Prison Reform and Society

RICHARD HAUSER

SHORTLY AFTER my wife and I arrived in this country in 1957 we tried to find out from as wide a group of people as possible what were considered to be the most pressing social problems in England at that time—problems that perhaps needed fresh study and new thinking. The following six subjects came to light as being well worth consideration:

1. *Education.* Not the formal education of universities and grammar schools but the problem of what is to be done with the children in the C and D streams of our secondary modern schools who are bored and are considered "difficult" and unteachable.
2. *Mental Health.* Not the medical psychiatric care given to the acutely disturbed but the preparation for life in the world of those about to leave an institution and the care of those who had already left.
3. *Homosexuality.* This was in 1957. The Wolfenden Report loomed large and the public was, for the time being, interested. Our findings were later published in "The Homosexual Society" in April 1962.
4. *Racial Problem.* This was part of a much wider problem of a community under stress and sometimes breaking down under stress. In its narrower aspect the need for "scapegoats" was the point at issue.
5. *Social Isolation.* This was primarily of concern in so far as it affected young disturbed housewives. Interest centred on the results of movements from old property to new housing estates. Naturally, too, there came under this heading those who were relics of many years of institutional treatment, the tramps, the drunks, the old: the afflicted group. Some call it the "depressed tenth."
6. *The Penal System.* On the face of it, it seemed that this question would concern itself with prisons, approved schools, probation, the principles on which judges sentenced and on what happened to men when they left prison and before they were arrested by the police. Prison seemed to me, at least, a good starting point. In the event, the ramifications turned out to be much wider.

Once it was agreed that these were the six outstanding subjects we started work in all these fields on the principle of "Learning by doing." It was not long before

we realised how close was the interrelation between them all. Wherever we found people under stress in one department we learned things which threw light on what was happening in another. There could be no doubt that most social problems had common roots no matter what the outer appearance might be. What we have learned from the isolation of housewives has helped us to understand about the ex-prisoner; the experience of mental patients is of value in interpreting the experience of children leaving school. This is why we believe that society must be seen as a whole, and it is on this "Wholist" principle that we have worked.

When we speak of penal policy or penal reform we are, all of us, concerned with much more than the prevention of crime. All the points of extreme stress in our society, whether they be prisons, mental hospitals or collections of dispirited and "backward" children in our schools, are merely indications of widespread malaise. The criminal world (in its widest sense) is the image of our society in a convex mirror. Society must be helped to grow and to mature, and we believe that it is through learning from the areas of extreme stress that it can achieve this. It is for the respectable citizen, the successful, the prosperous and self-contained to learn about the nature of society and about themselves so that they can discern the smallness of their growth, can gauge their own "social ignorance" and learn to be socially mature.

We know today that there are 31,000 men in prison although the number may have changed at the time of publication of this article. The number is greater than it used to be and sermons are preached about it. But we suggest that numbers are really of no great importance: what is of importance is that we should learn directly from this group about what is meant by social stress, about breakdown under stress and about prevention. Prisoners and prison officers should learn from each other, and society should learn from both. And it is not enough simply to learn. The expert study written for a learned journal or the specialist report are worth only the paper they are written on unless they lead to action. Our direct learning within the field of stress must lead to action and further learning.

It may be said that there are two distinct but widely accepted ways of regarding the prisoner—the "bad" approach and the "mad" approach. Either he is a "bad" man who is to be made "good" or he is a "sick" man who is to be healed. In the first case it has to be admitted that very few men belong to any religious groups (perhaps the proportion is no more and no less than in the general population), nor are they members of the Rationalist Association. There are *some* who may be appealed to on moral grounds. In the second case there are few who are sufficiently

grossly disturbed to need the expert intervention of the psychiatrist. If these two approaches are confined to the few, what happens to the many? We suggest that we have now become used to the fact that we do nothing—which is the "sad" approach. Our recidivist prisons are mausoleums of idiotification—in the literal sense. The prisoners are made into private citizens and are left alone in their privacy.

