, it may be claimed that there are many particular aspects of "welfare", namely, those affecting marriage and the family, in which his intervention would be appropriate. In a similar way the Assistant Governor may find himself in a situation of some complexity. His lines of communication with the inmate inevitably lead into the field of welfare. Some need is disclosed in the course of an interview in the Assistant Governor's office. How far should he become involved in the active follow-up of such a matter? If he does so, would he, with the Chaplain, be considered as trespassing into the domain of the Welfare Officer? Here at Wakefield the answers to these questions have not yet reached a final conclusion. Perhaps it is as well that they have not, in terms of any clear demarcation of frontiers. We have, however, attempted to deal with the practical difficulty of overlapping and duplication of work, by setting up a welfare registry to record welfare histories of the inmates, and to indicate the interest and intervention of different members of the staff. Certainly, from the practical point of view and in the face of the amount of work to be handled, there is more to be done than can be dealt with by one office.

A further complication, relating to the Chaplain's interest in the welfare field, arises from the fact that the Church Army maintain from their London Headquarters a special department, that of Prison Welfare (known also as the Prisoners' Families Department) which functions as a valuable and effective auxiliary arm to Chaplains and Church Army Captains working in prisons, making helpful and encouraging contact with the inmates' homes, bringing practical relief with money, clothing or furniture in cases of real hardship, and in appropriate cases defraying the cost of travel for visits where public funds are not available. I believe that at Wakefield we shall work through these overlapping interests with the minimum of difficulty. There is work to be shared to further a common end.

In the larger field of the Chaplain's general involvement with other members of the staff, I would like to suggest that the basis of that involvement resides in the fact that we all together share a common responsibility. It is the responsibility of a personal relationship. It affects the whole staff in relationship with prisoners. It concerns what we do for them, what we hope to achieve in them, what we hope to make of them. That the Chaplain carries this responsibility would scarcely be denied. By virtue of his office he cannot and would not avoid the duty to communicate respect, not for the shame and degradation in an inmate's persisting sub-cultural level of life, but for his potential worth as a human being, a living soul.

Every single human being has a right to feel significant, that he matters, that he has a place under the sun, that he is, in a true sense, important. This support and maintenance of the flow of our natural development is normally supplied by our parents, family, home, teachers, perhaps employers and good friends. All these, in the past, have helped to make *us* feel significant, that we matter, that we count for something. It is because so many of the men in prison have not been able to extract this kind of satisfaction from their environment that they are where they are today. We extract from our environment, for good or ill, values that are projected at us. That process never stands still. When a man is in prison, be it nine months or nine years, his personal significance and the values of human life are still being imparted to him, and because of the closed situation, perhaps even more intensely.

The inmate's social environment is a limited one. His direct contacts are with two groups of people. One is the prisoner group; the other is the staff. What values does he extract from the former? What values *should* he be able to extract from the latter? With regard to the prisoner group, it can hardly be assumed that the true dignity and worth of human life are enhanced. What of the staff? In this challenge the responsibility of the Chaplain is shared by all members of the staff. The Chaplain personally accepts this responsibility, in trying to impart his recognition of the inmate's value and potential worth in God's sight. His ultimate objective is to help a man (if he will be helped) by word and attitude, to know himself at his real worth—a child of God.

The Chaplain would not expect all members of the staff to speak in those terms, but what contribution do we all make in revealing our respect for human values and the worth and sacredness of a man's personality? There lies the challenge; that we all, according to our several insights and capacities, are called, in the exercise of our particular functions, to show respect for, and to give expression to, the highest assessment of human worth of which we are capable. In that we share the responsibility of a human relationship: we are interdependent: together we can present a system which is coherent and positive.

So, by our efforts to restore or to establish a man's faith in the real meaning and purpose of life, to give back to him a lost confidence in the reality and worth of moral virtue, we may *together* do something positive and constructive to restore the old wastes of broken homes and shattered hopes, and to make even the desert of some hard heart blossom as the rose.

