VOLUME X NO. 37 OCTOBER 1970

PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL

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

CONTENTS

The New Holloway

J. E. KELLEY

THE PRISON SERVICE, in the last twenty-five years, has been burgeoning with new ideas on the treatment and rehabilitation of offenders and many brave efforts have been made to try new methods of training and more constructive forms of treatment. Real attempts have been made to achieve regimes where equality is reached with outside industrial efficiency; since the advent of the National Health Service great efforts have been made to offer medical care as good in prisons as in the outside world; recognition that most delinquents are poor at managing their personal relationships and inept at fitting into community life and often inarticulate and lacking in practice in thinking out their problems has led to the introduction of group counselling, small units of psychotherapeutic communities and other forms of psychotherapy. Realisation that the closest relationship between staff and inmates is usually between the prison officer and the prisoner has led to a review of the role of the former and his part in the rehabilitation and care of the latter is being emphasised.

Welfare officers and social workers have been introduced in increasingly large numbers to help both the men in prison and their wives outside. Education is being reorganised, becoming more meaningful, expert and constructive; the number of vocational training courses steadily increases. After-care is no longer left to the good will of voluntary organisations but has been taken over as a responsibility of the State and placed in the hands of the Probation Service. Research into criminology is being undertaken and a professorial chair has been established at Cambridge. Great efforts are made to keep offenders out of prison, in order to lessen their institutionalisation, with all its weakening of already weak characters. Alternative penalties, the great increase in probation, suspended sentences, parole, have all been designed with this in mind. The difficulty of returning to the outside world after a long period of incarceration has been more imaginatively considered and the working-out scheme, the hostel scheme, home leave, etc., introduced. Open prisons with their less institutionalised regimes have been designed to try to assist this difficult transformation from prisoner to free man. The fairly recent innovation in all women's establishments of allowing women to wear their own clothes or clothes of their choice is another aspect of the attempt to introduce variety and encourage individual choice and self expression to reduce institutionalisation.

Over all has been cast the terrible shadow of increasing overcrowding and all achievement has been made

harder by the old-fashioned and inflexible patterns of most prison buildings in which modern treatment regimes usually seem singularly inappropriate. It is difficult for example to achieve normal medical treatment with inadequate hospital facilities; sending patients to outside hospitals makes great demands on custodial staff whose task it is by special watch to prevent the prisoner patients from absconding. The achievement of running small psychiatric units, of group counselling, of organising good education programmes is made much harder by the long galleries with cells each side, by the lack of classrooms, association rooms and of modern amenities. Modern standards of personal cleanliness are hard to achieve with the bathhouse where, in our overcrowded establishments, a weekly bath is the maximum rather than the minimum programme. Lavatory provision and ordinary washing facilities also date from a period where cleanliness may have come next to godliness but was a very poor second.

Much rebuilding and modernisation has been necessary in every sphere of our society in the last 25 years: slum clearance, replacing bombed houses, new towns, schools, hospitals, etc.; it is not surprising that penal establishments have been somewhat neglected. Nevertheless the time has now come when, unless this area of social need is overhauled, all attempts to retrain delinquents will be nullified by the conditions in which they are undertaken.

There is one area not overshadowed by overcrowding, and that is the section of women and girls. The number of these has not appreciably altered in the whole period. Partly for this reason, partly because of the appalling effect on young children of sending their mothers to prison, partly from motives of chivalry, and the shock of seeing women so drab and unsexed and trammelled by their loss of liberty, this is the area that has been selected for the first redevelopment, in spite of public anxiety about the security of the more dangerous male offenders, and it must be claimed to be greatly to the credit of this country that it is the mothers and future mothers whose retraining has been given priority.

Holloway, one of the five large London prisons, the only one to house women, is to be pulled down and rebuilt and as far as possible all new ideas and treatment forms for the cure of delinquency are to be included.

Administration of the Project

The first chairman of the project team, K. J. Neale, now the Director of Industries and Stores, contributed this short description of his method and approach to this task.

"A project on this scale with its novelty and penological significance demands what, in the intangible area of public administration, is called, management, leadership, commitment and morale. We aimed, therefore, to generate an early

impetus so that a significant momentum would be manifested in involvement at all levels. This was seen to be of basic importance not only to the "success" of the project as such but to the ultimate realisation of the full potential of our new policies.

"Thus was established project machinery which embodied the new expertise and experience in a compact decision-taking team to manage the project in all its aspects within the terms of reference laid down by the wider project group and Prison Department policy. A new style of management was developed in which project weeks at Steyning enabled us to achieve a speedier preparation of briefs and to enjoy the team-building bonus that flowed from the intensive approach to the task. We aimed too at the full integration of all members of the design team with the project administration as a whole. There were no enclaves; every member of the team had access to its papers and deliberations.