We believe that in most cases prisoners are neither bad nor mad but socially under-developed people who suffer from some degree of apathy. Some have never developed at all; some have developed and have fallen back. This under-development is not the prerogative of prisoners alone; it is shared by much of our society. But it is often seen in its severest form in prison. When we meet (as we do in our recidivist prisons) men who have never lived in the world except for a few months at a time, we find people who have never learned to handle the tensions of ordinary life as the rest of society has done (however inadequately in many cases). It seems to be the height of folly to push these people back further and thus ensure that their responses will be even feebler in future.

If constructive action is to take place, both the community and the individual must be taught to handle tensions. This is the real purpose of social education. Many of the root causes of people's difficulties cannot be easily removed. What is needed is the strengthening of the individual and the community so that they are better able to meet these difficulties. Many problems may baffle the individual on his own but if he can be stimulated to participate in the life of the group, or perhaps to form groups then the same problems can often be satisfactorily met and dealt with.

Though the individual's stress may often cause a stress situation for his group, this can be handled effectively by the group—especially if the group consists of people with similar experience. Many people will instinctively seek relief from the anxiety caused by some particular emergency, but the group itself may grow, and help the individuals in it to grow, by bringing to bear upon both the particular and the general anxiety the strength of its common reasonableness and solidarity.

In fact a critical or anxiety-producing situation, squarely faced, is the very climate in which social education and social growth are most likely to occur. If people seek to flee or are sheltered from their real difficulties (which is purely "aspirin treatment") they are not likely to develop the ability to stand up to them. Sooner or later these difficulties will catch up with them and overwhelm them.

Social education is therefore opposed to instruction; instruction is most effective in a calm and steady atmosphere; social education is at its best when group and individuals are hard at work, facing often stern reality, living their

difficulties and learning to grow through them.

Today all this has become an urgent question as never before, and the reasons for this can be clearly discerned. Previously there were forces at work in the community which had the effect of often preventing breakdown. These forces moulded personal relationships in families, groups, communities, by producing common objectives. People were united in the fight for better conditions. In war time they were united by sheer need. The moulding and uniting power of these outside pressures for survival is no longer as acute; the Welfare State, so very necessary from any point of view, has incidentally been instrumental in weakening defensive family and community ties; and the threat of war, while no less real, now seems far removed from the ordinary man's immediate province of action.

Thus the individual comes to have less and less need to defend himself, and less and less need to combine with others for mutual defence. He comes, in fact, to have less purpose to live for. This lack of purpose necessarily causes fragmentation: it hampers the individual in his struggle to live fully, and it makes for a falling apart of the community at the seams. People lack the will for community life; the individual may actually die of boredom.

In other words, man needs either to have the incentive of defending himself against hostile forces around him, or to have a new, constructive, social purpose for which to live. We have turned a corner into a new age where—apart from the ever-present, and therefore often half-forgotten need to fight against the threat of war—plain survival is no longer the main purpose of individual life. It may be that it is always the most sensitive people who suffer most from this lack of purpose: the young housewife, for instance, on a new housing estate, living with far greater material comforts than her parents had, may now find that in fact she has less to live for, and that this new existence is thoroughly frustrating; she will not understand the reasons why it is so, and may feel quite unnecessarily guilty about it. The real disease is *unlived life*. The cure for it is a new social purpose.

Today there are few realised and accepted positive values by which the community and the individual can evolve and grow. *If a person is willing to conform to a society which is really socially underdeveloped, he himself is socially underdeveloped.* If he is *not* willing to conform, his apparent illness (nonconformity) may well be in fact social health—provided he is activated by the desire to grow socially, and by knowing what to do, why to do it, and how to do it. Such social health (positive nonconformism) is the constructive opposite of the cult of conformity. The positive nonconformist must be carefully distinguished from the person who

is mentally sick, who because of definite sickness cannot fit into his community. Even here, however, it may well have been the shortcomings of society which triggered off mental sickness: social tensions and lack of social values, and the feeling, for instance, that nobody cares whether a man lives or dies —when these factors cause mental sickness it is society, in the first place, whose disease needs to be remedied. Society's disease is the lack of any true values, and its present ethics may be nothing more than a matter of "keeping up with the Joneses." Education in our schools today is mainly concerned with making people able to conform: but we may well ask, conform to what? When society lacks any worthwhile values, there is little enough left which it is worth conforming to. If people live in a family or community which weakens their social activities rather than strengthening them, this society is a danger in itself.

