

5p QUARTERLY

No. 2

new series

**P R I S O N
S E R V I C E
J O U R N A L**



Editorial Board

- DAVID ATKINSON
Governor, H.M. Borstal, Hewell Grange
- LESLIE LUMB
Senior Officer, H.M. Prison, Norwich
- JOHN ST.Q. ROSS
Higher Executive Officer, South-west
Regional Office, Bristol
- ROY S. TAYLOR, M.A., F.B.P.S.
Principal Psychologist, H.M.P.S. Staff
College, Wakefield
- MARK S. WINSTON
Deputy Regional Director (Operations),
North Regional Office, Manchester



*Cover photograph of H.M. Detention
Centre, Eastwood Park by courtesy of
Bristol Evening Post*

Cartoon by
A. TAYLOR
Officer, H.M. Borstal, Onley



Contents

Overcrowding	2
F. B. O'Friel	
The Honest Politician's Guide to Crime Control	5
Lord Stonham	
Cartoon	7
Development of Probation and Psychiatric Social Work Techniques	8
H. A. Prins	
The Visiting Watchdogs	12
G. Farnsworth	
Suicide in Prison	13
E. Stengel	
The Defences of the Weak	14
A. Barclay	
Book Reviews	15
The Media and the Message	23
A. H. Rayfield	

PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL

Editorial Office: HOME OFFICE, PRISON DEPARTMENT
SCOTTISH LIFE HOUSE, BRIDGE STREET, MANCHESTER, M3 3DH

Quarterly 5p Annual subscription 15p (by post 25p)

TASKS AND RESOURCES

APART from a brief policy statement in our first issue and an equally brief item on policy in the new-sized but old-priced issue of January we have never published an editorial as such. This is because the Editorial Board plans each number as a reflection of the current penal scene bearing in mind it is not the Journal's function to express an official view or represent any particular platform or pressure group.

Nevertheless, readers sometimes do ask: "Why does not the Journal say something about our problems and what should be done about them?" We would reply: "Look at the table of contents alongside, read the Journal and then say whether or not we have done precisely what you suggest".

Looking at today's penal picture we cannot fail to see the sombre background which OVERCROWDING provides. Much is being planned which will eventually brighten the whole canvas but it is a process which may appear irritatingly slow to the onlooker.

Apart from any new buildings we must welcome any measure to reduce the prison population and we must be aware of any new thinking on CRIME CONTROL. Neither the American "slant" on the Hawkins/Morris book (reviewed by Lord Stonham) nor its borrowings from the British way of tackling crime should encourage us to say: "It could never happen here". We need more Public-Police-Prison co-operation and understanding if indeed we are not to have some of the unpleasant American experiences repeated here.

Even if the prison figure fell dramatically we should be dealing with human problems in an "inside" situation with many "outside" connections, so it is important to follow Herschel Prins' arguments about our relationships with other agencies, particularly at a time when new social departments begin operating in a changing environment indeed Environment with a Department of its own. Nor must we forget people like our Boards of Visitors and Visiting Committees . . . and other WATCHDOGS. They are partners with us, another link in the Public-Police-Prison chain.

These, our main items, represent our task. To fulfil our task we need resources, the most important of which is staff. Staff cannot work without knowledge of our problems.

The range of subjects covered in our review section is an indication of the Journal's part in bringing you some of the knowledge you need to fulfil your task.

SOLITARY . . . SEPARATION

*As he went through Cold-Bath Fields he saw a solitary cell
And the Devil was pleased for it gave him a hint
For improving his prisons in Hell.*

"The Devil's Thoughts"—SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE, 1772-1834

TOGETHER . . . "ASSOCIATION"

*Come, let's away to prison . . .
We two alone will sing like birds i' the cage . . .*

"King Lear"—WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, 1564-1616

OVERCROWDING

PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

An Assessment by F. B. O'FRIEL

IN 1922, Sir Evelyn Ruggles Brise wrote in the preface to his book *The English Prison System* about the separate system:

The prison cell, as with the monks of old, was the method of redemption . . . if by its positive effect the cell worked on the redemption of the soul, its negative result was claimed to be equally efficacious in preventing contamination by means of segregation. Pressed severely to its logical conclusion, cellular seclusion becomes a refinement of cruelty while on the other hand promiscuity, resulting from unregulated association was admitted in this, as in other countries, to be the nursery of crime. The course of prison welfare has been in the direction of finding a compromise between these two opposite principles.

The final blow to the separate system in this country came when prisoners were placed three to a cell. Staff control of contamination was lost. Paragraph 9 of the 1969 Annual Report of the Prison Department states:

At the end of June 1970, the total population was 39,887 of whom over 13,000 were sleeping two or three in a cell.

The search for a compromise between Ruggles Brise's two opposite principles is clearly over for a time and the Prison Service has reverted to something akin to eighteenth century contamination

through unregulated association. One of the best descriptions I have read of current contamination is the article "Three'd Up . . ." by R. F. Bates, in March 1970 number of the Prison Officers' Association Magazine. Yet strangely enough, no research appears to have been done or to be contemplated, into the effects of contamination and in particular whether it is related to the falling success rates of penal treatment.

F. B. O'Friel now deputy governor of Onley Borstal, joined the Prison Service in 1963 after graduating in Law at Liverpool University. He has since served at Manchester and Liverpool

The first time that the practice of placing prisoners more than one to a cell is officially reported in the 1947 Report of the Commissioners of Prisons on page 24:

In our reports for 1945 and 1946, we may have given the impression that these were years of some difficulty; having experienced 1947, we begin to think of them as the "good old times". In 1946, we talked of overcrowding as a serious problem with a daily average population of some 15,800 little knowing that in 1947 it would reach 17,100 and that in the first few months of

1948 it would have passed 19,500 and appear to be moving inexorably to 20,000.

EFFECTS OF OVERCROWDING

One result of the overcrowding was that in almost every prison from time to time and in many all the time, it became necessary to sleep three men in a cell.

The 1948 Report of the Commissioners indicates how the problem continued to develop:

With a population level higher than that in 1947, the effects of overcrowding mentioned in our report for that year continued and there is little fresh to say on the subject. During the year, some 2,000 men on average were sleeping three in a cell in local prisons.

The impression given by the reports is that the practice of "threeing up" was not seen as a policy change but as a temporary expedient. As such it was not to be publicised or questioned. Looked at with the benefit of hindsight, the decision in 1947, however it was reached, was one that will dominate the Prison Service for at least half a century.

A judicial decision in the last few years in West Rhine Westphalia, a province of West Germany, stating it was illegal to place prisoners more than one in a cell resulted in emergency measures of several types to prevent illegality occurring. If one industrialised European country can act in this way

without disaster, it suggests that threeing up prisoners was and is not the only solution open to a penal system when faced with severe overcrowding.

This in turn raises the question of how the English Penal System found itself in crisis in 1947. In order to understand the crisis it is necessary to consider the movement of the prison population over the last 100 years and to examine the availability of accommodation to match the requirements of that population.

Prison population in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

As the prison population rose throughout 1970, passing the 40,000 mark in July, pre-war entrants to the Service must have reflected wryly on the population of about 11,000 experienced in the late 30s. In 30 years the prison population has grown by about 350 per cent, a growth rate of about 10 per cent a year.

The temptation to draw comparisons with the pre-war period is strong. In the August 1970 edition of the Prison Officers' Association Magazine, comment on the overcrowding crisis was concluded in the following terms:

And it seems inevitable now—unless fundamental changes in sentencing policy are introduced by law—that the adult prison population will reach 40,000 in the same period, giving a total of not less than 50,000 incarcerated in our penal establishments before 1980 and that is a very conservative estimate indeed which will almost certainly prove to be a considerable understatement of the position since already we have 40,000 in custody as compared to about 10,000 before the war.

The assumption that prison population movements must be measured against a base line of the inter-war years is highly questionable. Useful statistics are available on the prison population from the previous century and enable a judgement to be made based on a period of well over 100 years.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, any assessment of the number of prisoners in England was vastly complicated by the system of transportation and the hulk system. Transportation to Australia started in 1784 and continued until 1867. From 1916–46, transportation was at 3,000 a year; the final figure was 134,308 convicts transported to Australia. Parallel to transportation was the hulk system, a temporary expedi-

ent adopted in 1776. In his book *Punishment and Prevention of Crime*, Du Cane estimates that 3,000 to 4,000 convicts were held in the hulks.

The end of transportation produced the great era of prison building of the mid-nineteenth century: Pentonville in 1842 and a further 54 new prisons on the same model by 1848 with a total of 11,000 separate cells.

In 1850, the convict prisons came under the directors of the convict prisons. These, together with the local prisons were regularly reported on and accurate figures of their population are available.

The following tables indicate the total prison population compared with the national population over the last 100 years:

Year	Daily Average Population	Population England and Wales
1871	28,500	23 million
1878	30,600	25 million
1888	21,000	28 million
1898	17,600	31 million
1904	20,757	33 million
1911	19,797	36 million
1921	12,500	37 million
1931	11,500	39 million
1951	21,780	43 million
1961	29,025	46 million
1966	33,086	47 million
1970	40,000	50 million

Another aspect of the prison population is the change in the annual rate of receptions. Du Cane reports that the local prisons in the first six years of the Prison Commission averaged 193,485 receptions a year.

In 1904–5, committals to custody were marginally under 200,000. Not until the outbreak of World War I did the annual reception figure move below 140,000. So from the year 1878–1914, receptions were running at between 140,000 and 200,000. Since 1914 the figures have not exceeded 100,000. The worst figure so far recorded being 98,118 in 1967. It is, of course, highly probable that 100,000 receptions will be exceeded in 1970 but these figures will not be available until well into 1971. Hence, even in this crisis year, we will receive into custody no more than three-quarters of the number the Prison Service was dealing with in the 36 years from 1878 to 1914.

The difference between the 24 years' period and today is that the vast majority of receptions then were serving under three months. About 127,000 of the 167,000 received into custody in 1913

were serving under three months. Only 23,000 of the 98,000 received in 1967 were serving under three months. So the nature of the task facing the Service has changed. Nevertheless, it is a salutary thought that our predecessors coped with receptions and discharges on a scale well beyond anything we have yet experienced in this generation of prison staff.

The interesting and crucial period for the Prison Service was clearly the years 1918–39. In that time, the daily average population was between 9,000 and 13,000, well below anything experienced in the second half of the nineteenth century, the first decade of the twentieth and, of course, the period of 1945 onwards.

Our successors may be wise enough to identify this as a freak in the growth of the prison population in the twentieth century. Perhaps the fantastic casualties of the First World War decreased the potential criminal population. Perhaps the explosion of violence and energy between 1914 and 1918 removed the need for criminality to a large extent for a generation. Whatever the cause the prison population fell and stayed at a very low level, no more than 60 per cent of what it was in 1913, until the end of the Second World War.

Prison accommodation in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries

At the time of the nationalisation of the prisons, in fact on vesting day, the 2nd April 1878, there were 20,442 prisoners in local prisons. Add to this the total of 8,843 males and 1,251 females reported to be held by the directors of the convict prisons in 1878 and there was a total in custody of over 30,000. How were these accommodated?

The convict prisons consisted of:

Borstal
Brixton
Chatham
Dartmoor
Parkhurst
Portland
Woking
Wormwood Scrubs
Fulham } for females
Woking }

with a total accommodation of over 10,000.

The Prison Commission inherited 113 local prisons from the local authorities. At that point in time, there existed in England and Wales more establishments than the department controls at present although the total will be exceeded in the next few years.

Room for 37,000

The total accommodation reported to be available in the first Report of the Commissioners of Prisons was 27,213. Add this total to the accommodation in the convict prisons and the somewhat unpalatable truth emerges that there was accommodation for over 37,000 prisoners in England and Wales in 1878.

The Commission immediately brought into operation a drastic closure plan to remove many small local prisons from operational use. Appendix number 11 of the 1885-6 report lists 52 prisons closed in England and Wales between 1878 and 1886. Du Cane reports that the effect of the Prison Act of 1877 by 1885 was—

1. To reduce the number of prisons from 113 to 59 while the gross amount of prison accommodation was reduced from 27,392 to 23,089.
2. To greatly reduce the number of staff. The total cost under local authority control rose from £179,791 in 1857 to £239,247 in 1878. Under the Commission and the closure programme, the wages bill of senior staff was reduced from £95,000 to £55,000.

More closures

The programme of closures continued through the remaining years of the nineteenth century and the prisons at Kirkdale, Kendal and York were closed. In 1902, Newgate was closed and this marks the end of the first phase of prison closures.

The second phase of prison closures followed the drastic drop in the prison population at the beginning of the First World War and sustained in the inter-war years.

An examination of the annual reports of the Commissioners of Prisons for this period reveals that the drop in the population was followed by a policy of prison closure. In the annual reports a special appendix was published giving details of the prisons closed since 1900—an interesting contrast to Appendix 2 of current annual reports (Opening and Development of New Establishments). In the 1925-6 Annual Report, Appendix No. 5 reads as follows:

The following local prisons have been wholly closed since 1900:

		Total accommodation
Bodmin	June 1916	122 cells
Cambridge	June 1916	121 cells
Canterbury	Mar. 1922	
Carlisle	Mar 1922	168 cells
Carnarvon	Mar. 1922	78 cells
Chelmsford	July 1915	

Derby	Nov. 1916	369 cells
Devizes	Sept. 1914	198 cells
Hereford	Mar. 1915	105 cells
Ipswich	July 1925	166 cells
Knutsford	Oct. 1915	613 cells
Lancaster	June 1916	
Lewes	Nov. 1916	
Newgate	Dec. 1902	143 cells
Newcastle	April 1925	377 cells
Northallerton	Mar. 1922	
Northampton	Mar. 1922	215 cells
Reading	Nov. 1915	
Ruthin	Nov. 1916	84 cells
St. Albans	Nov. 1915	119 cells
Stafford	Feb. 1916	
Usk	Mar. 1916	
Worcester	Mar. 1922	393 cells

Leaving aside Newgate, the closure of which was clearly quite separate, 15 local prisons were closed in this period and entirely lost to the Service as accommodation. In March 1930, Plymouth too was closed, making a total of 16 establishments lost to the Service, since the outbreak of the First World War.

Eight of the above list were reopened at a later date and are currently in use. There are now 43 of the nineteenth century prisons left in commission, including Rochester, Portland and Usk. So, of the 59 establishments open in 1914, 24 had been closed by 1931 and 16 lost entirely for prison use.

The only new establishments opened between the wars were the three experimental open borstals at Lowdham, North Sea Camp and Hollesley Bay. Thus open places for some 500 borstal boys replaced the 24 establishments closed. Even comparing the new places created with the 16 old locals lost for good, the Service must have made a net loss of well over 2,500 places.