"The commissioning of the project instead of being left to one of its later stages was regarded as commencing from the out-set. Thus an ambitious training programme was mounted several years in advance of the expected date of opening of the establishment. This, and in the areas of consultation and discussion, demanded an interdisciplinary approach which is regarded as vital to the project.

Consultation with the field has been carried out in great depth at all levels. The briefing teams have concentrated on analysing specific activities in great detail as well as tackling the broader conceptual aspects of the new policy and the project's role within it. There has been, therefore, a full evaluation of the functional elements of the new institution with the help of numerous staff from their valued knowledge and experience. The purpose of this was seen as not only ensuring that the brief and design solution would be based on the best available advice but to enhance the involvement and commitment to this project of the staff of the institution.

"Project morale has remained high and the numerous people now concerned with it are dedicated to its success. There is a real belief in the project in all its human and intellectual dimensions. In this atmosphere the ground work of the project has been laid on sure foundations. Major problems undoubtedly remain and considerable strain will rest on the staff of the establishment during the difficult phasing operations in the construction stages." Mr. Neale ends his description with the note that "with full consultation with the staff and their co-operation these problems will be overcome."

The rebuilding of an establishment of this type is rather like building a small town, for in it everything needful to physical, intellectual, social and spiritual life must be provided. In addition to bedrooms, washing and bathing and laundry facilities there must be kitchens, a shop, a hospital,

an educational centre, and provision for physical exercise; a library, facilities for social life and meetings, chapels. There must also be a fairly complex programme of "work" to meet all needs. Finally visiting facilities must be provided for families to meet in surroundings as happy and in an atmosphere as relaxed as is possible under the circumstances.

The nominated architects, Robert Matthew Johnson-Marshall, have already built three universities at York, Bath and Coleraine, so they have experience in achieving a civilised setting for an institution. To this, for the new Holloway, has to be added security, which of course poses for the architects many new problems. As far as possible there must be freedom in captivity. Supervision and control there must be, but as unobtrusive as possible, and the aim is to design buildings where these can be tightened or relaxed according to need, for it has to be recognised that most of the women and girls who find themselves in prison lack stability and self control, and many express their feelings in actions, often violent, rather than in words. Yet, if their conduct of themselves is to improve, they must be encouraged to exercise self control and to make responsible choices, to learn the give and take of normal social intercourse, and for this to be possible, outside control and regimentation must be minimised, yet the staff must be aware of the atmosphere and of what is happening and able to step in whenever there is a behavioural breakdown.

After much discussion and thought it has been decided to establish the living accommodation in units of 16 and 32. Most of the inhabitants have found it difficult to make stable personal relationships and most have found it difficult to conform to normal social patterns. They tend to be those who truanted from school, ran away from home, could not remain in a job, separated from their husbands and abandoned their children. So their prime need is social re-education and training. It was decided that a group of 16 was small enough for members to feel they were persons, and receive individual care and attention yet large enough for them to have some choice in their friendships. Two such units share certain facilities, such as dining accommodation, television set, a utility room and so on, which again increases the range of choice of friends, and also helps to establish a pattern of "home" and "the neighbours". Some activities will be peculiar to each group, others will be shared.

It is planned to locate work facilities, the education block, offices, the chapels etc., separately from the living accommodation, because this is more normal. Most people go out to work, to school, visiting friends, etc. Individual rooms are to be large enough for people to invite a guest, and it is hoped that welfare officers and many of the specialists will visit their clients in their own rooms and that these visits can be returned

freely and easily by the clients walking across the grounds to the various offices. The rooms will be so furnished that possibly, as time goes on, the types of visitors to them can be extended and one might hope eventually family visits could at least sometimes take place in what is temporarily the woman's home surroundings. As far as possible easy and relaxed relationships with the outside community are to be encouraged, the number of welfare officers, it is hoped, will be six, and the work of The Griffins and the Cameron Group will continue; groups of selected students will continue to visit girls of the same age group and share thoughts and learn of each other's outlooks and experiences. Here again, the bedsitting room, the unit of 16, the larger group of 32 will, it is hoped, facilitate this sort of relationship.

Since one of the most harmful effects of imprisonment of women is not on the prisoner, but on her children, deprived of their mother often at periods in their lives when her presence is most needed, much thought has been given to this most difficult problem.

The number of women in prison with children is less than was thought, and the children in fact present a more acute social problem than has always been recognised. In an enquiry conducted by the Home Office Research Unit it was found that of 638 women, 415 had no children. On the other hand, the remaining 223 women had 504 dependent children between them, of whom one-third were illegitimate, but only 285 of these children were living with their mothers at time of arrest. Two hundred and five of them were under school age. Over half of the 223 women with children (132) had had a child or children in the care of the local authority at some time.

Some of the women do not, of course, wish to bring their dependent children to prison with them; it does not seem feasible or desirable for children of school age to be living in prison conditions. Four hundred and forty-eight of the 638 women in the sample were remanded in custody, almost half of them for less than 15 days, and only 92 subsequently received sentences of imprisonment.