We therefore make no apology for saying that conformism cannot be the purpose of prevention: in general we consider that current society has no satisfactory social purpose and therefore is seriously inadequate. It has lost its previous purpose of social defence against threats to its survival, and it has not yet found a new positive and constructive strength through social values. Ethics based on religion no longer provides a framework of social value for the majority of people, and ethics based on rational thinking has not yet come into its own. Society is in a state of hiatus.

At this point it may be valuable to make certain distinctions. For the understanding of prevention we must mark out three levels on which action can be taken:

(1) *The prevention of breakdown in society.*

This is dealing with those who are not yet under stress. (The comfortable conformists, not under industrial or personal stress who believe themselves to be competing successfully).

(2) *The prevention of breakdown of those who have already shown signs of stress which they are able to bear only with great difficulty.*

(The isolated, the apathetic, and the bored).

(3) *The prevention of a recurrence of further breakdown of those who have already suffered one;* (e.g. the ex-prisoner, ex-mental patient).

It is essential to learn from the third stage what can best be done about the others because on this level the problems are most clear and concentrated. For the understanding of non-violence you must study violence. We find that people who have been "sick" can very often be the best advisers as to how to avoid the breakdown of others. This we have learned in our work with mental patients, prisoners, attempted suicides and delinquent youngsters. Their own social value can be re-established by helping others.

Social Inadequacy

A socially inadequate person is one who has not developed anything near his potential capacity as a social being. This may be the fault of his environment, of his community, or of his society, or of all these forces.

Present society does not demand any ethical behaviour from its members but only avoidance of crassly anti-social attitudes. This means that in such a society people are not often aware of their inadequacy. We must help to develop people's full social faculties. To do this we must not force them into positive action, for such a course would have no real or lasting value as a new motivation for their future life.

When we come to consider the question of how far a man may be regarded as being personally responsible for his inadequacy and able to fight against it, it is important to distinguish three definite stages:

(a) *Social Ignorance* is simply the social underdevelopment of a person.

(b) *Social Inadequacy* is the stage reached when a person becomes aware of his social ignorance. different degrees of this inadequacy.

(c) The third stage will be one of *shame*, if, being aware of his inadequacy, he then does nothing—or too little—about it.

Social Inadequacy therefore is conscious and may come to be a cause of shame: Social Ignorance refers to people who are not aware of their condition. Social Inadequacy and Social Ignorance must both be distinguished from Social Incapacity. Social Incapacity results from an objective, probably physical handicap, which hinders the person from developing socially—severe mental subnormalcy, severe mental disurbance, etc. These relatively rare conditions are clearly beyond a person's own capacity to rectify.

The degrees of Social Inadequacy (or it may be Social Ignorance) can be described as follows:

1. *The Severely Aggressive*, e.g. the sadist, sociopath, the violent criminal, the aggressive sex offender, the active victimizer of scapegoats.
2. *The Severely Incapacitated or Handicapped.*

   This is a person who cannot overcome a hindrance which makes him socially crippled. This may be a permanent condition or one which might alter if circumstances were different or new opportunities for development arose.
3. *The Potentially Aggressive.*

   This is the person who is potentially willing to undertake aggressive action but has not the courage to do so. He waits for a time when he believes there is no risk of being caught, e.g. the petty criminal, the potential mobster.
4. *The Severely A-Social.*

   Here is the person who has given up any intention of developing further. He feels

himself incapable of growing any more, so he vegetates. He may feel simply that he is no good, and see therefore no point in making an effort. If there is a likelihood of mass action on the level of group 3, he may join in readily, especially if his is a case of frozen violence.

5. *The "Normal" A-Social.*

This man conforms. In his eyes, so long as he has committed no conventional crime he owes nothing to society—in fact "Society owes *me* a living." "Why should I worry?"; "Not my business"; "I keep my nose clean"; "I get on with *my* life"—these are typical reactions.