Re-opening the closed and opening up the new "opens"

When the prison population began to rise towards the end of the Second World War, the Prison Commission took two different courses to accommodate prisoners. Every prison in the country left standing from the closure programme of the inter-war years was reopened and a large programme for the conversion of other accommodation [an American army hospital, an Elizabethan house, a Land Army hostel, a nobleman's country seat, an R.A.F. airfield, a Victorian fort]* was undertaken to provide open or semi-secure establishments. Finally, with the opening of Everthorpe in 1957, came the beginning of the new generation of secure prison building.

The following table sets out the prison population and available accommodation:

Year	Prison accommodation	Prison population
1878	37,000	30,000
1885	32,000	25,000
1905	25,000	21,000
1912	27,000	18,000
1925	21,000	10,000
1935	16,000	11,000
	(several hundred open)	
1946	14,000	15,800
	(several hundred open)	
1953	21,000	23,567
	(4,500 places open)	
1968	32,474	32,461
	(11,000 non-cellular)	

Conclusions

We have experienced an era from 1870-1930 when the prison population declined. This has been matched by a programme of closures which reduced cellular accommodation to about one-third of what it had been at the time of the setting up of the Prison Commission. Even today, we have no more operational establishments than the Prison Commissioners took over on 1st April 1878. In the same century the population of England and Wales has doubled.

The rise in the prison population immediately after the Second World War resulted in an unpublicised decision of expediency to allow the practice of placing more than one prisoner to a cell. This has now reached unbelievable proportions where some 13,000 prisoners are compelled to share cells. It is not possible to forecast when overcrowding will be eliminated unless an unrealistically optimistic view of population trends is adopted. It is a salutary thought that the expedient of the hulks, adopted as a temporary measure in 1776 lasted between 80 and 90 years.

Perhaps what is required now is an open debate on whether overcrowding should continue. At no stage has the multiple occupation of cells been tested in public debate and discussion, nor has it been subjected to research. Moreover, discussion on the size of the accommodation necessary for our prison population should be conducted against a realistic background of historical information rather than the persistent references to the low point of 11,000 in custody in the inter-war years. The fact that the Prison Service today has less cellular accommodation than was available for 40 years before World War I should give the public the accurate backcloth to our present frantic efforts to find more sites and to build new establishments.

* *The English Prison and Borstal System* L. W. Fox, p. 99.

Far-reaching proposals for dealing with

DRUNKENNESS . . . DRUGS . . . DOWN AND OUTS . . . "DRAG"

outlined in

The Honest Politician's Guide to Crime Control*

GORDON HAWKINS and NORVAL MORRIS

Examined by LORD STONHAM, Joint Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Home Office, 1964-7, Minister of State, Home Office, 1967-9

THE honest politician, after reading this extremely enlightening, eminently readable and fascinating book, might be forgiven for thinking that the only way to control or reduce crime is to remove the most frequently committed crimes from the criminal code. The first principle of the distinguished authors' bid to control crime is to "strip off the moralistic excrescences on our criminal justice system". The system of which they write is American, which differs in a number of respects from the British. The authors are largely guided by the definition of the proper sphere of the criminal law given by John Stuart Mill, particularly the section which declares that the criminal's "own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant, he cannot rightfully be compelled to do or forbear because it would be better for him to do so, because it will make him happier, because, in the opinion of others, to do so would be wise or even right". The duo assume dictatorial powers and issue a number of ukases (!).

No more "drunks"?

Thus: "Public drunkenness shall cease to be a criminal offense". Here, they are in line with public thinking in Britain where, in the 1967 Criminal Justice Act, power was taken to abolish imprisonment for drunkenness once the Home Secretary is satisfied that there are sufficient facilities for other forms of treatment. In America, one arrest in every three is for public drunkenness—more than two million each year. This is more than twice the combined total for the seven serious crimes which the F.B.I. uses for its index. The cost of handling each drunkenness case has been estimated to average 50 dollars, so that at a conservative estimate the annual expenditure, excluding the expense of treatment or prevention, is

100 million dollars. "In addition, the volume of arrests places an enormous burden on the criminal justice system; it overloads the police, clogs the courts and crowds the jails". It also diverts substantial police resources from coping with serious crime. "In one city, 95 per cent of short-term prisoners were drunkenness offenders".

Yet the system neither deters nor meets "the problems of the chronic offenders who form a large proportion of those arrested". All it accomplishes is the "removal from view of an unseemly public spectacle". The authors think "that the use of the police, the courts and the prisons on this scale to handle unseemliness at a time when one-third of Americans are afraid to walk alone at night in their own neighbourhoods is so ludicrously inept and disproportionate that we need no more than point it out to justify the removal of drunkenness from the criminal justice system". They agree, however, that if a person in drink causes damage to property, steals or assaults another person, he should be arrested under the statutes dealing with malicious damage, theft or assault.

Drugs and crime

Next: "Neither the acquisition, purchase, possession, nor the use of any drug will be a criminal offense. The sale of some drugs other than by a licensed chemist and on prescription will be criminally proscribed; proof of possession of excessive quantities may be evidence of a sale or of intent to sell". And then "No form of gambling will be prohibited by the criminal law; certain fraudulent and cheating gambling practices will remain criminal". With drugs, their case is not too convincing—it depends on appreciating that "drug addiction itself is not a crime in America, the . . . effect of . . . laws is

to define the addict as a criminal". They also deny that there is a causal connection between drug use and crime, pointing to "the fact that drugs not only release inhibition but also suppress function. . . . They may well inhibit more crime than they facilitate". So, "the one certain way totally to destroy the criminal organisations engaged in the narcotics trade and to abolish addict crime would be to remove the controls and make narcotics freely available to addicts". This last has not been the British experience, though there is certainly much to be said for it—not enough, perhaps, to justify the authors saying that "the British approach . . . has resulted in a situation where no serious drug problem exists". On gambling, the case for abolishing restrictions rests on the declaration that it "is the greatest source of revenue for organised crime. Estimates of . . . the criminal revenue . . . vary from 7 to 50 billion dollars . . . the laws prohibiting gambling are poorly enforced and there is widespread disregard for the law . . . the choice is between leaving gambling and the vast profits which accrue from it in the hands of criminals or citizens taking it over and running it for the benefit of society or, by licensing and taxation measures, controlling it". But in Britain, to which the authors do not refer in this instance, we have cleaned up the law in a satisfactory and rational manner.

The fourth and fifth proposals deal with disorderly conduct and vagrancy on one hand and abortion on the other. The discretion allowed the police under the first head is "conducive to inefficiency, open to abuse, and bad for police/public relations". And "the vagrancy statutes offer the astounding spectacle of criminality with no misbehavior at

* University of Chicago, 1970. £2.50.

all". The existing laws "will be replaced by laws precisely stipulating the conduct proscribed and defining the circumstances in which the police should intervene". Under the second head "Abortion performed by a qualified medical practitioner shall cease to be a criminal offense".

Sex and the law

The sixth recommendation provides that "sexual activities between consenting adults in private will not be subject to the criminal law". Listing a comprehensive range of these activities, the authors say that "in all . . . the role of the criminal law is excessive" and that "with the possible exception of sixteenth century Geneva under John Calvin, America has the most moralistic criminal law that the world has yet witnessed . . . we think that in some areas the law itself constitutes a public nuisance".

Summarising their comments on the over-reach of the criminal law, the authors suggest "that if the employment of the criminal justice system's resources were . . . restricted along the(se) lines . . . and the means thus made available were devoted to protecting the public from serious crime, such a redeployment would result in a substantial accession of strength to law enforcement which would help appreciably to reduce the crime problem to manageable proportions". Yet the British reader must ask, considering how closely the authors' specific proposals coincide with British practice, just what scope there is for such reward in Britain.

Public confidence in police force

The removal of the gross overload of unnecessary and unfruitful work will clearly not, of itself, make the police more efficient and effective. In this country we are used to a constant stream of complaints about the police, most of them unjustified, but this book makes it clear that our position is nothing to that of the police and the citizen in America. According to the authors, "the most authoritative text on the police in America . . . speaks of the widely held belief . . . that our entire police organism is rotten from top to bottom, and from periphery to core . . . that American police systems are beyond all hope of reconstruction". Clearly, the authors did not share this view. They say that "the majority of the inhabitants of the ghetto see the police as protectors of their persons and property". What is needed is a thorough understanding of the police role and an improvement in police/public relations.

They make a number of suggestions with this in view. As they make clear, the law, being unenforceable, is not calculated to sustain public confidence in the police, but is rather likely to create suspicion and corruption. Since their resources are insufficient to maintain the moralistic criminal law "why are they not dedicated to achieving a more modestly phrased but socially effective criminal law, aiming to protect us as far as it can from physical violence and certain serious property depredations—and little else?"

Better conditions for police

To equip the police for this narrower, more important role, the authors propose that "police salaries must be raised to provide adequate starting stipends and appreciable increments for each promotion". They argue that "the salaries of police inspectors should be equivalent to those of circuit court judges while a chief inspector should receive the same remuneration as a supreme court justice". The salaries must be on a level high enough to recruit and retain college graduates. The "recruitment standards must be raised in respect of education, intelligence and personality characteristics and relaxed in respect of height, weight, visual acuity and residential qualifications". "Tact, emotional stability . . . and intelligence are . . . more vital to the successful performance of the police role . . . than pounds of flesh, of which, our . . . observation suggests, there may well be a present surplus in our police forces".

Again, so far as we are concerned, most of these recommendations are old hat and the authors have obviously drawn heavily on our experience. One idea they do not advocate is a reduction in the number of forces, which would seem even more desirable in America than it was here.

Three career entries for police "officers"

Perhaps the most interesting recommendation is for entry at three different levels and the encouragement of lateral entry. "The *police agent* should have at least two years of college and preferably a . . . degree in either the arts or the sciences. He would perform many of the tasks currently performed by detectives but in addition would be required to handle all the more serious cases calling for a large degree of judgment, intelligence, education and initiative". But the position of agent would be open to serving officers without the necessary academic qualifications. "The *police officer* would perform the duties of

general enforcement including routine patrols", but there would be no traffic duties to perform because "traffic warden corps shall be established to relieve the police of routine traffic law enforcement". "The *community service officer* would be an apprentice policeman . . . recruited between the age of 17 and 21, without . . . a high school diploma, but with the capacity to advance his education" during service. With this subdivision, with pay improvements and with the establishment of "basic training for all recruits and in-service training at all levels", the authors are confident of the future.

Training

On training, the authors quote Charles Reith: "It can be said of police training schools that the recruit is taught everything except the essential requirements of his calling". The American recruit receives less than three weeks training against the British months of pre- and post-service training and subsequent refresher courses. The authors want to see emphasis placed on training in the "exercise of discretion in law enforcement, police-minority group relations, the police role in the community".

Other suggestions cover complaint procedures, portable radios, compulsory anti-theft devices on cars and the introduction of a single emergency police number throughout the United States. Consideration of the sum total of this expert criticism of the American system should make us thankful that we live under the protection of the British copper. It is difficult to imagine life without the comfort of a 999 call.

The tools of violence

One chapter is entitled "From Murder and Violence, Good Lord, Deliver Us". Here again, there are any number of recommendations which will appear draconian in America but which, fortunately, have already been attended to here. Apart from advocating the abolition of capital punishment, the ideas concentrate on the use of guns, "switch blade or gravity knives" and on drunken driving. Among these, it is proposed that "any person who uses or attempts to use a firearm or imitation firearm in order to resist arrest, shall be punishable with imprisonment of up to 10 years in addition to the punishment imposed for the offence for which he was being arrested". And "Any person who . . . has in his possession a firearm . . . shall be punishable with imprisonment of up to five years".

LORD STONHAM concludes his review by listing Hawkins' and Morris' ten proposals to reduce the prison population

And so to . . . prison

This resort to the threat of imprisonment adds pungency to the chapter dealing with prisons headed "Rehabilitation—Rhetoric and Reality". Although only two-thirds of all offenders are sent to institutions, America's 400 prisons handle two and a half million admissions a year and have an annual budget of more than 1,000 million dollars. Most of the arguments for change follow lines adopted in Britain during the last five years or still under urgent consideration. They argue for smaller prisons and an optimum size of 100 prisoners is recommended. They insist on the closure of almost 100 prisons upwards of 70 years old and a continuing drive toward open prisons and to community as against institutional treatment. It is forecast that by the end of the century, prison will be as dead as transportation. The standards of accommodation in the cells are described as varying between tolerable and unfit for a zoo. There is urgent need to reduce the population and the ukases are:

1. "The money bail system shall be abolished. All but (those) who present high risks shall be granted pre-trial release".
2. "Unless cause to the contrary can be shown, the treatment of all offenders shall be community based".
3. "For a felony no term of imprisonment of less than one year shall be imposed".
4. "All correctional authorities shall develop community treatment programs, providing special intensive treatment as an alternative to institutionalization".
5. "Work release, graduated release and furloughs for prisoners" shall be expanded.
6. "All laws restricting the sale of prison made products shall be repealed".
7. "All local jails and other correctional facilities including probation and parole services shall be integrated within unitary state correctional systems".
8. "All authorities shall recruit additional probation and parole officers as needed for an average ratio of 35 offenders per officer".
9. "Parole and probation services shall be made available . . . for

felons, juveniles, and such adult misdemeanants as need . . . them . . .".

10. "Every release from a penal institution . . . shall be on parole for a fixed period of between one and five years".

This last proviso would serve to leave sentencing to the courts and leave the actual period to be served to the discretion of the prison authorities.

The law is, in many respects, different in the United States and the volume of crime apparently so much greater than in Britain that precise comparisons are not possible. It is, however, true that the book provides much food for thought and very much encouragement for

progressive penologists in Britain. Unquestionably, the main recommendations are all in line with what we have done or are attempting to do. This is perhaps not surprising when one of the joint authors is a former assistant principal to our prison staff college. In America, as here, the main hope for the future lies in progressive reforms. The book declares that probation has been proved to be no less effective in reducing the probability of recidivism than severe forms of punishment; that money (if not souls) can be saved by revised treatment systems; that much money is wasted by unnecessary security precautions. The public pays very heavily for the marginal gains that may be provided by repressive custodial systems. This makes this book one which should be read, studied and kept for reference by everyone concerned with the rising incidence of crime.