It is planned in the new Holloway to provide 42 places for women with children up to the age of five years, and a further unit of 16 is to be so designed that it can be used as a mother and baby unit should this become necessary. It is hoped that, with the provision made at other establishments, this will suffice and meet a very real and pressing need.

It is planned to reorganise daytime activities. Over a third of the present population of Holloway is unsentenced and composed of remands, sections and trials. These women need occupation because they are worried and anxious about their future and separated from their families and friends, but they cannot undertake steady work, because there are many calls on their time. They need to see

solicitors, probation officers, welfare workers, doctors, psychiatrists, psychological testers and also family visitors. Occupation must be provided that can easily be put down and taken up.

About a sixth of the population is committed for borstal training. At present Bullwood Hall and Exeter are the only closed borstals in the country for girls, they can take 120 girls between them. Another 50 to 60 girls have to wait transfer in Holloway, where at present the facilities for training are poor indeed. In the new Holloway it is planned that these girls shall have constructive training and that they shall be specially selected as being either in need of psychiatric treatment or exceptionally backward in education. Thus their daytime activities will include educational classes, vocational training courses, a full physical exercise programme, some form of industrial work, as well as group counselling, community meetings and psychotherapy. For those women and girls who are seriously mentally disturbed or physically ill occupational therapy must be provided suited to their needs. Finally, for able-bodied sentenced women, training and practice in useful constructive and steady work needs to be offered. It is thought at least some of these may also benefit from remedial education and vocational training.

For this complex programme to be planned and carried out successfully, it is proposed to appoint a day-time activity organiser, who will have the assistance of the industrial manager, education officer and chief officer, but who will be responsible for the setting up and implementation of the programme.

It will be appreciated that the new Holloway is entirely treatment oriented, and naturally the hospital services provided will be ample to meet all needs. Medical, surgical, pathological, radiological services are to be provided and there will be special units for drug addicts, alcoholics and the more deeply disturbed patients.

However, in the last analysis, success depends upon the quality of the staff and the relationship between staff and patients.

It is perhaps in the field of staff structure that the greatest innovations are to be made. We are happy to be able to say that the demolition of the very poor staff quarters and the provision of quarters more suitable to the status and quality of the staff is the first phase of the rebuilding.

The management structure of prisons used to be severely hierarchical—the governor at the top, the prisoner at the bottom and a simple series of grades in between. He was supported by a chaplain and a doctor; but if the chaplain was for any reason absent, the governor took the services. The doctor was called in by the governor's decision alone. In recent years this structure has been widened and altered by the great

increase in professional and specialist services now offered in prisons. Although the governor is still regarded as the head, ultimately responsible to the Home Office for everything that goes on, he has a number of professional colleagues who carry great responsibility in their own spheres and are in some cases accountable, not to the governor, but to professional heads within the department but outside the prison. Doctors, welfare officers, nurses, chaplains, psychologists, administration officers, education officers, works officers, are among these.

It has become more and more necessary for the governor to become a manager working with a board, but he is still regarded as the head of the discipline staff. This system of employing a number of disciplines with strictly limited spheres of action and boundaries does not really encourage maximum efficiency of treatment. It is hoped in the new Holloway that the various groups will learn to work amicably and profitably together. The governor will be, as it were, chairman of a board composed of the departmental heads and this interdisciplinary grouping and consultation will penetrate throughout the establishment.

This, of course, is an ongoing process. People can only learn to work together by working together. It is much easier to preach co-operation than to practice it. "Your idea of co-operation is for everyone to do what *you* want", as an exasperated governor once said to a specialist colleague.

This process of learning has already begun, it cannot wait until the new Holloway is built, with its staff training centre, which it is hoped will be used by all the women's service.

Over a period of two months members of Holloway staff of all kinds have met at Wakefield where, guided by Roy Taylor and David Alderson they have discussed the training needs of Holloway. This is an interdisciplinary group, working together on a project, not simply being talked at.

The recommendations of these conferences will be gathered together and studied by Mr. Taylor and Mr. Alderson with a small committee of medical, nursing and discipline staff from Holloway and a training programme planned which will be carried out and developed over the coming years, while the rebuilding takes place.

Great efforts are being made by the architects to facilitate working in small units and in these other new ways during the rebuilding period. Wings are to be partitioned into small units and extra space for classes and association provided, for example.

Detailed plans of the new Holloway are not yet available. Much thought and work and hope is going into the making of them, and as far as possible flexibility of use is to be the watchword so that, as we advance towards the 21st century, a building has been provided able to care for and to help the failures of society.