Three Training Plans

- **Vocational Training for Recidivists**
- **Shocks for Stars**
- **Child Psychology for Young Offenders**

J. GIBSON

I AM A MEMBER of the staff of Liverpool Prison. I am called a Prison Officer, or, if you prefer the phraseology of the wrong-doer, a "Screw". It is my intention to bring home to you the seriousness and danger of social reform in Her Majesty's Prisons.

Today we take too much notice of politicians, welfare workers and religious bodies who are apparently prepared to base the treatment of the present day criminal on a famous quotation—"There but for the Grace of God, go I". This is all very well in theory, but is this what is actually the treatment for people who err? In a civilised community, we must have laws and responsible citizens to administer these laws, or men would return to the primitive stage of the uncivilised. Why not leave it to the experts who have years of experience in dealing with the wrong-doer, that is the police and the prison officer. Surely living amongst these individuals for many years makes us the specialists.... I will endeavour to set a plan which, in my opinion, would be successful in correcting the wrong-doer. I honestly believe that, both physically and psychologically my plan would work and the criminal would be able to return to society as a useful citizen.

My plan is based on conversations I have had with my charges, some of them young offenders, some habitual criminals and some first timers.

Habitual Criminal

Why does he come back?

There is not just one reason, but a combination of reasons. Possibly lazy, bitter, hating society, not given a chance, he becomes his own persecutor and prosecutor. He has been sent to prison from his early youth and has suffered the isolation of the prison cell for weeks on end—nothing but dull routine. He gets very little sympathy nor does he ask for any. On returning to his family, relatives or associates, he

may be treated by them as a returning hero; but society in general treats him with suspicion. This, to my mind, is where everyone falls down. We frown upon him being an ex-convict and avoid his company. Employers will not give him a job, the police hound him and he feels an outcast. I suggest that, in prison, we correct his faults and when he is discharged, help more in his rehabilitation. Set up State Vocational Training Centres and teach him whilst giving him a living wage a useful semi-skilled or, where possible, a skilled trade and get the backing of the Trade Unions. The most important part of rehabilitation is being accepted back as a useful citizen. Although he may have been convicted several times, by his terms of imprisonment he has paid his debt to society. So now we can use that very wise quotation in its correct perspective—"There but for the Grace of God, go I".

The most surprising thing about these unfortunate characters is that they are kind and considerate to their wives and families and in return they receive a high degree of loyalty in their absence.

To sum up, the habitual offender being sent to prison by society and losing his freedom and civil rights is surely punished enough whilst there. The Prison Directors have gone a long way in assisting them to regain their status as men; if the community will not accept them back, then we fail to find the answer to crime.

The First Offender

Assuming that this individual has fallen to temptation for the first time, I suggest that, if practicable, he should be sent to prison for a short term of about twenty-eight days, with strict discipline and rigid training. This I maintain, would act as a good deterrent for future waywardness and, when he walked out of the prison gate, it must indeed be for the first and the last time. To illustrate this, I was a C.Q.M.S. in a Military Corrective Training Establishment, Khartoum. The sergeant major was a kindly man at heart, but a martinet in the camp itself. Because of its reputation for severity, the crime in the district gradually dwindled to nothing and finally the camp was closed. I am not suggesting for one moment that this type of man management should take place in civilian prisons, but a short, sharp lesson often works wonders.

The Young Offender

This is the immediate beginning of graduation into crime. Let us first find out from where it started. I am seeing this problem through the eyes of a family man with four children and not as an official. After a great deal of difficulty and patience, I have won the admiration and confidence of my own children. These are the two main factors—admiration and confidence; without them there is no hope of success. The child becomes

a weak character and, like all children, will ape anyone who takes his fancy, quite often the wrong type. In my opinion, the danger age is reached when the child reaches its eleventh birthday. Character and personality start to develop and, when the child is well disciplined, half the battle is won. Parents should not give way at this stage or they fail in their duties and become bad parents.