**I CANT PUT MY FINGER ON IT
BUT THERES SOMETHING
ABOUT THIS ESCORT THAT I
DONT LIKE**



With the increasing involvement of the prison officer as caseworker it is necessary to understand the aims and methods of fellow workers in allied social-work fields; the Journal offers this survey

Development of Probation and Psychiatric Social Work Techniques

H. A. PRINS

(i) *It is better to prevent crimes than to punish them.*—Beccaria, 1764

(ii) *... it is better to invest in our youngsters than to maintain criminals in our prisons.*—

Mr. Frankie Vaughan. "Guardian", 5.9.70

As a probation officer and latterly as a probation inspector, I take the view that probation and psychiatric social work are more closely linked than may appear at first sight. Three reasons for this are:

(1) As social casework services they both share a concern with the problems of "deviant" behaviour;

(2) They are both very much family focused branches of social casework; and

(3) Each in its own way shares aspects of the team approach, psychiatric social workers sharing their work with psychiatrists and psychologists, and probation officers with magistrates and Court officials.

However, I must not push this particular comparison too far; suffice it to say that probation officers and psychiatric social workers probably have more approaches in common than some other social caseworkers.

Perspective on the present

In considering the present or fairly recent past, it is always a good thing to cast one's mind back a little in order to acquire the sense of balance that comes from historical perspective—a practice we could all indulge in to our advantage a little more frequently these days. May I just remind you that "probation" grew from that curious mixture of Christian concern and social expediency that seems to have characterised the nineteenth century. As a humane, if rudimentary measure for the treatment of offenders, it exemplified the Gilbertian approach of letting the "punishment fit the crime". Pursuing the Gilbertian frame of reference, it is sad to reflect that even in the latter part of the nineteenth century offenders may still have been seen as "a source of innocent merriment", along with the mentally ill and other social deviants.

Probation's subsequent development was influenced considerably by the growing concern with "individualisation" of treatment (as is illustrated in the various statutes passed at the turn of the century such as the 1908 Children Act, the 1908 Prevention of Crimes Act and similar pieces of legislation). The '20s and '30s saw probation developing alongside other social casework services in which the approach was heavily psycho-analytic. (It is of interest to note that the first formal attempts to train

Herschel A. Prins, Dip. Soc. Sci., A.A.P.S.W., M.R.S.H., has worked as a probation officer and as a psychiatric social worker. For over five years he was an inspector in the Probation and After-care Department of the Home Office. He is currently Lecturer-in-charge, Course for the Certificate in Psychiatric Social Work, Department of Psychiatry, Leeds University. Chairman, Northern Branch, I.S.T.D.

probation officers followed on soon after the early experiments in the training of psychiatric social workers.) The 1950s and '60s saw the "social" being put back quite firmly into social casework to the advantage, some of us would feel, of all concerned. From a historical point of view our approach to those in need and the ways in which this has changed can be quite usefully exemplified by our approach to drunkenness and the drinking offender. I think it probably went something like this:

(a) "Police Court Missionary" approach—*exhortation of the offender to better ways.*

(b) Early and middle twentieth century approach—*finding suitable occupation, distraction, etc.*

(c) Latter half of twentieth century approach—*search for the reasons for the indulgence in alcohol, etc.*

The example I have given is, of course, crude and a gross over-simplification, but it probably makes the point. (See also Newton (1956).)

Assistance from developments in cognate fields

Let me leave history behind for a moment, and try to summarise very briefly (and therefore inadequately) what have been some of the strengths and weaknesses in recent contributions from cognate fields of interest:

(a) Sociology

Sociological theory helps us to gain perspective in a field in which it is all too easy to become pre-occupied with the individual *qua* individual. Recent studies by such workers as David Matza (1969) have contributed much on the importance of *labelling* and how this may militate against the provision of effective help for those who society sees as deviants. Sociological research has also thrown light on group processes and interaction—a field of increasing interest to probation officers; and some branches of sociology have helped to shed light on the management aspects of our professional social work tasks, though in my view it is a mistake to assume that industrial management techniques have universal application in the social intervention field.

(b) Psychology

A number of writers have shown that the direct application of classical psychoanalytic theory is of limited value in the treatment of most delinquents. Melitta Schmideberg (1970) is a somewhat controversial exponent of this view. But, the strength of psycho-analytic thinking is that it encourages a certain

attitude of mind towards people under stress and it generates a capacity for understanding and forgiveness—also a humility (which some people obtain, of course, from religion). The point I am trying to establish is that there is a need to distinguish between *psycho-analysis as a method of treatment*, and *psycho-analysis as a system of ideas and concepts about behaviour*. I think that this distinction is essential if we are going to be able to assess its relevance for the treatment of offenders.

In recent years, the *behavioural psychologists* with their interest in learning theory have provided some useful leads for us to follow if we accept that a not inconsiderable number of delinquents have experienced faulty learning situations and are in need of "re-education". Recently, psychologists working in this field have conducted some interesting experimental work in operant conditioning and with aversion therapy for some sexual and other deviants which offers interesting evidence of the possibilities in this particular field. (See, for example, Rachman and Teasdale (1969) and McGuire (1969).)

(c) *Clinical psychiatry*

A number of psychiatrists make the important point that they cannot claim any more expertise as counsellors of delinquents than other workers in this field. What the psychiatrist can legitimately be expected to offer in the forensic field may be summed up as follows:

- (a) Clinical appraisal and judgement borne of long experience of assessment of *all* aspects of a person's total social, physical, and psychological functioning.
- (b) A screening service for the detection of the offender who has a formal mental illness. (Though it is as well to remember that even in the specially selected populations, of remand homes and prisons, the proportion of psychiatric problems is in the region of 15–20 per cent (Scott, 1969).)
- (c) A consultative service; a "shoulder to weep on" if you like.

Where psychiatrists have taken a *special* interest in, and made a *special study* of, the treatment of offenders (such as for example Dr. Peter Scott), they often have a most important contribution to make in the sphere of both diagnosis and treatment. Scott (1960) has, for example, provided one of the most helpful classifications of offenders, from a

diagnostic, descriptive, and treatment point of view, and it is worth summarising it at this point.

He described four groups of individuals as follows:

- (i) *Individuals* well trained to anti-social standards, their behaviour is characterised by absence of guilt feelings, and they are taught from childhood to get what they want without consideration for others.
- (ii) *Individuals* who indulge in *reparative* behaviour which enables them to adjust to difficulties which the environment may have produced in them. (Examples would be the numerous *compensatory* type of offences.)
- (iii) *Individuals* who are badly trained. Childhood experiences have lacked consistency and inducement which, in turn, have produced an individual who is inconsistent.
- (iv) *Individuals* who have become rigidly fixated because of the frustrations placed upon them. The learning process has broken down and has been replaced by a fixed response which produces repetitive stealing, sexual offences and the like.

Such a classification clearly has important diagnostic and treatment implications, and offers a ray of hope in a field too full of "global" approaches.

(d) *The work of other clinical experts*

Some psychiatrists, but also biochemists and geneticists have conducted interesting work into the question of chromosomal abnormalities (e.g. Price and Whatmore (1967) Cowie and Kahn (1968)). Although the results of such enquiry are as yet inconclusive (largely because of the populations on which the research has been done have been highly "selected"), the work does provide some interesting indications that environmental factors in *certain kinds of cases* may not have the importance that has sometimes been suggested, and that *constitutional* factors may have more significance than has previously thought to be the case. Other work, by such investigators as Dennis Stott (1963) has concentrated on the possibility of "neutral impairment" (or very light brain damage) and has provided us with a fruitful field of exploration in trying to assess whether such a physical factor which may make a youngster particularly *vulnerable* in stressful situations.

(e) *The law*

A careful study of the law can provide us with the greatest sense of historical perspective of all, for it gives the structure through which probation mediates its services and, more importantly, it is the medium through which society decides who are the criminal (and, of even greater significance, who are *not*). Study of the law, and of the comments of lawyers (many of them distinguished in the field of criminology), reminds us, as I have pointed out elsewhere (Prins, 1970), that offences "come and go", and that crime is only what the law says it is at any point in historical time. For example, incest did not become a criminal offence until 1908, and the laws relating to infanticide were not finally clarified until the late 1930s. Attempted suicide has now disappeared from the statute book, and I do not have to remind you of the interesting and complex path by which consenting homosexuality between adult males ceased to be a matter for the criminal Courts. (A detailed study of these events awaits the attentions of some aspiring Ph.D. student.) Further study reveals that in a *reverse* direction the laws relating to gambling, driving under the influence of drink, and drugs have been tightened up. All this reflects the "see-saw" element in law enforcement, and also the ambivalence of society towards those who are its deviants and law-breakers. Probation officers are involved, therefore, in a field which is full of moral dilemma and speculation, and it is not to be wondered at that they may sometimes see themselves as "keepers of conscience" more than most other social workers; I shall have something more to say about this aspect later. This brief excursion into what a study of the law may have to offer us also provides opportunity to trace, very briefly, the way in which the Probation Service has accreted unto itself its present multiplicity of duties. Beginning as a means of offering help to *first offenders*, it quickly broadened its scope to more complex cases, it soon took on the care of certain individuals released from institutions, it provided an ever increasing diagnostic service for the Courts, and sought to work in co-operation with doctors caring for those who could be helped by short periods of psychiatric care; all this, to say nothing of its ever increasing concern with what I might loosely describe as "non-criminal" matters, such as adoption, marital problems and so on. As a result of the 1963 Children and Young Persons Act the service has probably

lost a small amount of work with "beyond control" cases to the children's departments, but this will have been off-set by its increasing concern with social work in penal institutions. Without wishing to give offence, or to seek to make great claims, it is to be hoped that in this latter field the service has been able to provide a "humanising" influence in the same way that it has been a humanising influence in the Courts over the last 50 years or so. And more recently still, it has had to cope with this tremendously difficult task of parole, which highlights particularly the probation officer's function as an agent of "social control". If this was not additional burden enough, the service has had to face the task of working with auxiliaries and volunteers. This cannot have been an easy task for a service that, with some justification, is chary of the "rescue motive". I have referred to all these matters at the risk of boring you, since you are more acutely aware than I am of the problems involved. I merely wanted to pin-point the size of the task and its impact on someone who is now working outside the service.

Some of these more recently-acquired duties have important implications from a management point of view, and as Utting (1970) has so cogently argued in a recent paper, some procedural amendments to the ways in which you carry out your tasks (particularly in the area of parole) have most important implications for the independence of role that probation officers have always cherished.

Future tasks and their implications

Having taken a quick look at the past, and at some more general issues, let me now throw a glance towards the future. At a social work organisation level we have to accept the fact that the Probation Service as a *service* (and I am not now speaking about *individual members*) has opted to "go it alone". This is not the place to re-examine the pros and cons of this decision; suffice it to say that the decision having been taken, the service, through N.A.P.O., will have to find the best way it can of making its important contribution, and also, as N.A.P.O.'s general secretary recently wrote (Bell, 1970) of working with B.A.S.W. I am confident enough in the service to feel sure that it will be able to do this, and now that the decision has been made, this could be a unique opportunity for it to develop even further its considerable expertise in the ambulant treatment of delinquents. I do not, from an organisational point of view, see the need for the

service to become more closely linked with "corrections" than it is at present. It may be advantageous to the correctional field (and by this I refer mainly to penal institutions) to have links with a service that is firmly based in the *Courts and in the community* since this link may serve as a reminder that *community is important*. This could have the advantage of helping penal institutions avoid becoming too inward looking and inner-directed. I do not see the need for the service to become a national (and if, as an ex-civil servant I may use the phrase) "civil-service". The present links with the magistracy and the Courts are useful and provide a necessary measure of independence from possible political control or intervention.

There are, of course, some dangers in remaining a specialist service. Probation officers may become, increasingly, the repository of social work departments' drop-outs and rejects (in much the same way, I suppose, that the Home Office, as residual legatee, has become the repository for matters that other departments have wished to shed or cannot find a place for). I foresee a risk that in future the Probation Service may have to carry a great deal of the obloquy about offenders that other social workers have shared with them in the past to some extent. One may well ask, where will all the negative and bad feelings about delinquents go? It is hard enough as it is for probation officers to operate against a background of public repulsiveness; as hard as it has been, no doubt, for the Prison Service to operate within the restraints imposed after Mountbatten.

As a separate social work service, probation, as I have already indicated, will have the chance to develop its specialist skills still further. This could be of considerable importance at a time when generic type trainings are becoming much the vogue, and when we stand in danger, perhaps, of being all types of social caseworkers to all types of clients. Too little emphasis on specialist skills and techniques *could* have just the effect of diluting the standard of social casework that the image projected by Seeborn seeks to avoid. From a training point of view, I consider that we must have wide varieties of trainings, some generic, some specialist, so that we can cater for the wide range of recruits that we wish to attract into the probation (and other) social work services. Probation offices would be dull indeed if all the staff were turned out from the same production line with no variation in the model!

Some speculations concerning the size and extent of possible future tasks

At the time of preparing this paper there is a good deal of uncertainty in the Probation Service about the nature of some of its possible future tasks. As is well evidenced in the N.A.P.O. document on *The Future Development of the Probation and After-care Service* (1970), there is a feeling that any such changes must have important implications for *recruitment and training*.

Let me consider for a moment the size of the *present task*. Although my figures are based on the year 1968 (H.M.S.O. 1969), they will suffice, since if anything they will be by now an underestimate of the work load. In 1968 the main work load was as follows:

TABLE I

Current cases—probation, supervision, after-care	124,000 plus
Enquiries—of all kinds (criminal proceedings, non-criminal, adoption, etc.)	... 211,500 plus
Matrimonial cases dealt with	... 31,715

NOTE.—In 1968, there were some 3,200 probation officers, and the cost of the service was some £8½ million. It is interesting to compare these figures for those of the Prison Service. Some 15,000 staff and a service which cost the country about £50 million (H.M.S.O. 1969).

In economic terms, if in no other, such comparison requires no further comment. It is perfectly clear that the service is carrying a more than exacting load. I would now like to gaze into an arithmetical crystal ball and try to see, however dimly, what reductions could be expected when the provisions of the Children and Young Persons Act 1969 are fully implemented. It is important to do this if we are to be objective in assessing the future demands on the service.

Let us first of all consider the number of probation orders made in respect of all persons and of those under 14 (both male and female) in 1968:

TABLE II

(i) Total number of persons placed on probation for indictable offences, 1968 (male and female)	... 42,540
(ii) Number aged under 14	... 7,994
(i) Total number of persons placed on probation for non-indictable offences, 1968 (male and female)	... 7,194
(ii) Number aged under 14	... 425

Adding the totals together we get the following:

TABLE III

Total number of orders made for both indictable and non-indictable offences	49,734
Less total number of those under 14	8,419
Such a reduction would give us a total of	41,315

On these calculations, if the Probation Service did not have responsibility for the under 14s, it would shed about 15 per cent of its supervisory work in this area.