The Prison Officer and the Computer—Partners or Rivals

R. W. BURNHAM

PREFACE

The central theme of this article is an assessment of the effect on the everyday life of the average prison officer if a computer, or computers, are introduced into the Prison Service. The writer is a criminologist, not a computer man, and understands only limited details of "software" and next to nothing of "hardware", which are the trade terms for the operating techniques and the actual machinery respectively. Therefore, there is an absolute minimum of jargon in the article. In the course of his work he has been concerned with some possible uses of computers in prison systems, and these are some of his thoughts with the British prison system specifically in mind.

The term "prison officer" throughout is used to refer to men of all ranks in the Service, from the newest basic grade recruit to senior governor I, who work in an actual institution; but the persons especially in the writer's mind are the landing or party officers who provide the bulk and backbone of any prison service. "Head Office" is used to refer to any of the policy-making, administrative centres of the Service, and does not mean only, although it includes, the Prison Department offices at the Home Office.

WHAT ARE COMPUTERS?

The importance of this topic arises from the fact that the real question is probably not "if" computers are introduced but "when". The reason for this statement will become a bit clearer through a short account of what these machines are.

Their name implies that they are essentially high-powered adding machines, and this is how they are commonly described, and indeed what early models were. But a contemporary computer is in fact more like a whole communications system and as such is a cross-breed of a collection of teletypewriters and teleprinters with an enormous library and filing system, while still able to do extremely difficult

arithmetic almost instantaneously as a side-line. So the basic characteristic of the machine with which this article is concerned is not the ability of the machine to count, but to remember, and to collect its information from anywhere and despatch it to anywhere. Thus, many computer people prefer the name "information machines" to computers, and this term certainly makes their use in a prison system more understandable.

The ability of the computer to operate at long range is especially important in a system like the Prison Service, for to computerise the whole Service requires only one machine, which need not be located at Head Office, although there may be reasons for duplicating the machine elsewhere. The equipment for linking up the central machine with any required number of access points, in our case at institutions, is only the already existing telephone network. With this, teletypewriters can be used to put information into the system, and teleprinters to extract it for use, at any access point. Within 10 years it may be possible to talk into the machine so that the teletypewriter will not be needed. Thus it will be possible for two people at different institutions to have a typewritten conversation as easily as they have a telephone one at present, but with the significant advantage that they can call on any of the vast store of information in the machine's memory, have the conversation, or details of it, recorded in the memory, can include people in as many different institutions around the country as they wish, and have a written record of it all afterwards. Clearly this is not an operation to be undertaken for an afternoon's social chat, but as a means of getting important information from where it is known (which may be partly at an institution and partly in the central filing system, that is the machine's memory), to where it is required in written form in a matter of seconds rather than days or weeks is a big help to efficiency in any system.

It will not surprise anyone, and particularly those who have received a nonsense bill from a firm who use a computerised accounting system which occasionally goes wrong and despatches bills for £1,010 or £0 100s., when it means £10 10s., to learn that there are snags. The three main ones, as far as we are concerned, are:

(i) Software—the flexibility of the machine. It can handle only conversations and communications which follow a rigid, pre-arranged pattern. These are problems of programming, and are important to us only because, although research is continuing to improve the performance, this need to stick to some kind of pre-arranged pattern will probably be the main limitation on computer usage for many years.

(ii) Hardware—the size of the memory of the machine. The technical details again are unimportant, but briefly the memory size is limited by the time taken to find an

item in it. Research here promises to make a machine in a few years with a memory large enough for all Prison Service purposes. The ones now to be found are already probably adequate; in these, the most common memory design large enough to hold all required details on all aspects of the Prison Service would just about fill a traditional 13′×6′×6′ cell, and looks like a lot of seven-inch gramophone records stacked on long knitting needles.

(iii) Reliability—a combination of hardware and software, and is simply the fact that the machine may break down or confuse itself, as in the billing example above. This, too, is being improved but is not totally cleared.

This brief and over-simplified description of a contemporary computer system has emphasised the "information" aspect of the machine. In any machine or machines installed in the Prison Service there will, of course, also be its calculating elements. These will be used particularly by those responsible for the day-to-day running of the whole Service—computers are very good at allocating and stocktaking questions and can apply these to prisoners as to anything else—and by researchers, who are likely to become more and more involved with the system. The existence of just these two demands is probably enough to bring about the installation of a computer system anyway, so that, as I implied earlier, our question is not whether to have one but how to react to it when it arrives. Staff members at institutions are likely to be much more affected by the information aspects of the machines, however, and so it is with this in mind that I turn to the immediate impact it may, or could have.