4-5. Between groups 4 and 5 there is the severely asocial person who is "normally" social within his own "in-group". Beyond his immediate group he will be very hostile to anyone who does not belong.

6. *The Sophisticated A-Social.*

He does something, but it is not nearly enough in relation to his abilities and potential value for society. Often it is merely a smoke-screen for his social attitude, sometimes underlined by cynicism. This is typical of the ex-idealist who has lost faith in his ideals and prefers to have an ego-centred life, aggressively defending his non-participation as a social being.

What appears to be necessary is to develop educational techniques of a social nature:

(a) To help people to become aware of their social inadequacy. Most people are not aware of it: a society which in fact is composed of themselves plus an elite which wants little if any real change, will neither teach awareness nor require it.

(b) To learn what they can do about it. For this Social Training is needed—in school and at all levels of adult society as well.

(c) To help people to develop *their own* positive values of a social nature.

(d) To show in a Pilot job how much richer life can be if it is fully lived.

We must also try to develop a social climate in which Social Ignorance is regarded as objectionable and dirty as its equally "unnatural" counterpart, physical uncleanliness. This means that anyone who has no real social values that he lives by, is to be considered on a level with a filthy person. People must become aware of the fact that severe Social Inadequacy may well bring about a dangerous situation not only for the person concerned but for the whole group with which, or near which, he lives: it is a handicap which may seriously interfere with the development of the whole group.

After developing a sense of shame for one's social ignorance,

the next step is a will to live by social values. At present our greedy society pays only lip-service to constructive social values. There are some genuinely religious people, believing in the "grace of faith," who apply their social value in practical ways. But religious and non-religious alike should be able to agree about the "disgrace" and the shame of living a life empty of values—a life which is socially inadequate.

Any approach to the law-breaker must involve two main considerations—what is best for society and what is best for the man concerned. Basically the requirements are the same—that the man should live and work as an honest citizen in the community. We believe that the concept of social development is the only guide that will help us to find constructive answers. What of our principles and practice in our social system today?

In the first place we do not subscribe to the view that behaviour can be judged on the basis of fear of the consequences of misbehaviour. We would object on ethical grounds to any system in which fear was the basis of conformity. But we have reason to believe also that fear does not work as a deterrent in most cases, nor is punishment a satisfactory means of correction in the majority of cases.

Throughout history societies have sought to enforce conformity through the medium of punishing wrong-doers. The punishment has taken many forms, the more usual one being imprisonment. But even when prisons were hell, men still committed crimes. In more recent times the threat of very long sentences of imprisonment has done little to blunt the upward curve of the crime graphs.

What is not generally realised is that a deterrent is effective so long as the person believes he will be caught, or may be caught. He will go to prison, he will be punished, life will be made uncomfortable for him *IF* he is caught. But if the man believes that he will not be caught, the question of the deterrent does not arise. Every law-breaker is aware of the risk involved in his crime, but we have found that most are able to mesmerise themselves into a state of believing that the chances of success heavily outweigh these risks.

Repeatedly we have been told: "If I did not think that I would get away with it, I would not do it. What do you think I am, *a fool*?"

Men with long criminal records have said that in contemplating a crime they carefully study the situation and in this preliminary stage they think carefully about the risk of being caught. The whole purpose of their planning is to avoid detection, having once convinced themselves that they will get away with it, their concentration is then focused on the *Job* and putting their plans into action.

If they should get caught, they are then able to write it off as

being "Bad luck." "It would have been O.K. if only the policeman hadn't changed his beat that night..." this time it was bad luck (or an admitted mistake) but next time, with a little more care, it will be a pushover. We believe, therefore, that so long as law-breakers are able to find security in this self-mesmerization, the deterrent will not work for the determined criminal.

There is one further point worth making in this respect. We have often asked men who were eligible for preventive detention, whether the threat of this heavy sentence did not make them think twice and then again. We received the same reply that "When you had decided to go ahead with a job you did not think about prison because you wouldn't be caught", but a number said that the threat of a long sentence might influence their decision on the type of "job" they would do. "If you stand the risk of a heavy sentence" they said, "then you make sure that the job is a big one and really worth while just in case..."