Of the total number of persons being supervised in 1968, 26 per cent were in the 14-17 age group. If, eventually, the Probation Service were to lose 50 per cent of supervision in this age range (and this admittedly has to be conjecture), we might assume that the service would then lose about 30 per cent of its total supervisory responsibilities.

It is possible, also to make some speculation about the diminution in the volume of after-care work for both approved school and detention centre cases. In 1968, approved school after-care represented 3.2 per cent of the total after-care caseload, and detention centre after-care some 4 per cent. If we assume that any savings in detention centre after-care would be on the junior side, we can see that the total diminution in after-care would be very small indeed compared with the diminution in probation and supervision cases.

Even if my arithmetic is faulty (and the more one plays with figures the more vulnerable one becomes), a picture emerges of a service becoming predominantly concerned with a high percentage of hard-core adult cases.

Social casework implications

Let me now consider briefly some of the implications of these changes in social casework terms. In so doing, it is important to bear in mind the recommendations of the Report of the Wootton Committee (H.M.S.O., 1970). It is reasonable to anticipate that measures may be introduced that will be aimed at reducing the prison population (by such means, for example, as service in the community, extension of attendance centres for adults and hostel care with and without probation supervision). It is not possible to enter into any detailed discussion of any such proposals but certain general considerations emerge and these may be summarised as follows:

(a) A service predominantly concerned with adults may expect to attract and recruit a different kind of person for the Probation Service of the future. No longer will candidates be attracted to the same extent by the age-range in the work; people who wish to work with children will opt to work in the child care section of the new local authority social service departments. I am not suggesting that this is necessarily a bad thing, but the assessment of *motivation* at recruitment stage will need to take these changes into account, and perhaps a new *job analysis* will be required to replace the one undertaken for the Home Office in 1946.

(b) From a training point of view there are important implications. No longer will students have quite the same experience of seeing the theoretical teaching about human development and behaviour being worked out in practice in say, a small adolescent case-load. Other ways may have to be found to make up for what could be a serious deficit. In a service increasingly concerned with after-care and parole, more attention in the training situation will need to be paid to the effect of institutional experience on the individual. Goffman (1961) and Clemmer (1940) will have to become the New Testament to the Old Testament of Hollis (1964) and Reiner and Kauffman (1960). More teaching will be required about the hostel as a "transitional community", and about inmate self concepts.

(c) Teaching, both theoretical and practical, will need to concentrate more on inadequacy and dependency and the various ways in which these conditions can show themselves. If there is an attempt to keep inadequates out of prison (and many people advocate that this would be an excellent thing), then the approach of the family service units, as seen through the writings of Irvine (1954), Philp (1963) and, more recently, Walker (1970) may have much to commend it and especially the opportunities for work with such people in a group situation (Walker op. cit.). If these clients are to be helped effectively in this way, then case loads will have to be much smaller; it is interesting to note that Norval Morris and Gordon Hawkins (1969) advocate, on American experience, a case load of about 35.

(A conservative estimate of the number of additional probation officers required would be about 750-1,000.)

(d) The value of authority and enforcement for the delinquent client has now been well established in the case-work literature (e.g. Foren and Bailey (1969) and Morrison (1969)). It will be of increasing importance, however, to refine further our techniques of differential casework *within the delinquency field*, and I have suggested elsewhere one possible means of classification in this respect (Prins, 1969). The probation officer of the future should be the clinician *par excellence* in the delinquency field, and current opportunities for specialisation could provide him with unique opportunities to develop such expertise.

(e) One can assume that the idea of using volunteers and auxiliaries will continue to develop. This has important implications for the service in terms of its capacity to come to terms with its own feelings about "non-professionals". It is interesting to note that in Poland, for example, there are 7,000 volunteers supervising 40,000 offenders, and that Holland, Japan and Denmark have long established traditions in this field. In England at present we have about 2,000 (*I. J. Off. Therapy*, 1970).

Research

Finally, a word about research. The Probation Service is one of the few social case-work services involved in ongoing government-sponsored research. This has obvious advantages, but of course there is always the feeling that one is under "scientific" scrutiny. There is also the problem of feed-back, for, as Professor Jepson remarked not long ago (Jepson, 1970), researchers do not have an unblemished record for making available the results of their researches to practitioners. The service should make its voice heard now if it is going to reap any advantage from such researches that have been, and are being, carried out, for ways must be found to enable the Probation Service to continue to develop its clinical skill and to develop further discriminating and selective techniques so that it can continue to make a significant contribution to the welfare of those who, for a variety of reasons, find themselves at odds with the changing norms of our society as reflected in the rules made for law and order.

REFERENCES

- BELL, D. (1970). "Independence—Not Isolation". *Social Work Today*, 1, 45-6.
- CLEMMER, D. (1940). *The Prison Community*. Boston.
- COWIE, J. and KAHN, J. (1968). "XXX Constitution in Prepubertal Child". *Brit. Med. J.*, 1, 748-9.
- FOREN, R. and BAILEY, R. (1969). *Authority in Social Casework*. Pergamon, Oxford.
- GOFFMAN, E. (1961). *Asylums*. Doubleday, Anchor Books.
- H.M.S.O. (1969). These, and the following figures are taken from "The Report on the Work of the Probation and After-Care Service", 1966-8 (1969). Cmdnd. 4233. Dec. H.M.S.O.
- H.M.S.O. "People in Prison" (1969). Cmdnd. 4214 (p. 13).
- H.M.S.O. (1970). "Non-Custodial and Semi-Custodial Penalties."
- HOLLIS, F. (1964). *Social Casework: A Psycho-Social Therapy*. Random House.
- Int. Jnl. of Offender Therapy*, 14 (1970). Editorial Comment. 15-16.
- IRVINE, E. E. (1954). "Problem Families: A Discussion of Research Methods". *Brit. Jnl. Psych. Soc. Wk.*, 9, 1-9.
- JEPSON, N. J. (1970). Paper given at a Conference on "Research in the Penal Field". I.S.T.D. University of York. 6.6.70 (unpublished).
- MATZA, D. (1969). *Becoming Deviant*. Chicago Univ. Press.
- MCGUIRE, R. (1969). "Aversion Therapy for Offenders." *Med. Biol. Illus.*, 19, 161-5.
- MORRIS, N. and HAWKINS, G. (1969). *The Honest Politician's Guide to Crime Control*. Chicago Univ. Press.
- N.A.P.O. (1970). *The Future Development of the Probation and After-Care Service*. 15.
- MORRISON, R. L. (1969). *Stresses of Change in the Probation and After-Care Service*. Second Denis Carroll Memorial Lecture. I.S.T.D.
- NEWTON, G. (1956). "Trends in Probation Training". *Brit. J. Delinq.*, VII, 123-35.
- PHILP, F. (1963). *Family Failure*. Faber and Faber.
- PRICE, W. H. and WHATMORE, P. B. (1967). "Criminal Behaviour and the XXX Male". *Nature*, 213, 815.
- PRINS, H. A. (1970). "Probation and After-Care: Some Aspects of Casework". *Howard Jnl.*, 13, 47-57.
- PRINS, H. A. "Casework with Offenders". (1969). *Jnl. App. Soc. Studies*, 1, 181-7.
- RACHMAN, S. and TEASDALE, J. (1969). *Aversion Therapy and Behaviour Disorders: An Analysis*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- REINER, B. and KAUFMAN, I. (1960). *Character Disorders in Parents of Delinquents*. F.S.A.A.
- SCHMIDEBERG, M. (1970). "Reality Therapy with Offenders: Principles". *Int. Jnl. of Offender Therapy*, 14, 19-25.
- SCOTT, P. D. (1960). "Assessing the Offender for the Courts: The Role of the Psychiatrist". *Brit. Jnl. Criminol.*, 1, 116-29.
- SCOTT, P. D. (1969). "Crime and Delinquency". *Brit. Med. J.*, 1, 424-6.
- STOTT, D. H. (1963). "New Possibilities in the Aetiology of Delinquency." *Int. Annals. Crimin.*, Paris, 2, 396-406.
- UTTING, W. B. (1970). "Procedural Innovation and Professional Authority". *Social Work Today*, 1, 26-30.
- WALKER, L. (1970). *Group Work with the Inarticulate*. F.S.U. London.

THE VISITING WATCHDOGS

GORDON FARNSWORTH

who is editor of the Bristol "Evening Post" and chairman of the Board of Visitors at the junior detention centre at Eastwood Park, Gloucestershire

The Bristol Evening Post publishes seven editions daily, covering Bristol, Somerset, West Wiltshire and South Gloucestershire, with a circulation of 180,000

THE PRISON SERVICE must not be an ostrich. We who serve the community in our varying walks of life, whether it be as a newspaper editor or a farmer, a headmaster or the licensee of a pub, must be ready if called upon to offer our experience to others. And the Prison Service cannot be excluded. That is why I felt obliged to accept the Home Secretary's invitation to join the Board of Visitors when a junior detention centre was opened at Eastwood Park, near Falfield in Gloucestershire.

What is our role? As we see it, quite simply to be watchdogs. Not just on behalf of the public at large, nor solely for the boys but for the officers as well.

Of course, the first task as watchdogs must be concern for the boys and their welfare in particular. In a sense it always saddens me to meet them for I feel so many are there as the result of the indifference and insecurity of broken homes.

How can we as a Board of Visitors help these boys? By getting to know them, by encouraging them along new paths. So many have never before had anyone to take an interest in them to find out what they rather than we are talking and thinking. I believe it has been of real value both to us and to them to meet informally in discussion groups even if only once or twice during their detention.

We have certainly found out a lot about these boys. They don't really drift into crime. They are dragged into it. Boredom pulls them into groups for companionship and excitement.

The daily routine can give them a fresh start but the incentive is not really there unless we visitors, as watchdogs on behalf of the public, can persuade the community to do more for them when they come out of detention. The emphasis while they are with us must be on training, equipping them to be citizens, but in the time available it can never be enough; this must go on when they rejoin the community.

There must, in fact, be a sort of outreach by organisations in touch with youth; such bodies as the Y.M.C.A. and the National Association of Boys' Clubs must be encouraged to reach out and link up with these boys while they are in detention.

It is not easy, I am sure, to be a prison officer. It must be a vocation but it is all too easy to become cloistered, to feel cut off from the world outside. We visitors can provide a valuable link for the staff with the community. A board can, and I hope we do, back up the staff, sharing ideas and problems so that they do not get that depressing feeling they are on their own.

It is because of this involvement which I feel watchdogs must have with the establishment that so much depends on the choice of people to serve on the Board of Visitors.

Modestly, but with some pride, I think Eastwood Park has been fortunate. A right balance has been so struck so that the warden can have the counsel, if he desires, of a wide cross-section of the community.

Eastwood Park has, for example, the licensee of the village pub; who better to represent the locals? Ticklish problems arise in which a second opinion can be invaluable; who better than a doctor or headmaster? And if, for instance, there are difficulties with the gardening, who better to run to than a farmer? We have one on our board and he has been of immense help.

But no such board would be complete without the advice of a mother. Who better to understand boys? Eastwood Park is blessed with two women visitors, one of whom is a trained social worker and they have both instilled in us a care and a concern which may sometimes escape we males.

There is indeed a place on the Board of Visitors for many who serve the community; even for an editor, if only to write the annual report to the Home Secretary!

Suicide in Prison

The Gesture and the Risk

Some theories (and some misconceptions) examined by

E. STENGEL, M.D., F.R.C.P.

visiting psychotherapist, H.M. Prison, Wakefield. Emeritus Professor of Psychiatry in the University of Sheffield

THERE has always been a suicide problem in prisons and other places of detention. The public feels that there is something wrong with a prison which has a high incidence of suicide, just as it believes that there is something rotten in a city or a country with an excessive suicide rate. Society dreads suicide among its members, and so do families and other groups. Those who could possibly have prevented it in their roles as parents, guardians, spouses, doctors, nurses or prison officers tend to react with a sense of guilt or with protestations of innocence. Suicides in prison tend to cause additional ill-feeling, because the victims are deprived of their liberty. At any rate, there is general agreement that the incidence of suicide in the prison population should be kept as low as this is humanly possible. This is why all members of prison staff should have some knowledge about suicide and its prevention.

Those who want to study the problem more deeply will find a great deal of information in a book entitled *Suicidal Behaviours*, edited by H. L. P. Resnik, M.D., published in 1968 by Little Brown and Company, Boston.¹ It contains 48 articles by as many authors, mostly American. Richard Fox contributed a chapter about the work of the Samaritans in Britain and E. Stengel wrote about attempted suicides. There is hardly any aspect of suicidal behaviour which is not covered in this formidable volume (536 pages). It should serve as a valuable source book for students of suicide. The less studious and ambitious might find it heavy going. They may even tend to be intimidated by the wealth of scholarship displayed in this book. What they need is some

elementary knowledge about the size of the problem, the causes of suicidal behaviour and the principles of suicide prevention. They also need to be made aware of the most common misconceptions about suicidal acts. They are likely to find a Pelican book², recently published in a second revised edition, helpful.

There is much uncertainty among prison staff about the size of the suicide problem in the prison population. Suicide, i.e. a fatal suicidal act, is a rare event and even suicidal attempts, i.e. non-fatal suicidal acts, are not very common in the ordinary prison. In fact, the risk of suicide is very high among prisoners on remand and among convicts in the early phase of imprisonment. The more time has elapsed since conviction, the smaller becomes the risk of suicide in prison.

Prison staff share most of the misconceptions held by the general public concerning suicidal acts. The following are the most common:

People who talk about suicide won't do it. In fact, careful retrospective enquiry reveals that almost all people who committed or attempted suicide had given some indication of their intention, directly or indirectly.

People who genuinely tried to take their lives should be left to die, instead of being brought back to life at all costs. In fact, only very few of those people resent having been saved, and even those who do so at first, soon accept survival without demur. The urge to live usually triumphs.

There is no point in saving people who are determined to die. They are bound to kill themselves before long anyway. In fact, suicide is not inevitable even in the most determined cases, provided appropriate preventive measures are taken. States of acute suicidal danger are usually transient.

Suicidal acts which are carried out in

such a way that intervention from others is possible, need not to be taken seriously. In fact, uncertainty of outcome is a feature of most suicidal acts. They are more or less dangerous gambles with life. Even among the fatal suicidal acts only a minority are carried out in such a way that death was inevitable.

Suicidal attempts undertaken without unambiguous self-destructive intention are not genuine. In fact, many suicidal acts are carried out with the feeling "I do not care whether I live or die" rather than with a clear determination to end life.