Information on Prisoners

It will provide a much more complete information service to all staff members on inmates. Officers are being encouraged more and more to take an interest in the men or boys, women or girls in their charge, and yet frequently have as their only information on them what they, the prisoners, choose to tell them; and prisoners have been known to stretch the truth before now. With the machine it will be possible to produce a compact summary of the individual for the use of every officer who is likely to have lengthy dealings with this particular person; this summary will be fully up to date, contain whatever information the officer wishes, if it is known at all, and nothing more. Thus it will not be necessary for an officer to have to fumble through bulky, and often irrelevant, wads of paper in tattered 1150s: he can simply request a summary, giving the specific details he wishes, from the operator at the access point, i.e. the teleprinter/typewriter, and stay there for less than one minute while it is typed out in front of him like the football results on Saturday afternoon television; or he can order it and pick it up at his convenience. In this way, all the staff can be encouraged to

know as much as possible about individual prisoners not only by being told, in a general way, that it is a good thing, but by the fact that it has become an easy and not frustrating operation.

It is just as easy for officers to put information into the central record: thus the report of a landing or party officer can be dictated by that officer to the operator, and be available for use within the hour by a parole board, staff at another prison, Court or whatever authority needs it. In this way the officer can be brought much more actively into the system of control and decision-making with respect to each individual prisoner, and as such gain more of the importance in the running of the system which their fundamental role in the operation of the system deserves.

Information from Staff to Head Office

The major effect of the information implications of the computer system, as I imagine it at the moment, will be upon the relationship of the everyday prison officer, whatever his rank, and Head Office, in personal terms. This applies to his communication both to and from Head Office; each of these directions of information flow can be divided into two categories. The two categories of flow from officer to Head Office are likely to be (i) his personal wishes concerning posting; and (ii) his opinions on the situation in certain respects of the work and operation of the Service.

(I) By the use of such an information system, it will be possible with a minimum of clerical effort to maintain a system of organised postings which takes account both of the needs of the Service and the wishes of individual staff. Each officer, in his personal file in the memory, will be able to indicate the area of the country, type of institution (open, closed, adult, borstal etc.) and type of atmosphere (strict discipline, individual case-work etc.) in which he prefers to live and work. He can also indicate how much, if at all, he wishes to move from his present station, with an inclusion of such special conditions as that his children are at a critical schooling age, so that he does not wish to move for a given number of years.

If all this information is included, as the manpower requirements for each institution change, or new establishments are opened, and perhaps eventually old ones closed, the staffing question can be settled immediately. Here is an example, in which I have used the names of actual institutions to make the picture more alive. The details are, of course, purely a result of my own imagination.

Let us imagine that, owing to some policy change, it is decided that 10 officers can be transferred from Liverpool (Walton) Prison for service elsewhere. The computer can be asked to carry out the following operations immediately:

(i) to pick out the names of the Liverpool staff who most desire to leave;

(ii) to record the details of where

each of these wishes most to go;

(iii) to search its memory of vacancies and requirements in other establishments, taking the most needy first;

(iv) to allocate those 10 names to the institutions coming at the top of the urgency list with the conditions which are closest to their expressed posting wishes. Thus an officer who had asked for a closed borstal in S.E. England would be linked with Feltham or Rochester automatically, if either figured on the list. If neither did it might be that he could go to Eastchurch, which is not a closed borstal, or Portland, which is not in the S.E. An officer who had asked more simply just to stay in the N.W. but did not mind what kind of institution, would be allocated to whichever institution in that area had the most pressing need. A third officer who specified only an open prison would be given first chance at any such place which figured on the list of possibles, irrespective of its siting;

(v) to transmit to the officer in question at Liverpool an offer of that posting which the computer matching service had picked for him, with details, in writing, and a request to accept or decline it within a given number of days; and

(vi) to select 10 reserves from the next most-anxious-to-move Liverpool men, match them as the others, and warn them that they may be offered a posting, so that they could have their accept/reject decision ready if one of those above them declined the offered move.

All this could be done within 10 minutes of the first decision to transfer 10 officers out, and the whole decision process completed within the time taken by the individual officers to decide.

It is important to appreciate that the extent to which an officer can specify his wishes is quite variable. That is, he can name a specific institution, or simply an area, just one type of institution or one type of approach; obviously the wider the limits he lays down, the better his chance of getting his choice. It is equally important to realise that this in no way opposes the basic idea of the Prison Service as a discipline service. It assumes the policy that, all things being equal, it is a good thing for staff to live where they wish, and work in a place which suits them; but often all things are not equal. Just because the computer can fit a man in somewhere does not mean he can go there *of right:* it merely means that, as long as his wishes are an important factor in posting, they will be followed. In particular, the machine can be set so that it takes account of the needs of the institutions first of all, and in the example, all 10 might go to

Wandsworth from Liverpool, because Wandsworth had a particularly acute shortage of officers. What the machine can do to help in this position is to search rapidly the wishes of the whole Service (this might take it a couple of minutes or so), to find men from anywhere who wish to move, and whose choices include Wandsworth, either by name or within the description. It could then check to see if the vacancies they would leave suit the Liverpool leavers; a rather quicker job. Those wanting Wandsworth can then be contacted and told they can have it, and to decide within a certain time. This kind of operation, however, cannot be used often or on a large scale, as otherwise the Service would consist of large numbers of officers on safari around England just to satisfy a few.