These viewpoints, so often expressed and representative certainly of the majority of recidivist prisoners, has reinforced our view that these men who make up the bulk of the prison population, are relatively untouched by the threat of punishment.

No matter how tough the prisons become, no matter how long the sentences, they would not be deterred from crime so long as they were able to convince themselves that they would not be caught. We believe therefore that their behaviour pattern can be changed only when they can be helped to think straight. This training can be given in prison, but only when the role of the prison is changed from that of a punishment centre to one dedicated to the work of rehabilitation.

Rehabilitation and Training

If, therefore, the conventional and time honoured "tough" approach simply does not seem to work, neither, we believe does the "comfortable incarceration" method. The basis of our approach is that a man should not go to prison for punishment or for a convenient period of "cold storage" but for rehabilitation.

Rehabilitation should begin the day a man comes into prison, the day in which his dependents (if he has any) begin *their* sentence. They, too, are members of society, isolated and under stress. Their needs go far beyond a National Assistance Board arrangement or the pacifying of a hire purchase company. He and they should be in the care of the prison authorities who, as things are, act merely as custodians. This care, if it is to be effective should last long after a man has been discharged.

It should be realised, too, that progress does not always follow a straight line; there may be many setbacks and the fact that a man breaks down does not mean that the attempt has failed. If a prisoner has a relapse it may mean that the

treatment is wrong and that it has not been continued for long enough. Medicine does not work at once. A relapse must be studied to see where the breakdown has come and whether there has in fact been progress. Has he been "out" longer than before? Which particular crisis must be guarded against next time?

Prison is the logical place for the commencement of rehabilitation training but it must be a different sort of prison from the sort which we have now. The emphasis must be on a planned progress of social development. Dead minds must be brought to life. We have given a description of a practical approach in our paper "A Pilot rehabilitation scheme in Wandsworth Prison."

Not long ago a group of people who had had a very little experience of prison gained a great deal of publicity for their proposals for prison reform. They concerned themselves almost entirely with the irritations of prison, things like sanitary arrangements, changing of socks, what they called the "human indignities." But the real and greatest human indignity is a dead mind. Social under-development is a greater reason for shame than having to use a chamber pot while living three in a cell. Some people see the future of prison reform lying in bigger and better prisons (all modern conveniences and cultural outlets). This is simply untrue. Such things have no bearing on whether you are going to live in society as a respected citizen. A sense of social values—your own, and not values forced upon you—is more important than a pair of pyjamas to sleep in. *Those who concern themselves with making life in prison more comfortable are doing a disservice to the idea of prison reform.* The amenities tend to loom so large that they take on the guise of prison reform. They can come to serve as excuses handed out by authorities which will not face up to the real reform problems.

Reform can be measured only in terms of helping people to stay out of prisons; the little comforts given will not serve that purpose. They will in fact only make the real problem of rehabilitation more difficult; the aspirins will serve only to put prisoners to sleep, a deeper more comfortable sleep, more institutionalised, so that the real rehabilitation will be more and not less difficult.

There is something to be said for a man having something to complain about; at least so long as he is complaining and rebelling his mind is working. But the big change that must come in prison is the approach to training.

Prison Officers and Training

We believe that the training should be done basically by prison officers. They, after all, are the people who really know the man. They are in constant touch with him and are better able to assess his progress or lack of progress than any governor or psychologist. What is their present role? As far

as the local and central prisons are concerned, not very different from the guards in Norfolk Island a century ago. This is the reality no matter what lip service is paid to high sounding principles. They are called prison "Officers" but "officer" is an empty courtesy title. Their advice is not sought since what goes on in prison is the preserve of the criminologist and sociologist. They have been treated as people who are only one jump ahead of the prisoner in education. They are the N.C.Os in an army that has no known objective. Before we came into Wandsworth Prison we were warned that we "would get nowhere with them." In the event we found some outstanding men, people with imagination and enthusiasm who were anxious to learn and to do. There is some reason to believe that what we found is not untypical of other institutions and that officers are becoming aware of their wasted abilities and are anxious to do constructive work.