Most suicidal acts, especially those which do not seriously endanger life, are carried out with the sole purpose of impressing and manipulating other people. In fact, every suicidal act, even if fatal, has some effect on the environment and most people who commit such an act are aware of this. Inevitably, this effect is often used, in prison and outside, to manipulate the environment, but if the act may endanger life it is none-the-less suicidal. The misconception of the faked suicidal act carried out with the "ulterior motive" of attracting attention is the most common and the most dangerous in the Prison Service. It can be responsible for suicide, as it probably was in the following case reported in the *Guardian* in 1968 and quoted in my Pelican book (pp. 85-86):

PRISONER DIED IN "SUICIDE GESTURE"

A man found dead in his cell in Y Prison three weeks ago made a suicide gesture rather than a deliberate attempt on his life, and accidentally killed himself, the governor said yesterday. A verdict of misadventure was recorded on G. G. R., serving a two-year sentence for theft.

Dr. X, senior medical officer at the prison, said R. was given to histrionic displays to draw attention to himself. In July he inflicted a wound on his wrist and said it was a suicide attempt. The doctor thought this a gesture to gain admission to hospital, not a genuine suicide attempt.

This suicide might have been prevented if the first act of self-damage had been taken seriously. It might have been partly manipulative, but it was a misjudgement to ignore the self-destructive component of the act.

People who commit suicidal acts, do not behave as if they wanted either to live or to die, but as if they wanted to do both at the same time, usually the one

¹ *Suicidal Behaviour*, ed. H. L. P. RESNIK, is obtainable in this country from Messrs. J. and A. Churchill, Ltd., 104 Gloucester Place, London W.1 (price £6.25).

² *Suicide and Attempted Suicide*. STENGEL, E. Penguin book, 25p.

more or much more than the other. The notion that a "genuine" suicidal act is aiming at death alone is a misconception which costs lives, in prison and outside. It is more dangerous in prison because the range of methods in this environment is smaller than outside. In prison hanging is usually the method of choice.

Cases like the one quoted are not uncommon. They show that the official suicide rate in a population depends very much on the definition of what constitutes a suicidal act. The notion of a "genuine" suicide held by the S.M.O. in Y Prison was based on a misconception of what is going on in the minds of people committing dangerous acts of self-damage. Doctors and prison officers are, of course, not unbiased in these cases. It would not be surprising if, unconsciously, they preferred to blame misadventure for a death which could possibly have been prevented by them, had they taken a different view of the situation.

The tendency to ignore or to minimise the significance of potentially serious acts of self-damage must be resisted. Almost invariably, when I have discussed these cases with prison doctors and staff, I have heard the comment: "But he did not mean it", even if the prisoner concerned was dead. My usual comment is: "He did and he didn't. This is typical of most suicidal behaviour. The urge to self-preservation is extremely difficult to suppress". We cannot go on leaving it to local or individual preferences to decide what constitutes a suicidal act. We ought to adopt a working definition which, though not infallible, should go some way to doing justice to the complex motivations underlying suicidal behaviour. I propose the following definition: *A suicidal act is any deliberate act of self-damage which the person committing the act could not be sure to survive.* The crucial question, then, is whether or not the person took a risk, seen from his and not from the observer's point of view. If he did, the act should be classified as suicidal, irrespective of the presence or absence of a manipulative tendency.

Having identified a certain type of behaviour as suicidal we have to take preventive measures. Their discussion is beyond the scope of this article. Perhaps we shall return to this subject on another occasion.

The Defences of the Weak*

Portrait of Norway's Preventive Detention

Review by ANDREW BARCLAY, Assistant Governor
H.M. Prison, Coldingley

THIS book was published five years ago and seems to have been somewhat overlooked. This may be because it is a study of a Norwegian penal institution rather than an English or American one and because it is presented in a rather complex style. Nevertheless it does offer a great deal of relevant and valuable discussion for the development of research into penal institutions in industrial societies.

The book reports on a sociological study of inmates in a medium security, treatment-oriented correctional institution in Norway—Ila Institution for Preventive Detention. Research up to that time stressed the occurrence of an informal inmate culture based on inmate peer solidarity which is directed against the formal structure of the institution. This line of argument can be seen in the research of Sykes, Clemmer, the Morris's and others. However, Mathiesen's own data indicates a profound lack of inmate solidarity; indeed inmates seem "unprisonised". Mathiesen looks for a functional alternative for peer solidarity in what he terms "censoriousness". To quote: "Individual censoriousness implies that, rather than being a member of a solitary social category, the individual stands alone. Furthermore, rather than adhering to deviant norms, the individual shows consensus with established norms stressing that the ruler deviates from these principles. We shall attempt to show that individual censoriousness is typical of persons who are, or feel, 'weak' in relation to their superiors, and that the various forms of reaction therefore may be called the defences of the weak". Let me use an example to explain what I think Mathiesen means here. When an inmate criticises a prison officer for breaking the officially accepted rules by which the officer should act, the inmate is implying that he agrees with these rules. But at the same time he attacks authority without necessarily behaving according to the established pattern of an "inmate subculture". Mathiesen stresses, how-

ever, that peer solidarity and censoriousness can be observed alongside each other.

Mathiesen carries out a very useful test of Sykes and Messinger's summary of the inmate social systems in United States prisons in so far as it fits the Norwegian case. He finds the norms of the inmate culture that Sykes and Messinger describe—loyalty, fairness, privacy, manhood, aggressiveness towards staff—are, to a large extent, not adhered to. The lack of aggressiveness towards staff found in the Norwegian institution as opposed to the aggression Sykes and Messinger found in an American prison may be because of the greater professionalisation of crime in the U.S.A.

Individuals . . . or . . . equals

Having shown that peer solidarity is not the total answer to inmate life, the author goes on to discuss the alternative of censoriousness in terms of "models of justice" and "models of efficiency". The treatment staff at Ila—mainly psychiatrists—believe in individualisation of treatment. At the same time the inmate holds certain principles of justice and efficiency; for example the principle of equality, i.e. privileges should be distributed equally to everyone. However, for example, the criterion used for granting furlough (home leave) or release (N.B.—indeterminate sentences) appear to inmates as totally ambiguous because these criteria appear to vary from case to case. It is tempting for staff, particularly administrative staff, to accede to claims for equality in the distribution of rewards and punishments because it tends to reduce conflicts among inmates, and between officers and inmates, and because staff live by similar principles in a democratic society. It would also, however, reduce the inmate of responsibility—all he has to do is remain in the institution, and therefore treatment becomes impossible. Other examples are given of how inmates make staff feel their decisions to be unjust or inefficient; to be "illegitimate". The resultant change in decision-making is desirable to the inmate and

* *The Defences of the Weak.* THOMAS MATHIESEN, 1965. Tavistock Publications Ltd. £1.75.

Staff-Staff and Staff-Inmate Relationships Examined

the administrative staff as far as good order is concerned at the expense of treatment. This has relevance for British prisons that attempts some kind of treatment especially those which employ specialists.

Mathiesen hypothesises that censoriousness, if successful will lead to greater bureaucratisation and as a result the inmate will find problems inherent in staff decisions less individually demanding and more "legitimate". But the regime will show less individual understanding and result in more unmerciful impersonality. The psychiatrists will tend to adhere to existing, traditional treatment means—for example, sedatives, pills, etc.—and ignore their failure of goal attainment. Thus a deviant inmate subculture and peer solidarity will emerge more strongly.

In the final chapter Mathiesen, having described the occurrence of censoriousness and its relation with peer solidarity, now suggests conditions that make censoriousness rather than peer solidarity the main mode of reaction to power. The unpredictability of the inmate situation as they perceive it is due to the individualised treatment orientation. Coupled with this is the poor bargaining position that the inmates perceive themselves to be in, *vis-a-vis*, the staff with the result that they find little point in uniting and therefore are "weak". These are two examples of the conditions which lead to censoriousness.

Censoriousness is the main theme of the book but in the construction of his argument Mathiesen introduces several interesting aspects of institutional life at Ila. He gives a very informative description of the Norwegian penal system explaining particularly their supposed preventive-oriented, as opposed to their punishment-oriented, institutions. Ila takes those men who are found at their trial to be of "mental immaturity" or "lasting mental decline"—these being legal concepts not psychiatric diagnoses. These intermediary categories between an offender who commits a crime consciously and an insane offender; these are very difficult categories to ascertain.

His discussion of other aspects of prison life tend, at one and the same, to make the book more complex, but, also whets the appetite for further deeper discussion. For example, he looks at inmates' attitude towards staff whether they see the administrators or the experts as the more powerful in

decision-making. Also a broad attempt is made at forming a typology of prison officers ("guards") as inmates see them. Inmate orientation towards staff according to their reference point—outside society or prison society—is discussed. At the same time staff attitudes towards each other and towards inmates are being looked at. Indeed I found this middle section of the book concerning staff/inmate perceptions very stimulating because it touched on so much, but disappointing that it could not go into these various aspects in further depth.

I have two criticisms really. The

sheer number of different aspects he introduces tends to add to an already complex form of writing. Secondly, I cannot understand the use of his quantitative data, it is tacked on to the end of each chapter almost as an apology. He admits his samples are not large enough to fully substantiate his arguments so why not leave them in an appendix?

Although this is a difficult book it is well worth coming to grips with. It has a lot of relevance for prisons which find themselves moving away from a treatment-oriented goal, or indeed moving towards one. It also contains many areas that need looking at more closely.

Book Reviews

OUR REVIEWERS INCLUDE—

VERNON P. HOLLOWAY, Principal Psychologist, Wormwood Scrubs Prison
MICHAEL MILAN, Deputy Governor, Hewell Grange Borstal
J. A. GREEN, Head of Technical Studies Department, Staff College, Wakefield
J. S. SHULMAN, Deputy Governor, Rochester Borstal
PETER L. PYE, Warden, Werrington House Detention Centre
MICHAEL LANGDON, Deputy Principal, Officers' Training School, Wakefield
SUSAN F. McCORMACK, Assistant Governor, Holloway Prison
JOHN BALDWIN, Lecturer, Criminal Law, Sheffield University
DAVID LONGLEY, Assistant Governor, Gringley Camp (Hatfield Borstal)

CITY LADS IN BORSTAL

DAVID LOWSON

Liverpool University Press, 1970. £1.75

DAVID LOWSON has been a probation officer and then an assistant governor in borstal for a time before going on to teach at Liverpool, where this book about borstal trainees returning to that city was written.

In borstal, the author was not one of those who sought an explanation of delinquency in the internal disturbance of the young men in trouble. Rather, he felt we should try to understand the social background from which they come, which he now says is "the permissive undemanding culture of the working class community, in which freedom from pressure to conform to conventional norms is one of the compensations for low social status and lack of opportunity". It is this standpoint which determines the direction of his study, the selection of areas for investigation and the attitude he takes to the data as they emerge.

The book investigates 100 trainees returning to Liverpool. First, it ex-

amines the pre-borstal details of the sample—home, school, work, offences, institutional experiences. It shows what happened to them in their training, where it was, how long it lasted and what specific experiences it involved—like trade courses. Twenty-five tables describe the facts about this sample, much of it useful material for people looking for raw data.

The main chapters are concerned with the attitudes of the 82 of the original 100 whom he managed to persuade to answer his questions. This was a demanding task. The 45 tables presenting the data tell us what the discharged trainees were prepared to say about their attitudes to the Courts which sentenced them, to the people who dealt with them in borstal, to home leave and to the people and situations awaiting them outside.

Part of the book looks at the problem the author had with what was being said by those who had served part of their time in correction at Reading. He had to decide whether to send his information to the Home Office and several pages deal with his attempts to absorb

the details given him and to interpret them satisfactorily.

As the book appears in a social research series, it ought first to be examined for its research merit. The data are set out as numbers falling into various categories—it is a descriptive, head-counting presentation. This is not put to work; there are no calculations or comparisons, internally or with any external group. So we are at liberty to draw our conclusions, as the author draws his. The facts presented are illuminating to varying degrees and form a back-cloth to the author's developing argument. But it must be made clear that this kind of research never proved anything. This is not a book in which a theory is set up and tested; no proof or disproof is contained here. It is a work which starts from a certain standpoint which is unlikely to be shaken because the approach precludes this. The author's own claim in this respect seems modest enough: "The information derived from an examination of the background of only 100 lads is not sufficient on its own for general conclusions; but to the extent that the evidence it offers is consistent with the findings of other environmental studies, it would seem to support the case for a predominantly sociological, rather than psychogenic interpretations of delinquency".

But even this modest claim seems overstated for the same reasons that the claims of those holding the opposite viewpoint may be overstated. The size of the sample is a red herring; the issue is whether any research has been done with the data. The author hints that he may still intend to examine ways in which his findings may be related to each other and to failure rates. It may be that it is unfair to seem to single David Lowson out for something which is not unusual in research in this field—never putting at any great risk the viewpoint one espouses.

Perhaps we have to assess the work, not in terms of its quality as research, but as something different; the book is written in calm, cautious tones; it is not characterised by exaggerated claims. Yet, at the finish, one is left with the conviction that it is the work of someone who is determined to press home his beliefs. David Lowson has had a great deal of experience of offenders and has a message for us. We may consider the book in this light.

Although he is asking questions which show how much individual offenders may differ, we are constantly brought back to statements which show that the author is preoccupied with the

ways in which offenders are similar. They represent a common background, they take a common attitude to training and present essentially a common problem to the trainers. But this belief that, for example, offenders rapidly learn to adjust with solidarity to other segments of society is not without its problems for the author. He seems fairly well aware that, if he wants to assert that borstal trainees soon learn what to say and what not to say to those in charge in borstal, then this has implications for the quality of the information that he can get as an interviewer, in that he might become stereotyped as someone different by the interviewees as a class. How can he assess the reliability of his information? He clearly strives for something authentic, trying to convey his faith that he has had meaningful contact with these city lads. He seems to communicate well to the reader the grounds on which he establishes his confidence in this respect; but it is a little spoiled by the mild surprise or gratification he occasionally expresses that the offenders seem to have felt more positively or less critically about some of those in-charge of them than one might have feared or expected.

In the final pages, David Lowson sums up what he wants to advocate. What is the message? City lads are remarkably well insulated from the pressures to conform which emanate from another section of society, particularly when that section seems very distant and alien from their own. People who are optimistic about what institutions can do to influence the attitudes of delinquents will get little comfort from this book. David Lowson wants us to abandon our public school models for training and our reliance on a kind of authority which has little lasting meaning to the offender when he is back in the working-class parts of big cities. To make borstal training more effective, the author feels that we have to adopt an approach based on those people on the staff whom offenders can recognise and respect, enabling these people to make a personal and interested approach; this institutional approach also has to have its equivalent development in the cities themselves.