The machine could help quite a lot if, say, it was discovered that 100 officers wished to go to Leicester and only one to Grendon Underwood, when both needed 10 officers from somewhere. The machine would be very good at finding second-best postings for the Leicester surplus and enough "don't-mind-too-much's" to make up the Grendon staff.

In summary, the machine could help considerably to personalise the place of residence and work for the staff without effort or delay; and presumably this would be good for the morale of everybody.

(II) The potential use of the computer described above is one which may help to improve an officer's private life as much as his working one. The second is concerned only with the working life, but may mean a great deal more to his overall contentment in the long run.

One of the most universal complaints of the ordinary workers in any large organisation is that the top management either does not care or does not know what they, the workers, think or know about the job. The Prison Service is no exception to this—indeed it seems highly unlikely that there are any exceptions among large, formal organisations. So it has become very fashionable in the last 10 years or so, when this situation has been openly recognised, to talk about "communication", or, for those who wish to sound really technical about it, "feedback". The modern computer makes this possible on a scale quite unthinkable before. It will be quite possible, technically, to have the Prison Service in the permanent state of basing the majority of its operating and policy decisions upon the knowledge of what the officers in the field think, as much as on other factors, and where, of course, this is appropriate. As the Prison Service is a discipline service, there can be no question of a democracy, but there are many instances where the policy makers would like to know what all the staff members feel about certain problems. Once they got used to the idea, they may very well discover in how many more cases it is a good idea.

I have used the phrase "all the staff" in the previous paragraph

deliberately. For the computer as an instant information machine enables a survey of the opinions of the staff to be taken at regular intervals on selected topics. One way of working the scheme would be as follows:

On one day in each month it could be arranged for each officer to hand in to the operator at the access point answers to questions which had come from Head Office and been distributed previously. These could be two basic kinds: (a) What are your feelings about feature X of the Service? (Such as the introduction of metal eating trays, or the abolition of promotion examinations.) Do you approve strongly, approve mildly, have no opinion, disapprove mildly, disapprove strongly? (b) What is your greatest single cause of discontent in the Prison Service; and what recent change in the Prison Service has been the biggest improvement? Both these questions could be subdivided into (i) staff conditions and (ii) operating procedures.

Thus, with very little effort on the part of each officer, the central authorities could soon have a very accurate picture of the attitudes of the staff throughout the Service on most of the main areas of uncertainty of this type. There are several features of the system which should be emphasised.

(1) It covers *all* officers; there would no longer be any need to ask a few representatives what every officer thinks. Not only will there be greater accuracy of information on staff views, but also the psychological satisfaction for each officer of knowing that, even if it is small and perhaps unheeded, *his* voice has been heard, and *his* vote counted.

(2) It is easy, and once the system is installed, fairly cheap to operate. Thus such a census could be taken every month, or even every week. Indeed, the machine could manage one every hour, but it would be tiresome and unproductive for the staff. One way to achieve this would be to obtain a list of a variety of staff complaints, by means of some sort of Gallup poll of a sample of staff, circulate this to all staff members via the machine, and have them vote on the relative seriousness of each separate complaint. Thus a "moan of the month" could be formally instituted—and also a "plug of the month" if it is thought desirable to find out what the staff particularly approve of.

At the moment it is not possible to take into the machine just any statement of complaint or approval and compare them with any other. This is part of the programming limitation mentioned earlier. For the machine can recognise only what it has been taught to recognise, so that it has no means of knowing that "there is not enough, or good enough, housing" is the same as "insufficient or inadequate accommodation", although the ability to recognise such similar patterns is developing; this restriction may be removed quite soon. Therefore the potential topics for comment by the whole of the Service have

to be coded, in a very rough way, beforehand, so that the replies given by each officer are in terms that the machine has already been equipped to handle. There are other ways of asking for such information, and doubtless with time it will become very easy.

(3) It overcomes the problem of local opinion being mistaken for national opinion. At the moment, if one basic grade officer or one governor is asked: "What do officers/governors think about such and such?" they will reply in terms of what they and their friends within the Service think, and these are the only replies that they could give. But there is no reason to believe that the opinion of one small, often localised group of men within the Service are *necessarily* representative of the opinions held within the Service as a whole, (although they *may* be, no-one knows).

One of the ideas which is becoming most generally accepted in modern management theory is that the obtaining of the most relevant information on which to base rational decisions is critically important. For a long time it has been agreed that for some aspects of running the Prison Service, or any similar organisation, the main storehouse of such relevant information is the officer involved at the floor level. The practical problems, however, of obtaining, classifying and analysing the potential information have been too great. The computer changes this—not overnight, as it will take some years before all the serious problems have been investigated, and that does not mean solved. But it does offer a genuine opportunity to incorporate the everyday prison officer in the field, whatever his rank, into the control mechanism of the whole Service.