There can be little doubt that if training is to be effective a link must be forged between the prison officer and prisoner. This link should be forged when a man comes into prison and should be strengthened by the fact that prison officers as a group should be known to be concerned about his family and outside life. It follows logically that this concern should be continued after a man has left prison. The prison officer should be the person to whom he can always go for advice and help. There must be communication between prisoner and prison officer; if people can't *talk* together, they can't work together. Training is a joint effort.

Prison Officers who, either through the unfamiliarity of these ideas or because they have become attached to a set routine over a long period of time, feel some doubt or dismay should carefully examine their position. If they do not do this work they will become merely turnkeys. There is a tremendous gap in the treatment of prisoners which will have to be filled by people concerned with rehabilitation. If prison officers do not fill the gap, others will and the future of the prison officer will be set at the minimum level of turnkey.

If they do undertake this work they will come to exert considerable influence not only in respect of prisons but of society at large. Prison is only an extreme form of society and if a way is found to help this extreme form towards social adequacy, then society at large outside in the jungle will have to learn from prisons. The future that is offered then to prison officers is that of a move towards professionalism.

The job in prisons is therefore a double training job; on the one hand prisoners must be trained, but before this can be done, their trainers (prison officers) must be trained.

If the job of rehabilitation is to be taken seriously then new tools must be made available, or old

tools made more efficient. What prison officers need is to be shown how they can give better effect to their capabilities. A certain amount of training of prisoners can also be done by prisoners themselves. They play an important role because ultimately they must carry on the leadership role outside. The best leaders are those that come from within the peer group.

What Course of Training?

Training as far as prisoners and prison officers are concerned is not a matter of listening to lectures no matter how gifted or experienced the lecturer may be. It is a process of development. Everyone must be made aware of the "Four Crises" which exist for a man when he comes out of prison (see appendix) and must be familiar with the five basic stages outlined in the Wandsworth Report.

It is integral to a training course that people should be able to evolve a system of values. Nobody can live without values and remain a social being. There must be an opportunity for full and ruthless discussion. We have used what we call the "personal-age and social-age scale" and have found it to be a useful tool in discussion. (It is analogous to the chronological age—I.Q. scale). Personal age is the personal capacity of a man to develop his own personal abilities so that he can succeed as an individual. Social age is the willingness of a person to identify himself with others. When we attempt to measure other people or other groups by this scale and then to measure ourselves or our own group, we sometimes stumble on facts (often unpalatable) which have been hidden from us. It is possible for self-realisation to give rise to shame and indignation which can be a starting point for constructive thought and action.

Training should aim at making a prison into a community service centre where prisoners can "pay back" to society by doing work of social value. Doing outside work which is of value to the community not only gives men dignity but serves as an example to society.

Any course with prisoners should take into consideration the fact that most of them are inadequate people who cannot compete and therefore take short cuts. The reason for doing group work is that it strengthens the individual. In groups he need not compete. Alone he cannot. Group solidarity is opposed to lonely competition.

Whatever field we work in we must never forget that the freedom to identify with others involves a process of maturing. Prisoners, too, must be given responsibility, especially in the second and third stages, since this gives self respect and the feeling of being valued. In our society it is customary for us to give people dignity by awarding them the C.B.E. and, later, a Knighthood. This is not feasible with prisoners but when they are allowed to do work for,

and be valued by, others they will achieve a dignity of their own through their own actions.

We would see Group Counselling as something which creates a bond between prisoner and officer and makes for a warmer atmosphere (in itself good) and which is administratively useful; but we believe that it is in *group work* that people can be both enriched by further knowledge and be given confidence and dignity through the realisation that they are people who have social value.

An excuse so often put forward for the failure to undertake rehabilitation work in prison is that of cost. We see it rather as a case not of whether society can afford to do it, but whether society can afford not to do it.