One suspects that this book is much more a work containing the faith of the author than was intended; also he seems to believe that the data he has presented bears much more strongly in terms of proof than can be the case. It is, after all, one man's opinion, but an informed and experienced one.

V.H.

REWARDS IN AN INSTITUTION FOR YOUNG OFFENDERS

L. KARACKI and R. B. LEVINSON

Howard Journal, 1970, pp. 20-30.

CORRECTIONAL institutions are generally recognised to be failing in the task of making their subjects less delinquent. In recent years some success has been claimed for the use of operant conditioning techniques applied to delinquents. As yet there are only a limited number of accounts in the literature, and by and large what has been done has been confined to particular cases rather than to institutional regimes as a whole. Recently, however, some correctional institutions have started to experiment with these techniques and the article under review is the description of one such.

The idea of operant conditioning theory, vastly simplified, is that behaviour is established and modified by its consequences. We do things more often which are in some respects rewarded and cease those behaviours which are unrewarded or punished. Control of the consequences, therefore, gives control of behaviour. A method of applying this principle to institutional practice is the "token economy".

The token economy is a system whereby desired behaviour is rewarded by points which in turn are used for obtaining things of value to the subject. These may range from commodities such as sweets or tobacco, to the use of recreational facilities and eligibility for consideration for release. (It is, of course, important that the market should be geared to consumer demand.) Points, because they are used to buy a variety of rewards, gain considerable force as a source of reward in themselves, and this should provide a potent means of controlling and modifying behaviour.

At the Kennedy Youth Centre where they have introduced the token economy, it briefly functions in the following way: points are noted on a performance rating form on which are itemised the various bits of behaviour to be undertaken. Behaviour is divided into three areas or contexts: behaviour on the living unit, performance at academic studies and performance of chores. Each area carries a set limit to the number of points it is possible to earn so that a good total requires good performance in all areas of institutional behaviour. Points are awarded by the staff member on observing the required

piece of behaviour and totals are calculated at the end of the week. As well as this way of awarding points there is a bonus points scheme whereby points can be given on the spot. The advantage of this second system is that it can be especially useful where the object is to establish new behaviour rather than simply to maintain institutionally convenient or academic behaviour. Points earned by these two means may be spent in a variety of ways, some voluntary, some not. Room rental, a certain compulsory level of saving and earnings tax to cover certain general amenities are deducted each week. The remaining points may be spent on such things as snack-bar purchases (soap, toothpaste, or ice-cream), leisure time activities (trips into town, use of gymnasium and swimming pool, attendance at film show), or special services (rent of civilian clothes for trips out, telephone calls, purchase of items ordered from a mail order catalogue). There is considerable emphasis on variety of choice for in this way points gain their considerable value to inmates. These choices are, of course, freely available in outside society but the deprivations of institutional life greatly enhance their value.

However, the strongest deprivation for anyone in a penal institution must be the deprivation of his liberty. At Karl Holton, an institution for young offenders within the California Department of the Youth Authority, which is participating in a comparative research project under the direction of Dr. Carl F. Jesness points have also been made a means of obtaining release. In this institution the token economy runs parallel with a points system by which points accumulate to a predetermined level which then gives eligibility for recommendation for release. Each point a boy earns serves both as money to buy the sorts of things described at K.Y.C. and as points towards discharge, and thus they gain great strength as a means of influencing behaviour.

What has been the K.Y.C. experience of using this 'system'? Karácki and Levinson are quick to point out that the principles here (of rewarding appropriate behaviour) are not new to corrections, but they feel that the token economy because of its all-inclusive nature and its ability to relate to individual treatment requirements has potentially greater correctional effectiveness than traditional reward systems. They indicate, however, that the token economy has not been an easy system to operate. "The seemingly countless forms and unrelenting deadlines neces-

sary to operate the system on a current basis have required enormous effort from institutional personnel and, at times, have taxed the patience of even the most sanguine staff member. Nevertheless, the expectation is that it will prove to be both an effective population control device and a powerful treatment tool."

Now, although the writers claim potential effectiveness for operant conditioning techniques both as a means of institutional control and of individual treatment, in fact they reveal that this approach has more easily lent itself to smooth institutional running than to the meeting of specific treatment and training needs—that is, the modification of delinquent behaviour. For, since this behaviour will differ with each case, many different models of reinforcement need designing and this makes the operation of the regime much more complicated. First, the required new behaviour has to be identified, then it has to be observed and recognised and then rewarded—and this for each individual. But though this causes difficulties, as both K.Y.C. and Karl Holton point out, these need not be insuperable. At Karl Holton, for instance, they have introduced a questionnaire for identifying deficiencies in behaviour which relate to subsequent delinquency. The various deficiencies in behaviour measured by the questionnaire each have a standardised series of treatment models upon which an individual treatment can be based, in order to change the behaviour in the desired direction. Karl Holton also indicate that, after much thought, significant progress has been made in the observation and rewarding of the desired behaviour as it occurs in individual cases, even with a low staff-to-boy ratio; and they note the importance of social reinforcement—the rewarding effect of interest and approval by staff—in this area.

It would appear from the accounts, then, that operant conditioning techniques when applied to individual delinquent behaviour within the institution provides no short cut. Their application can be complicated and a good knowledge of the theory and of the individual as well as a deep interest in him is necessary. But, with individuals, quite impressive successes have been claimed for these techniques in the modification of behaviour. Furthermore, they provide an objective means of establishing treatment goals and of measuring progress, which is very lacking at present in corrections. It will, therefore, be very interesting to follow the progress of the regimes at Karl Holton and K.Y.C. and

to study the results when they are published.

It can be argued, however, that the shortage of staff and training facilities which is characteristic of correctional institutions at present makes impracticable this and any approach which depends on intense work with the individual. What is needed in this situation is a general treatment or training which all may undergo and which will reduce the failure rate overall. Mark Williams at the 1970 Midland Region Assistant Governors' Conference pointed out that operant conditioning techniques could be used in this way. He suggested that a pattern of behaviour which is incompatible with delinquent behaviour be established by the methods described at K.Y.C. Thus, one might teach inmates to get up punctually, to present themselves at work punctually, to work hard etc., and such behaviour could be established so that it functioned independently of the institutional context. This behaviour would be incompatible with the sort of itinerant thieving which typifies much delinquency and would itself encourage positive responses from the outside community, which in many cases would establish the behaviour even more firmly. The idea of establishing good work habits etc. is as old as the hills, but an effective means of establishing them is not. We might do well to consider carefully anything which claims to be both effective and workable in our present hard-pushed position.

M.M.

THE SPRINGING OF GEORGE BLAKE

SEAN BOURKE

Cassell 1970. £2.10

THIS book is the author's detailed account of how he planned and engineered the escape from Wormwood Scrubs of George Blake; of how Blake was spirited out of England and then to Moscow, to be followed a few weeks later by Bourke himself. It is also an account of the two years the author spent in Russia until he returned to Ireland on 22nd October 1968, which was the second anniversary of Blake's escape.

It is an astonishing story which, taken at face value, is the tale of a modern Pimpernel. It is told with tension and excitement and has all the ingredients of a successful "thriller" complete with master spy, the element of K.G.B. intrigue, the young conspirators, the escape from England concealed in the

hidden compartment of a van whilst travelling across Europe. If it is read in this vein it is an enjoyable book but as a documentary of a prison escape, it is almost impossible to assess.

I was left with the impression that Bourke was used by Blake and then discarded once he had served his purpose. Why Bourke was chosen rather than any other prisoner is not entirely clear. If looked at in this context, the book would appear to be a self-justification on Bourke's part for his actions before, during and after the escape. Probably only one man, Blake himself, knows the full story. Until such time as Blake gives his version of the affair, the accuracy of this book must remain problematical.

J.A.G.

THE PERSONAL SERVICE SOCIETY

PAUL HALMOS

Constable 1970. £1.75

NOW that we have a Department of the Environment in the Government, it comes as no surprise at all to be told by Professor Halmos that business men, engineers and technologists concern themselves increasingly with social science. It probably needed some spelling out, however, that this concern is in terms of the total symbiosis between technology and environment, and not just out of peripheral welfare consideration for the staff and customers of each industry. In other words human relations objectives have come to be perceived as essential to business efficiency, and not just as kindness to the workers. It is now appreciated by many that avoiding strikes, by having good industrial relations, saves money. In the prison world, avoiding riots may actually save lives. Human relations, then, do matter.

Professor Halmos submits that: "There is evidence everywhere for the overspill of a personal service mode of thought into the area of impersonal skills and techniques, and into the area of technological know-how". This is the "indoctrination" of which Professor Halmos writes. He adds that "Education in human relations must be psychotherapeutic, or it falls short of being truly an education in human relations". Thus management studies tutors act as counsellors to their students, who in turn function as counsellors to their subordinates and colleagues at work.

Similarly, consultants "counsel" an organisation, while managers take up a

viewpoint previously taken only by psychoanalysts or social workers. In this way a new ideology enters into fields previously thought to be separate from the "human relations" ethic. In place of "competitive, self-assertive, aggressively creative man", Professor Halmos sees "co-operative, sympathetic, gently imaginative man". It must be admitted, however, that such a creature is still not typical.

In the future, according to Professor Halmos, achievement will be valued more and more in terms of personal services rendered, not in terms of delivery of goods. Once again the tradesman will defer to the new style pastoral figure (now called the counsellor). Should people be paid more for being especially sympathetic and sensitive? It is a question which workers in penal establishments might find fruitful.

Counsellors help others by means of a personal relationship. They show concern and personal involvement. In doing so they face the paradox that although they should not meddle with the lives of others, yet they aim to change the personality of the client. The client should remain freely responsible for his behaviour, yet must be influenced from outside himself.

Values sacred to the counselling profession—the accepting, non-judgmental, honest and clear-sighted—relate to ideals such as social justice and human rights. When philanthropy is thus professionalised, there is a danger that its workers might become over-privileged; however, as licensed practitioners they remain accountable for their activities.

Professor Halmos exaggerates the trends in society which he seeks to point out. He sees everything in terms of his concept which, however, does not seem flexible enough to avoid being over-stretched. His assertion that increased professionalisation will reduce bureaucracy is by no means supported by clear evidence. But Professor Halmos is a prophet. He is telling society that it would be foolish to neglect certain values which by now have spread from the "caring" professions into business and into the "impersonal" service professions.

He reminds us that the personal social services are concerned with the well-being of individuals, and the development of effective, satisfying behaviour and relationships. This concern is essentially mystical, he suggests, and not just a question of virtuoso technical competence in the handling of feelings and professional relationships.

In teaching, in management and elsewhere, dexterity is increasingly defined

in terms of the so-called human relations ideology. Service is increasingly exacted through incentives rather than threats, while tact and consideration are required in place of severity and a commanding presence. This is another way of saying that relationships are handled in the light of counselling principles (in industry, in prisons, almost everywhere). The economics of sentiment have supplemented those of financial profit and loss. Feelings are also facts.

In this process, psychology has pervaded the realms of teaching and of management. Out of this has come a new moral climate which is shared increasingly by business management, teaching, social work and medicine. Teaching machines and computers operate impersonally in our world; older ideas of pastoral care and the moral imperative have been eroded; yet a new basis for morality is emerging—a personal service ideology—the faith of the counsellors. In this faith, human relations (and no longer the relationship between the individual and God) have become the basis for morality.

Without denying the need for power, Professor Halmos sees progress in the increasingly altruistic role which he ascribes to professional workers. "The personal service professional, at his best, is an artist in evoking sentiment. He cannot function without total application of the self. In order to be helpful to his client, he must resolve to perform a role of concern. He can never say he has finished the job, but only put it down saying: 'I have done all that is humanly possible'. He will always feel an urge to develop his work, to amplify his role. If he does not, then he is not one of those who help to create new cultures." And so the banner dropped by earlier moral leaders (saints, heroes, holy men) has now been picked up by personal service workers.

Contained in all this idealism is an inconsistency. Personal service professionals seek to foster the contentment of their clients. For the clients then, it is *personal* contentment which matters. But for the professional, what matters is a divine discontent, which drives him to seek the betterment of others. The two roles fit together of course. The client is in need; the professional has the key to satisfaction of the need. The client's contentment comes from his own experience; that of the professional comes from changes in the experience of the client.

The result curiously recalls the day when the poor were "them, not us". Soup may be insulting; the offer of insights can be patronising too. In truth,

of course, the professional is just another specialist, offering his contribution in the way the baker offers *his*. It helps to have the bread delivered daily; this activity too could be described as a "helping" one. The helping is in fact mutual, a hungry social worker being as unhappy as a troubled baker. "You to your trade, and I to mine." This seems truer than Professor Halmos' idealising of personal service professionals. After all, don't some bakers derive satisfaction from the feeling that they are helping others by supplying good bread at a fair price? Technicians also may reach out for more mastery and identification with their task, though not for more concern (empathy). Yet this is only because the social worker's personality is used in his work in a way in which the technician's is not.

Are social workers the only ones to identify wholeheartedly with their role? Surely a craftsman may do so, too, and may find his craft "meaningful use of personality for its own sake"—even though he may be paid for his work. Indeed we could regard social work as a craft. But devotion to a craft is less likely to be described as selflessness than is devotion to the satisfaction of the psychological needs of other people. The social worker simply must care about his clients if he wants the best results. Insincerity leads to inefficiency in the world of the social worker. However, provided we act as if we care, and keep this up for long enough, we will care. Sacrament leads to grace. Trusting open prison inmates leads to their responding, says Professor Halmos. This leaves out of account, however, the need for careful selection before allocation to open conditions. If a person comes to accept privately the beliefs and value judgments that he has expressed publicly while playing the expected social role, this might lead to his being set, ossified, in a habitual stance. Yet in his clients it might be the means of producing change, if in their treatment they can be brought to play socially constructive roles until they "form the habit".

Professor Halmos reminds us that several sorts of professional worker have been made "culture heroes" in TV programmes (e.g. probation officer, doctor, pathologist, policeman, manager). No doubt their roles enshrine something of the magic held by earlier heroes (the nobleman, the general, the traveler). The power of the divine philosopher king has been dispersed into many figures. These—the professionals—now represent the god in the machine—today's embodiment of society's ideals—religion revealed through the profes-

sion of the new faith—the counselling ideology. This ideology has pervaded the world of business management, and in the future its ethical principles will become part of the new professional worker's self. The professional, in playing his role, will express some of this quintessential truth, and will do good as a result. The suggestion is that professionalisation brings social change and not vice versa. A set of values is being brought to life by the practice of personal service workers. This contrasts with the idea of charismatic leadership bequeathing a code of principles which are expected to lead to good practice.