At fourteen years of age, children have developed sufficiently to know how far they can go. Some of their responsibility lies within their educational training. Parents and teachers should co-operate, but I am afraid that all too often they have their differences. Taking notice from stories often brought home by the child, the parents are often the culprits. We should never give way to the child, even after investigation of any complaint. Problems can easily be settled admirably by discussion with the teacher. If both sides fail, the child becomes irresponsible, selfish and, perhaps, develops high emotional feelings. This is the beginnings of the present day juvenile delinquent. The child breaks the law and it is up to the learned judge to find the answer. What follows is detention centres, approved schools, borstal training or even imprisonment. Now the prison officer takes command. Are we using the correct psychological approach to get their minds into a more healthy condition? I think not. Public opinion, politicians, welfare workers and religious bodies dictate to us. It is not our heritage to be considered a cruel or a brutal nation. Even our enemies in war have never suggested that. So, there should be no reason to suspect men who have been selected as prison officers resorting to any form of treatment that would be frowned upon by the average person. The Governor is responsible for the conduct of his staff, the Prison Directors must answer for the Governor and the Home Secretary answers to the Government for the welfare of inmates. Surely, we come under the category of responsible citizens and our dealings with the wrong-doer should never be challenged. I believe that the treatment of the young offender is much more difficult to administer. A doctor has a much more simple task in treating a rare disease than we have in doing our job, at least he has found what disease his patient is suffering from before he can treat it and, with his patient's co-operation, he is successful. Our task is so much harder, because of lack of any such co-operation. We must be firm; if the young offender suspects a weakin an officer's armour, he will pounce upon it. In order to qualify, a professional psychologist must be trained. We have thousands of psychologists in Her Majesty's Prisons—every inmate becomes one.

Discipline must play an important part in the correction of this type of inmate. Without it they would over-run us. The Prison

Department is concentrating upon the young offender; they realise the danger to the community if the crime wave increases amongst us and particularly amongst the teenager. In prison or other institution, the young offender learns hygienic habits by regular bathing. Physical education plays a part in their training and regular vocational training courses take place and, in the evenings, almost every type of voluntary class is available to him. Education authorities are keenly interested and send along qualified teachers to assist.

What of the inmate himself? On the surface he appears to be reforming, but what we have always to be on the look-out for is the "rotten apple"—if we can penetrate this individual, then we are on the way to success. Here again, rehabilitation takes place after discharge. The community must do everything within their power to assist in this. *Don't cast him out.*

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

MARTIN WRIGHT was a prison visitor at Wormwood Scrubs until last year when he left London to become Technical Information Officer for Richard Thomas & Baldwin, Ltd., in Aylesbury. By profession a librarian he also acts as a free-lance translator for *Excerpta Criminologica.*

. . .

G. EMERSON, a Principal in the Prison Department of the Home Office, has been Secretary of the Advisory Council on the Employment of Prisoners since its inception in 1960.

. . .

J. O. CARTER joined the Prison Service in 1959 and has been Assistant Governor at Dover for the past three years. His interests are archaeology and photography.

. . .

A. GOULD is the Governor of Dover Borstal.

JOHN WILLIAM GIBSON, who has been an officer at Liverpool for the past five years, served 26 years in the Army, mostly with M.P.S.C., and was formerly in the Fire Service.

. . .

R. S. TAYLOR formerly worked at the P.D. Allocation Centre at Wandsworth from 1956-62, he is Principal Psychologist at Wakefield.

. . .

GERALD MCLOUGHLIN joined the Prison Service in 1956 at Wandsworth and has been at Liverpool as Senior Psychologist since 1961.

. . .

THE REVEREND H. S. PEARCE joined the Prison Service in 1953 and has served as Chaplain at Wakefield since then. He is about to transfer to Grendon Psychiatric Prison.