It has been officially stated that the cost of sending a man to prison, keeping his family, etc., is in the region of £2,000 a year. This figure (which many consider to be too low) multiplied by the 31,000 men in prison in Britain, represents a cost of some £60,000,000 a year.

The excuse is also put forward that rehabilitation would require a considerable increase in manpower in the prison service.

We believe that the work could be done with the existing manpower. Prison officers admit that there is a great wastage of effort in the existing prison organisation, due largely to the fact that prisoners are not segregated. So long as potential escapers and violence cases are mixed indiscriminately with other prisoners, whole establishments are worked on a maximum security basis.

This not only results in a great deal of wasted effort on the part of officers, but it means that all the men in a prison must accept a form of imprisonment made necessary by only a very small percentage—perhaps ten per cent —of their number. A sensible segregation of prisoners would allow many officers to be freed for the work of rehabilitation.

APPENDIX I

Alternative forms of Imprisonment

We believe that it might be of assistance to judges and magistrates if they were also to have in their hands other alternatives to the normal prison sentence.

The alternative forms of imprisonment which we propose hereunder could be used either with, or instead of the normal prison sentence.

1. *Selective Service*: This might serve a purpose for those people whose offence did not justify any other forms of imprisonment, but who should, on the other hand, make some compensation to society. Men involved would have to undertake work of social value, either full-time or on a part-time basis. This is based on the principles governing the treatment of conscientious objectors and underlines the compensation theory.
2. *Week-End Prison*: This would be intended for people who have good jobs and are maintain-

ing their families. There could be variations of this . . . those concerned could either sleep in or out of prison over the week-end. The main point would be that the week-end period in prison would be used for social training.

3. *Twelve-Hour Prison*: This would be intended for the man who needs to be forced to work, and who also needs social development. He would work in a special establishment (representing prison) in some suitable form of employment which would be paid at normal civilian rates. At the same time he would receive social training. This man would return home to sleep at night.
4. *Five-day-week-Prison*: This would again be intended for people who are being forced to work in order to pay back compensation. This would serve both for repayment and for social training, but would not entail a serious breakdown of family life as a man could go home to sleep at weekends.
5. *Work Camps*: These would be intended for unmarried or isolated inadequates who had no security with a family or community setting. Here there could be two different grades—for those seriously inadequate or endangered by their environment it might be possible to set up small communities where these men would work at whatever was best suited to their skill. They could live in hostels or in some sort of private dwelling if these could be found.

   An alternative, to be used for those who were considered dangerous (offenders against children, etc.) would be a work camp in which inmates would be strictly confined within the camp area.
6. *Prison Community*: The main difference between this and the work camps would be that in this community the man would live with his family. This could be either a factory or an agricultural community intended particularly for those cases where it was necessary to rehabilitate the family as well as the man. This would be a relatively free life with only a minimum of restrictions. It would serve to get the family out of an endangering environment.

APPENDIX II

"The Four Crises"

In the introduction to Part One of this paper we said that work in one social field has helped us to understand better the problems encountered in other fields. One common factor that has come to our attention in dealing with prisoners on the one hand and mental patients on the other is that which we have called the "four crises."

We have found that a person emerging from institutionalisation of any type may encounter four crises which have basic similarities though they may each be in a

different setting. It should be said at this point that not every person emerging from institutionalisation will encounter all these crises, or for that matter any of them. We have sufficient evidence, however, to suggest that the probability is that he will encounter at least one of them.

The four crises are introduced into the group training sessions with prisoners so that each man may be forearmed by being forewarned. We cannot forestall these crises, but by telling prisoners of their existence we are at least able to help the prisoner identify them for what they are and in this way more readily cope with them should they arise.

We have called the first crisis the "gate crisis." The gate can take the form of either a physical barrier that has confined them within a prison or any other establishment, or it can be the purely mental barrier that has confined them none-the-less securely within a particular environment.

Take the prisoner as an example. One morning after 'X' months or years, he ceases to be a number and once again becomes a man. At one moment he is behind the gate; at another he is on the other side. On the one side he has been living in a rut of routine. He has been protected from "life"... his food has been found for him, he has been clothed, he has been discouraged from thinking. On the other side he will have to fend for himself.