INFORMATION FROM HEAD OFFICE TO STAFF

This will take two forms also, as I imagine it at the moment.

(III) A whole series of different types of information which may be labelled generally as "answers to section (II) already described". For when Head Office have collected and analysed the opinions of all staff members on problems where they are relevant, the problem is not necessarily solved. In many cases it may be—once Head Office know that 90 per cent of the staff of all grades favour a given change, which is not impossible for other reasons, it can be made. My personal feeling, having talked informally to many Head Office personnel and field staff in several different prison systems is that there are many situations exactly of this type, but it is difficult to predict in advance what will and will not be.

The phrase "not impossible for other reasons", however, is very important. Many of the changes desired by the staff, of which higher pay is the most simple and clear-cut example, are not necessarily within the decision of Head Office alone. The Prison Service is but a part of a bigger system, the Home Office, itself part of the administrative system of the whole country. Thus

not all its decisions are to be made in isolation. Secondly, Head Office may be aware of other factors internal to the Prison Service, such as future plans which are already made, making certain present inadequacies inevitable, without such factors being generally known.

It may also be often the case that what one group of staff think to be the general view of all staff (because all their friends share it) is, in fact, agreed by only a minority of the field staff as a whole—again it may be the general view, no-one knows. Another example will help.

Let us assume that a survey of staff opinion on the desirability of the metal eating trays for prisoners, as mentioned earlier, reveals a 40–60 per cent split of opinion. However, on further analysis, easily and automatically done by the machine, it might be found that officers in closed local prisons were 85 per cent in favour, and in open borstal 80 per cent against. (Or the other way round—I picked the figures at random.) This situation has at least two implications for Head Office:

(*a*) unless there is another good reason against this, they should give serious thought to providing different feeding materials to different types of institution; this principle might easily become applicable to many specific types of equipment; and

(*b*) Morale and understanding, although not agreement, would be improved by each group of the staff knowing the feelings of the other. Indeed, it would probably be very interesting and enlightening for all the members of the Prison Service or any parallel organisation to know how many of their colleagues shared their views on any given topic.

Thus the first outward-flow aspect of the information system would be to keep the field staff informed on three things:

(i) the extent and local details of agreement or non-agreement on certain points throughout the Service, that is, let each staff member know what his colleagues are thinking;

(ii) the aspects of the system which are being changed as a result of information gathered; and

(iii) the reason why certain changes requested by the majority of staff cannot be made, or certain proposed changes opposed by the majority are still to be made. It is very important to appreciate that this may be the case—things will still happen which the staff may not like, perhaps just temporarily (because most men are in one sense conservative) and perhaps always. There may also be occasions when the reasons for something cannot be revealed. But except for these situations, it is not unreasonable for the staff of an

organisation to be told why such and such a thing will happen. It both makes them feel better, to know they have been considered, and it may even, if they accept the explanation, convince them it is better that way.

(IV) The use of the information system as a training aid. "Teaching machines" have been mentioned in the education world for the last 10 years or more, and a computer programmed for the purpose can be the best teaching machine there is.

There has been a lot of stress in the last few years on the desirability of "professionalising" the status and role of the prison officer: and it has been mostly agreed that in-service training, to a much higher level than is practised now, is an important way to this. But serious in-service training is difficult, because it has meant, so far, that officers have to leave the duty station and home for one or several weeks to attend courses, usually at Wakefield. This both removes them totally from the active role of the staff at their institution, at a time when few places are not understaffed, and also disrupts their domestic life, and is therefore unpopular. Although the latter may be necessary from time to time in a discipline service, it is desirable that it be kept to a minimum.

With a computer, certain kinds of training can be undertaken by individual officers at their home base. Certain times of the week can be set aside for officers who have chosen specific training programmes to attend the access point (for a large institution, a separate training access point can be provided), to indulge in an hour's dialogue with the machine. If they can type, they can be on their own; if they cannot, they will have to dictate their replies to the machine's questions or questions for the machine to answer, to the operator. It may be better to employ this second method generally, as an experienced operator will know the types of questions and answers which make sense to the machine (which, remember, *knows* a lot but *understands* very little), and which do not. But this restriction is fading, as already mentioned; machines are starting to be able to translate languages.

There are only some types of instruction which can be given by the computer, but they are of the sort which can be combined with a few discussion groups and informal teaching methods of that kind to provide a pretty complete do-it-yourself, train-at-home programme. The computer can be programmed to explain a set of basic ideas, such as an introduction to man management, the first principles of psychology and so on. It will then ask a number of fairly simple questions, (by simple I mean requiring answers of a simple, e.g. yes/no form—the questions may be quite difficult), and if the student gets these right, proceed to further topics. If the student gets the questions wrong, or if he wishes to revise, the machine will re-explain in different terms what it has already said, and can,

at request, produce a detailed and basic explanation of any one word or idea which causes difficulty for an individual student. So each student can go at his own pace, going back for a repeat or differently worded account of the same part as often as he likes.