By repeatedly acting in a way which successfully conceals an undesirable role, we may actually alter our personality. The influence of the underlying role will eventually be destroyed. This process may apply both to professionals and to their clients. It would follow that if we got adolescents to play the role of adult (treat them like men) then some real live adulthood may be evoked. Here Professor Halmos is hinting at the importance of play (and not only for children). Many young people do in fact question the solemn "up-tight" attitudes of bureaucratic society today.

There is, however, a possibility which Professor Halmos does not consider. It is that the professional workers might become bureaucratised through their very proliferation, and that their ideals might be debased, as they become common coinage. This has happened before, and might do so again. But Professor Halmos is an optimist and believes in progress. This is the indisputable message of his book.

J.S.

RESIDENTIAL LIFE WITH CHILDREN

CHRISTOPHER BEDELL

Routledge and Kegan Paul. Library of Social Work. £1.50

HOSTELS, children's homes, maladjusted schools, approved schools (community homes) detention, remand centres and borstals: this is the range of residential establishments that Chris Bedell attempts to survey in terms of the "common factor" in his book *Residential Life with Children*. One might well question what a children's home has in common with a borstal. The author suggests that by removing the "label" from those unfortunate enough to be taken into residential care, because of mental illness, maladjustment or delinquency, the institutional effects are simi-

lar, namely damaged personality, inadequacy and marked feelings of rejection by society as a whole. It is not surprising that the child placed in the children's home is as conscious of being "put away" as is the borstal boy on receiving his sentence. If the root of much mental disturbance and delinquency lies in early damaging experiences within the family structure, then, indeed, the residential field has a common problem.

Bedell says that there are over 90,000 children and young people in 3,300 residential care establishments at any given time, with 20,000 staff looking after them. This staggering estimate emphasises the need and the enormity of the problem which leaves no room for complacency. Residential child care, whilst generally acknowledged as the most difficult, is also the most neglected of the social work field: only a minority of its workers has advanced training, yet, there is a whole reservoir of knowledge gained by hard won experience in the subject of human behaviour and development.

The author examines in depth the provisions, resources, and the problems inherent in residential work. Very skilfully he highlights the more "tender" points, whilst recognising the wide variation in age grouping of those in care and of establishments. This book acknowledges the difficulties of staff working in the field; embraces their task and responsibility and seeks to identify the links between unit, institution and agency.

There is no false sentimentality; this long overdue study should do much to bring residential work to the fore. It is well written, and care has been taken to see all clinical terms are simply explained. It will prove a valuable contribution to those who would study the organisation, provision and administration of all types of residential establishments.

P.L.P.

ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

RALPH RUDDOCK, Senior Staff Tutor, Extra Mural Department, University of Manchester

Routledge and Kegan Paul. 90p.

"THIS book is one of a number devoted to the study of the knowledge required by social workers: it explores the concept of role in relation to social work."

The above extract is taken from the general editor's introduction. This statement of intent should not discourage

other than social workers from reading it or finding it extremely interesting and relevant for the book deals with the experiences of the individual in terms of role in family, social and institutional environments. Also its relevance is not directed to any particular level of management but applies to all grades of staff working in institutions.

It is easy to read and understand and the practical examples used to reinforce and explain abstract theories are drawn from everyday experiences.

In the opening chapters, R. Ruddock explores the concept of role and uses several institutional examples to illustrate his points. In moving on to the concept of culture, he uses some of Margaret Mead's work in "Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies".

For the experienced student of sociology the constant use of reference to other works is useful and interesting. Goffman and Berger are quoted; Michael Argyle is quoted in connection with relationships and the work of J. S. Moreno and Karen Horney is briefly but carefully explained. Eric Berne's book *Games People Play* is extensively quoted and the writings of R. D. Laing are used as a parallel study. J. P. Spiegel's examination of family role relations is explained in a later chapter. These references give valuable insight to other works in the same field and provide valuable stimuli for further reading.

Some interesting references are made to the Tavistock Institute and its association with the development of group methods. The work of A. S. Neill in reference to anti-role together with the work of D. G. Cooper and the part played by him in establishing anti-hospitals and anti-universities provides some interesting and provoking thoughts for all those at present working in total institutions.

In explaining the way a person integrates his many different roles into his living from moment to moment the concept of the role tree is introduced. This concept explains a very difficult theory in an effective and readily understandable way.

In dealing with the social worker/client role concept in casework Ruddock draws heavily on the work of Helen Perlman and that of Selma Fraiberg. S. Fraiberg argues that psychoanalysis has been a major influence in the development of social work theory. The work of both these writers together with that of J. P. Spiegel is dealt with in some depth in the chapter dealing with the use of role concept.

In the final chapters a variety of interpretations on a given example is discussed. Psycho-somatic, Kleinian, Freudian, Laing, Berne, Morris and Spiegel interpretations are placed on the same incident. This approach is used to illustrate the need for the social worker to be sensitive to the many possible factors that may be discovered in situations and that it is a mistake to impose ready made systems on them.

Finally, Ruddock deals with identity and role and discusses delinquency and the role that borstals play in providing a social support need for boys whose lives are turbulent and delinquent in their local settings.

This book could be used as a valuable support for in-service training programmes and at the same time provide interesting reading for the individual.

M.L.

DELINQUENCY IN GIRLS

JOHN COWIE, VALERIE COWIE, ELIOT SLATER

Heinemann 1968. £2.50

RESEARCH of delinquency nearly always concentrates on boys, because of the far greater number of boys than of girl delinquents. This book goes quite a long way toward filling the gap of available information about girl delinquents. It is based on a year's intake at the Magdalen Classifying Approved School for Girls, where John Cowie was at that time (1958) consultant psychiatrist. The bulk of the information was obtained from interviews with the girls, and tests of their intelligence and educational attainment. This is set in a context of impressionistic comment, discussion and comparison with the findings of other studies.

The conclusions of the book contain no surprises for those who have experience of dealing with delinquent girls. As might be expected, the girls studied were on average a good deal less disturbed than those with whom the staffs of girls' borstals are familiar. At the same time, they were more disturbed than delinquent boys at the same level. They were more likely than delinquent boys to have psychiatric abnormalities or symptoms—they were on average less intelligent and more educationally retarded; they were more likely to come from "broken" homes and from very large families, and there was more likely to be delinquency or psychiatric disturbance in other members of the family than is the case with boys. Yet in spite of all these adverse conditions, they were more likely than

boys to settle down and keep out of further trouble.

The reasons for these differences, and their implications for general theories of the causation of delinquency are fully discussed. The authors do not go into the question of how to treat girls once they have become delinquent, although they do find that some schools obtain better results than others with similar material, presumably because of the effects of different regimes. However, they do make some recommendations for prevention. In particular they point to the very damaging effects of homes in which the parents are unable to provide adequate care and consistent discipline, and they criticise the widespread view that children should be allowed to remain in their natural homes, however bad, for as long as possible.

S.F.McC.

CRIME IN ENGLAND AND WALES

F. H. McCLINTOCK and N. H. AVISON

London. Heinemann 1968. £6.30

THIS book, published in the Cambridge Studies in Criminology series, has already proved to be the most important source of factual data relating to the structure of recorded crime ever produced in this country. It provides the teacher, the researcher, as well as the layman, with a comprehensive, thoroughly detailed yet always straightforward and lucid account of the basic material concerning recorded crime. It also answers a host of important questions about the structure of crime and criminality which hitherto have been the subject of only superficial investigation or of optimistic guess work. The scope of the enquiry as defined by the authors is a "descriptive statistical survey of crime and criminality in England and Wales based primarily upon available criminal and demographic statistics with the purpose of providing a factual frame of reference for research and administration". They are mainly concerned in assessing the amount of recorded indictable crime (about 90 per cent of which involves some form of stealing), its variations between 1951 and 1965, its regional distribution and also in describing the characteristics of known offenders.

The book contains such a wealth of facts, presented in well over 100 statistical tables, that it is clearly impossible to do more here than to attempt to summarise and comment upon a few of the main findings of the survey. On

basic finding, now well known, is that recorded crime more than doubled between 1955 and 1965, increasing at a rate of about 10 per cent per annum, while the proportion of crimes detected fell by roughly 1 per cent per annum over the same period (although the absolute numbers of offenders detected rose markedly). As a measure of the level of crime within the community such statistics are subject to a variety of crippling weaknesses which are discussed at length by these authors. They find, and this is perhaps more important, that the greatest increases have tended to be among the more serious types of offence, in particular, breaking-in offences and robbery with violence. This is a rather disturbing trend, especially to those of us who like to console ourselves that most crime, at least in this country, is of a petty nature. Purists will not perhaps be satisfied with the authors' concept of "major" crime, which is in essence a measure of the more serious violent, breaking and larceny offences. The notion of "seriousness of offences" has always presented a great stumbling block for criminologists—and certainly one would like more detailed information from which to assess "seriousness" than the broad legal categories, supplemented by the value of property stolen, which is what McClintock and Avison are compelled to use. Nevertheless, crude though their measure of "major crime" undoubtedly is, it does represent a considerable refinement over the more often used measure of indictable crimes known to the police and is more likely in consequence to be a much more accurate indicator of trends in recorded crime.

The section of the book which deals with variations in crime rates and detection rates between local police forces shows some rather spectacular results. Very marked variations are found not only between different forces but also within the same force examined over a 10-year period. The authors are, however, right to regard this kind of data as potentially misleading. It is not always realised that the recording activities of the police themselves can influence, and sometimes considerably distort, the recorded level of crime or the detection rate in a particular area. Whilst there may be good reasons for this from a police point of view, it does mean that unless the researcher can make allowances for certain forces at least, it is likely that his comparisons of forces will be distorted to an unknown extent. But this does not detract from the value of McClintock and Avison's comparisons. It is clear from their extremely

guarded interpretation of these differences in rates of crime and detection that they are fully aware of these pitfalls. This is perhaps why they relegate what appear to be their most startling findings to tables in an appendix. It is a great pity that they were unable to study variations in police recording practices in this enquiry but it is of interest to note that one of the authors is now engaged upon a study in Scotland examining "the relationship between the reporting and recording of crime and the role of the police in the investigation of crime and the detection of offenders". Although, in our present state of knowledge, one must resist the temptation of accepting the differences which the authors find between local police forces on their face value, one of the chief merits of the book is that it provides a reliable framework within which to test a fascinating range of hypotheses. Why was it, for example, that the crime rate in Nottingham increased by 365 per cent over a 10-year period, or that the detection rate in Manchester improved by 22 per cent while that in Leeds fell by 23 per cent over the same period? Do such figures perhaps tell us more about the recording activities of the police than they do about either the "real" incidence of criminal behaviour or about police efficiency in these areas?

The latter half of the book, which is concerned with the "known offender" is extremely useful since we lack all but the most rudimentary information about the criminal population. The chapter on recidivism is particularly valuable in this respect. The "hard core" of recidivists (whose numbers in 1965 are estimated at 90,000 by the authors, one-third of whom had five or more previous proved indictable offences) impose a burden on the penal system which is out of all proportion to their numbers. Perhaps it will not surprise members of the Prison Service to learn that of recidivists over 17 with five or more proved offences, 90 per cent were found to have undergone at some stage some form of institutional training.

Although it is likely that no more than half of all offenders are detected, the authors correctly point out that this depends on the nature of the offence (in 1965, for example, the detection rate was over 80 per cent for offences against the person but only 33 per cent for breaking offences) and on the number of times an offender commits an offence—points which are too easily overlooked in discussions of the usefulness of official statistics as they relate to offenders. Nevertheless, it may well be the more serious and highly skilled offenders who

more often evade detection. However, leaving aside the chances of remaining undetected McClintock and Avison estimate that something like one-third of the male population, and one in 12 of the female population will be convicted of a standard list offence (a slightly broader category than that of indictable offences) at some stage in their lifetime. It must be hastily added that, owing to a lack of adequate data, the model they are obliged to use suffers from certain important technical limitations. It is extremely difficult to assess the effect of this, although this figure is supported by a few other small-scale empirical investigations. It must, therefore, be treated with a high degree of caution, but it does strongly suggest that earlier estimates by criminologists (usually of the order of 10–15 per cent) have seriously underestimated the widespread incidence of known criminality in the general population.

It will be very clear that I have not been able to do justice to even the most outstanding findings in an investigation of this nature. The scope of the enquiry as well as the thoroughness with which it is executed prevent this. Suffice it to say that, as a basic framework within which to approach the complex issues surrounding the use of official criminal statistics, this work is unrivalled. Anyone with a serious interest in the penal system can hardly fail to benefit greatly from careful study of this book.

J.B.

PRESENT CONDUCT AND FUTURE DELINQUENCY

D. J. WEST

Heinemann, 1969. £2.50

DR. WEST's book describes the first stage of a long term study of the onset and development of juvenile delinquency and behaviour problems among schoolboys in a densely populated working class urban district. For the study, 411 boys between the ages of eight and nine years were recruited and it is the intention of Dr. West's team to follow them up to school-leaving age or later. The purpose of the research is to trace the influence of community, family and individual factors, upon the personality, performance and social adjustments in later years.

All the schoolboys in the group are being followed through from the age of eight to 16 by which time the delinquent minority among them will have revealed themselves and their characteristics become apparent. They and their families

are repeatedly being assessed not only to identify the factors associated with delinquency, but also to discover how they appear to rank in importance. Dr. West takes up the whole range of generalisations so common in discussions on delinquency and explores both scientific and popular ideas, examining them in a technically sophisticated way. Naturally in such a study the author finds a complex of personal inadequacies and external handicaps which are not always divisible and where difficulties are encountered in the research, these are described frankly and in detail.

Dr. West sees his task to be the assessment of the rival claims of factors in delinquency such as economic hardship, poor discipline, or inadequate mothering. Such basic social information as household membership, financial circumstances, occupations, educational background of parents, accommodation, style of living and criminal convictions of parents, were sought. Topics of enquiry included the physical and mental health of the parents, their attitudes to their boys, their systems and consistency of discipline, their attitudes to child rearing, and their relations towards each other. Among the boys the following topics were looked at: present conduct in class and home, intelligence and educational attainments, performance on "personality" tests, nervous symptoms and histories of physical difficulties at birth which might have led to brain damage. An attempt has been made, by combining information from several sources, to identify those boys at the age of nine whose behaviour suggested considerable risk of becoming more seriously deviant or delinquent in later years. At this stage of the enquiry it has been demonstrated that boys who had been identified as particularly badly behaved according to the combined ratings of teachers and psychiatric social workers, had a greatly increased liability to juvenile Court appearances under the age of 14 years. It has shown in the study that those identified as troublesome at age eight were also identified at age 11, which suggests that a proportion of persistently anti-social juveniles can be picked out by their behaviour before the age of 10. Troublesome conduct was found to be positively correlated with almost every adverse item, whether of the boy himself or his background. The badly behaved boys usually fared badly on intelligence tests, showed poor psychomotor performance, were unpopular among their class mates and displayed a tendency to neurotic extroversion. The majority also came from a poor background such as broken homes,

neglectful parents, unco-operative or uninformative parents, parents in marital conflict, parents lacking in vigilance, lax in rules, unloving or unsatisfactory in their attitudes to the boy, parents of unstable personality and mothers of neurotic disposition. Dr. West's difficulty has been in deciding the relative importance of the different items.