The force of this impact with a new life... or with life itself... cannot be over exaggerated. No matter how much they may come to hate the existence within a prison, no matter to what extent they look forward to their day of freedom, even hardened prisoners have expressed real fears about the problems that will face them "outside."

Suddenly, at eight o'clock one morning, they are confronted with the hustle and bustle of traffic, with buses that seem larger than they remembered them, with cars that go twice as fast as they thought. They are suddenly alone, for the first time for months or years... there is no cell into which they can go and slam the door, no food orderly to bring around cocoa and a bun, no prison officer to say do this and don't do that.

The crisis at the gate is a very real thing for the ex-prisoner. It is the same, too, for a former mental patient. But this crisis occurs also for others suddenly wrenched out of some rut, and set down in new surroundings or in some new way of life.

Any institutionalised person (and here we exclude the prisoner and mental patient) who finds himself in a new environment, away from his particular community in which he was protected by a paternal society, can become very, very frightened. And being frightened, unless he is forewarned, he may panic.

The first crisis, then, comes with the initial impact with "life," and

coincides with the simultaneous loss of protection, or accustomed background and routine.

The second crisis is largely set within the family. For the ex-prisoner it is a case of settling down with a wife and children who have come to find a way of life in which he has no part. How will he fit in ? Will he be able to make a go of his marriage ? Will his wife forgive him, and forget what has happened ? This "family" adjustment can apply to the larger "family" of a new community. The man who has suddenly been uprooted from his suburban existence and sent to a new part of the country, to a New Town, or even to a new country, might find himself disturbed by the same problems of adjustment. The one who has no family must learn to live with his neighbours, room-mates, relatives or friends, with whom he will share a setting for the daily acts of living.

The third crisis is more often connected with work. To take the case of prisoners again, the ex-prisoner occasionally meets a real crisis in his attempts to settle down into a job. He will find himself out of touch with his job, his skill blunted by years during which he could not keep up to date with technical developments. He may feel uncertain, afraid of making a mistake, unfamiliar with the ideas of his new bosses.

Similarly, a man who moves from his little suburban home where he worked at the small factory two blocks away may panic at the thought of working in the large, impersonal factory at which he may be employed in a New Town. Out of the old "rut," he may find that his confidence is lacking. The same feeling will assail the young man, newly out of school, suddenly thrust out into an adult-world, where he will have to rely on himself.

Finally, the fourth crisis. This may occur at any time and, of course, may not even occur at all. It is the unpredictable, the crisis which cannot be foreseen but may suddenly come up and panic someone into a series of acts which may undo months of progress. Suddenly the man says to himself: I've had it, I can't take it one minute longer. I'm off ! Or the woman who had been settling down so well, will suddenly grab her things and rush out of her home, her job, her marriage, walk out on her children, and apparently "go mad," just when everyone thought she was recovering. The panic that seizes one at a fourth crisis is as sudden as lightening and can defeat reason unless one is prepared for it.

Prisoners have found that suddenly, one day, they are confronted with someone they knew "inside," someone who says they are mad to "go straight" and that if they would only care to come out tonight there is a cool thousand lying there waiting. Or the old prison friend who comes up and slaps them on the back

when they are out with the boss or girl friend who knows nothing of the past.

There may be the occasion when the prisoner's new boss suddenly confronts him with the evidence of his past; or merely when he has a row with the foreman and asks himself: "Is it all really worth while?" Wasn't it easier just "to go out thievin," even if it did mean a year or so in prison every while. Or there may be no obvious reason one can pin it on to. Out of the blue, it happens.

As we have said, this is the unpredictable crisis . . . and many who have come through the first three safely, with apparently flying colours, will come to grief on the fourth. It is unlikely that the group worker can forestall any of these crises. But what he can do is prepare those with whom he is working by telling them that these four times of crises might come up.

We have done this with all the prisoner groups with whom we have worked and also with patients in the mental hospitals. The effect has sometimes been comic . . . but the results rewarding.

Interested members of the public at the July Liverpool Show

(*Story on page 28*)