As an item on its own the closest and most important concomitant of behaviour disturbance was family income and Dr. West thinks that this may well outweigh in efficiency as a predictor of future delinquency all other measurable features of temperament, performance or parental background. The most unfavourable features associated with bad behaviour were closely linked to a social level of the family.

Dr. West suggests some interesting hypotheses which may be tested against the findings of later stages of the study. For example, well behaved boys almost without exception did well on the psychomotor tests which perhaps suggests that the lack of motor skills or lack of motivation, may be a good means of identifying at least some of the probable future delinquents. Unpopularity was also significantly associated with poor behaviour in boys from all social levels, and it may be that a boy's standing in the eyes of his peers may be a good indication of persistent anti-social delinquency. Boys who were given unfavourable ratings by teachers and class-mates may be expected to be particularly vulnerable to delinquency and poor performance on matrices may also be a powerful predictor of early delinquency. Inconsistent parental handling, parental under-vigilance and erratic maternal discipline may also be significant. The mental health of the parents and particularly the mother may be very relevant as neurotic disturbance in mothers correlated strongly with bad behaviour in boys. It was interesting to note that temporary separation during infancy was far from conclusive as a factor in behavioural problems.

Although in the study so far they have not been dwelt upon very much, the better behaved and better functioning boys, especially if they come from adverse social or psychological environments, may show something about the factors that protect some individuals from delinquent development. Above average intelligence, for example, was related to better behaviour in the lowest social group, but among the more affluent and socially favoured the fact of being intelligent was no protection

against the development of anti-social tendencies. An attempt to isolate and investigate a group of well behaved boys from bad backgrounds was largely frustrated by the fact that there were so few of them, the socially handicapped group being largely comprised of boys with poor conduct ratings. The few exceptions were mostly boys whose social handicap was the result of accidental circumstances, such as father's death, rather than the usual conglomeration of parental shortcomings.

In time, as changes in status of individual boys become charted, it should be possible for the project team to answer some questions about the stages in development when environmental factors show their effect. For example, up to the age of 10 no significant differences were observable in the different schools taking part in the study. At the age of 14, however, when some boys may have obtained grammar school places, it may then be possible to compare if they have done better in social behaviour and scholastic performance. It may also be that influences such as the presence of a delinquent older brother, the choice of friends and leisure pursuits, may assume greater importance. It is not known yet how accurately the behaviour shown at the age of eight or nine will predict adolescent behaviour as the ratings at the age of 14 are not yet available.

At this stage in the study at first sight it may seem that elementary social and economic factors will outweigh subtle personal and psychological factors in the background of future delinquents. Of special interest in this study is the demonstration of the extent to which the troublesome boys together with many family problems are concentrated among the poorest. The obvious question here is: do these problems spring from poverty or does poverty reflect the individual's underlying inadequacy? Much of this work may prove not only valuable to research but also to social policy and planning.

This book is a preliminary study dealing only with the first stages of the research and with the characteristics and behaviour of the boys only in the first two or three years. The full significance of the findings will not become apparent until the project is completed and it can be seen how far characteristics and patterns of behaviour remain constant, and whether the factors most strongly associated with very early delinquency are the same as those linked with delinquency in adolescence.

D.L.

The Media and the Message

ALAN RAYFIELD

AFTER the excitement of the summer months caused by the Parkhurst riot there have been few sensational items of news about the Prison Service likely to cause joy in the hearts of news editors and television producers. Although some might regret this departure from the public eye no doubt there was a corresponding easing of tension in governors' offices and the Press office. It is a sad but true fact that our Service only comes to the notice of the general public when it provides negative publicity: the everyday problems such as overcrowding or rehabilitation are dealt with in a lower key in the more "responsible" newspapers and journals.

However, there was one cause to lift the liberal heart and that was the general question of remand prisons and of bail for first offenders in particular. On B.B.C. television, the "24 Hours" team, through their reporter James Penrose, took a camera to Ashford and also followed up specific complaints made by the families of remand prisoners.

The resulting film concentrated almost exclusively upon these complaints and made much of the fact that a great number of remand privileges were not being granted. They also made allegations of staff brutality and commented upon the failure to communicate with some parents that their sons were in Ashford. These points were all made during the course of interviews with parents, friends and ex-inmates. The reporter also made an attack upon the non-granting of bail to first offenders suspected of offences committed during political or activist demonstrations such as the occupation of 144 Piccadilly. Following the usual policy on these occasions there then followed a discussion of the film in the studio between Alan Bainton, David Dimbleby and Pat Smythe who was described as an ex-magistrate and a youth officer.

It was very soon apparent that Dimbleby did not feel comfortable in the situation and played the role of inquisitor with some apprehension. He pushed forward certain specific claims made in the film with an air of "what about that then?" but felt unable to argue very

effectively with Alan Bainton who methodically dealt with each complaint in a very calm and reasonable manner. Perhaps an example of how one complaint was handled will stand for all. In the film the point was made that there had been allegations of staff brutality. An ex-inmate gave an account of an incident in which he had been involved and as a result of editing it appeared that there were several such incidents. Alan Bainton was able to point out that all the points made in the film referred to one incident in particular and that the member of the staff concerned had been disciplined.

This was a saddening experience because once again it appeared that sensationalism had been sought at the cost of objectivity and a chance to inform the general public about overcrowding and the remand situation had been lost. The studio discussion group was unqualified to comment upon why bail should be refused to certain types of alleged offenders and so wisely did not do so, but no attempt was made by the B.B.C. to prolong an examination of this issue.

Prisons provided the topic for Malcolm Muggeridge's programme "The Reason Why" on 11th October. The producer had gathered together a large collection of people who could claim to be interested in the subject including some who might charitably be called "experts". Malcolm Muggeridge stood in front of them all rather like a mediaeval choir master stricken with self doubt and opened the proceedings with a few philosophical gems including "one punishes to deter not for justice". He was answered by Edgar Lustgarten who is a professional storyteller if nothing else and the whole thing began to move sweetly along in a predictable manner with other "names" interceding as their cues appeared.

Suddenly it all went dreadfully wrong and I awoke with a start. There were several ex-inmates and their sympathisers in the group who had been silent until then but Edgar Lustgarten was getting into his stride and was regretting the abolition of capital punishment.

Jimmy O'Connor then leaped to his feet, pointed his finger at Lustgarten and said: "You've made your living for 25 years out of murder and you love it!" Lustgarten lost his cool and shouted some ill-considered reply which was the signal for everyone to stop trying to be objective: the sigh of relief was almost audible.

Malcolm Muggeridge was still vainly trying to challenge the opinions and asking for evidence but was plainly upset when people would not obey the rules and refused to listen politely to the opinions of others. He was trying to referee the contest between Lustgarten and his team of assorted housewives ("some of my best friends are criminals") and Jimmy O'Connor and his lads. Muggeridge was frantically blowing his metaphorical whistle unheeded right up to the end as the boots flew in.

It was a real emotional bloodbath and the main casualties were Duncan Fairn (who was not helped by being referred to as "Nairn" by Muggeridge), Douglas Gibson and Nigel Walker. Prejudice and opinion masquerading as "fact" were the victors and few questions were answered save that with this polarity of feeling in existence the Prison Service cannot win.

Despite my remarks in the first paragraph, the serious daily and weekly newspapers devoted a good deal of space in the autumn and winter months to the problems of overcrowding and alternatives to imprisonment. Norman Fowler, M.P. wrote a series of six articles in the *Times* called "Crisis in the Prisons" including one on the borstal system. He said nothing new but it was a competent survey of current problems. The *Guardian* concerned itself with an examination of the plight of men on remand and also published on 1st January 1971 a worrying extract from *Race Today*, the journal published by the Institute of Race Relations, in which black prisoners alleged ill-treatment by staff and other inmates both physical and psychological. The *Guardian* also produced an article considering the plight of mothers in prison and also devoted a full page on 25th January to the "new" Holloway. An important article appeared in the *Sunday Times* on 24th January called "Prisons: the reform that went wrong". It examined the effect that suspended sentences have had on the prison population and maintains that there are thousands now in jail who would not have been there before suspended sentences were introduced. Prior to their introduction magistrates tended

to use the tariff system of fine, probation and then imprisonment. Now they bring in the suspended sentence at once and miss out fines and probation. This means that the prisoner automatically goes to prison on his second Court appearance and stays there for longer than he would have done under the old system. The Probation Service has had its load reduced but the prisons have had theirs increased. Professor Radzinowicz comments that this should surprise no one who bothered to examine the evidence of other countries who have used the suspended sentence system in the past and found it wanting. In the past Britain has always relied upon probation and other forms of alternative treatment such as fines. In countries which have no such alternatives suspended sentencing is a forward step: where these alternatives do exist it can be retrogressive. No doubt the lawyers, politicians and social scientists will add to this debate in the near future as the prison population continues to rise.

"NEW SOCIETY"

New Society has had several articles of interest to us during the last few months and one is in some difficulty in choosing which to write about. In the issue of 12th November 1970 there was an article called "Media Myths on Violence" in which its author examined the irresponsible way in which the mass media dealt with emotional and potentially violent situations. She demonstrated the way in which student and Black Power demonstrations were pilloried so that participants became "marauders" not men; they "roved" instead of ran; moved in "gangs" not groups and engaged in "vandalism" rather than violence. This language shows how stereotyped blacks and students have become to the average man so that it is impossible for him to view their activities with anything like objectivity. I can recall the hysterical way in which the mass media dealt with our problems during the time of the Mountbatten inquiry: its peak being reached when the non-return of two boys on home leave from an open borstal made the 6 p.m. TV news. However, we ourselves are as guilty as any other when we indulge in the luxury of thinking in stereotypes and allow ourselves to be governed by them. ["All cons are dishonest—you can't trust any of them"; "A.G.s are wet and undermine discipli-

line"; "Officers have no loyalty and only work for the overtime"; "Head Office knows nothing—it's only there to mess us around".]

Barbara Wootton's article of 5th November on "Deviance: Criminal and Other" tried to answer the question of why we tolerate some forms of deviance and not others. She looks at the way society regards those of its deviants who commit crimes and began by recognizing that the penal system is asked to do an impossible task by trying to prevent crimes after they have been committed. Prison is also asked to achieve the mutually incompatible aims of helping the offender, keep him out of harm's way and deterring others. She suspects that many offenders will never keep out of trouble unless they get actually *better* conditions than they could ever expect to achieve for themselves and this is hardly likely to discourage their potential imitators. As a beginning she suggests that society should be more sparing of those it sends to prison and use alternative treatment methods and also that prison regimes themselves should be reshaped so as to focus upon the prisoner and his needs. I suppose if we are serious in our rehabilitative aims then she is right but one hates to think of the effect upon the profit of prison industries (amongst other things) should our primary goal ever become our primary concern.

Looking for heavier and more "worthy" material I came across a small article by Fostig in the edition of 26th November which tickled my imagination. He was commenting upon the way that the drug problem is being seized upon by the newspapers and often inflated out of all recognition and then he looked at the ludicrous fascination this problem has for social workers. One worker of his acquaintance talked a great deal about her work with drug addicts and it became clear that she had abandoned the other exhibitors of social inadequacy such as the alcoholic and had surrounded herself with addicts. "Could it be", came the unchivalrous thought, "that drug addicts are all that an enthusiastic social worker could wish for?" They are usually insightful, invariably passive, rarely socially disruptive, have good verbal ability and encourage a feeling of progress even when they have no intention of altering their ways. The point was taken and one could not help but recall the prison governor (no doubt apocryphal) who used to hand-pick his receptions from the local prison in order that they might best benefit from his advanced treatment methods.

Referring back to the article by Professor T. C. N. Gibbens about the treatment of violent offenders, which was examined in the last edition of the PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL, there appeared in the edition of 28th January an article called "Body-Buffer Zones in Violent Prisoners" by Augustus F. Kinze who could only be an American. Evidence seemed to suggest to him that the sheer physical proximity to another inmate was at least as powerful a trigger of violence as were threats, thefts or other more overt provocations. Kinze then tried a small experiment to answer the following questions: (a) Do violent prisoners have larger body-buffer zones than non-violent prisoners? (b) Do the zones of violent prisoners have a different shape from those of non-violent prisoners? (c) Does the size and shape of the zones change in either group over time? As might be expected, violent prisoners needed larger body-buffer zones than other prisoners and the shape of their body-buffer zone showed that they could tolerate people nearer to them when they could see them than when they could not. Once they became used to the researcher and his experiments they were able to tolerate a smaller body-buffer zone but at no time could they become as tolerant as the non-violent offender. There are obvious implications in this research not only in the location and work place of violent offenders but also for security wing and future prison design. Kinze emphasises that his experiment is only a preliminary one but we would be unwise to ignore his findings.

Finally, one would like to mention an article which appeared in the edition of 31st December by Stanley Cohen and Laurie Taylor based upon their experiences in "E" wing at Durham. In it they examine the problem prisoners face of keeping themselves mentally "alive" during long prison sentences without turning into "cabbages". This is a problem that occupies most of their time and one which they fear the most. The authors point to the paradox of abolishing the death penalty as a humane act and then condemning men to years of mental agony. There is no simple solution to it but we as prison staff could begin to help by recognizing this problem for what it is. We can unconsciously make matters worse by saying to them "Look at old Jack—he's done 15 years and he's used to it by now" and there are still some members of staff who seem to enjoy pointing out to long term prisoners just how much time they have to do: one hopes it is stupidity rather than sadism that makes them say it.

Copies may be obtained from
HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE

49 High Holborn, London, W.C.1
Brazennose Street, Manchester, M60 8AS
13a Castle Street, Edinburgh, 2
50 Fairfax Street, Bristol, BS1 3DE
109 St. Mary Street, Cardiff, CF1 1JW
258 Broad Street, Birmingham, 1
7 Linenhall Street, Belfast, BT2 8AY
or through any bookseller

Printed in England