Therefore, the machine can teach facts, factual backgrounds to more abstract subjects, and the outlines of ideas very well—individually, and at the speed the student wishes. What it cannot do is discuss these points in terms of words other than those programmed into it beforehand. Thus for a complete training programme, if 10 officers have their individual weekly hour with the machine, one or two discussion periods for them altogether would be necessary, taken by a staff member already knowledgeable in this field, or a qualified outsider.

This is just a sketch of how, at its most simple, such a system could work. Many different training programmes could be written for and included in the central computer, so that some structured, expert training in whatever subjects are considered worthwhile could easily be made available to a large number of staff with only a fraction of the disruption which would be necessary at present. With the new machines being developed, people at each different access point could use the training facilities all at once, and all using different, or the same, programmes. The choice of which programmes should be made available is itself a suitable candidate for one of the first opinion surveys which I described earlier.

Assessment and Conclusions

Such are some of the possible uses directly affecting staff to which a computer-based information system, as briefly described, might be put. Probably even more important is a consideration of what all this implies, that is a weighing of the advantages against the disadvantages and a look at how far we can have it both ways.

I think that the introduction of such a system would have at least one side-effect which may not be generally expected, at least if the experience of such changes in other situations is any guide. If the Prison Service thus encourages internal criticism of itself, takes notice of staff attitudes and either acts differently to suit them or at least explains why it does not do so, one of the main objects of complaint is removed from the life of the staff members at all levels. "Team spirit" has been defined in rugby football as the ability of all members of the team to excuse their own mistakes as the inevitable results of the more serious failures of other team members to do their job, and if in doubt blame the scrum-half. So in the Prison Service, again like any other large organisation, it is helpful to be able to work off frustrations by grumbling about everyone else, and if in doubt blame Head Office, or the dep.

If Head Office change themselves, via the computer, into figures of co-operation and enlightenment,

such a transference of annoyance will not be so easy; the casualty rate amongst deputy governors may rise sharply. The Prison Service will always have to have means of coping with staff irritation, for the two reasons. It has inevitably to be a discipline service, so that resentment can never be totally eliminated; and also it must be admitted by even the most pro-prisoner reformist that the everyday charges of the everyday prison officer can sometimes be extremely annoying people, and prison officers have feelings like anyone else.

I suspect, therefore, that this effect of removing, or at least lessening, the role of one whipping-boy in this way may be larger than we imagine at first thought. "Bogus" moans are useful, as they allow us to reduce our feelings of frustration without upsetting anyone close at hand: if one of the best targets for these is partly removed, the expression of feelings may come out more immediately, that is, in the day to day prison situation which is the real source of most such dissatisfactions.

But this is just one aspect of a larger possible change. The kind of information which a computer system can transmit is fairly clear-cut; it can be used only if people say what they mean with some precision, and it has to be taken at face value. If the machine tells Head Office that 75 per cent of the field staff disapprove of policy X, Head Office can no longer go on pretending it did not know. If Head Office acknowledges a piece of information of this kind, and issues a statement as to why they will maintain the policy, the staff, and especially the P.O.A. and the C.S.U., can no longer protest in vague terms; they must decide whether to fight it or accept it on the grounds provided by Head Office. In short, all the different levels, organisations, and groups, especially pressure groups, will be compelled by this system to put more cards on the table, and say exactly what they want and why. Areas of disagreement and conflict will become more clearly defined, and the result of this will be either that they are resolved, or at least improved, or the friction they create will grow.

It is probably true that many social organisations, including the Prison Service, are stuck in a nasty situation. They are largely ignorant of their own degree of success, or lack of, in achieving the purposes of the system, even if these are clear, which is rare; they are also ignorant of the true nature of their problems except at an individual level. (This is not to say that someone else does know the the real nature of these problems, just that no-one knows.) This ignorance does two things. It stops any rational, systematic progress and improvement, because if we do not know what is wrong, or how much, except in very general terms, we cannot improve it. It also, by techniques such as the transfer of irritation mentioned earlier, acts as a kind of anaesthetic against the discomfort caused by these inade-

quacies. Thus to improve things it is necessary first to bring out into the open, as clearly and sharply as possible, areas and topics of failure, ignorance and disagreement.

Except for those who actually enjoy trouble, this procedure is likely to be very unpleasant, and sometimes embarrassing. Units, groups and individuals will have to face each other without the comforting, absorbing cloak of ignorance, and will have to back down from positions they have long held, and this will be psychologically costly; this will probably happen to all groups within the Service to some extent, and to some groups to a great extent. It is vital for all parties to realise that the adoption of a computer-based information system will be one factor which encourages, and perhaps even starts, this process; it may be a good idea to think for a while as to whether people are prepared to accept it.

Another problem which derives from the same situation is the changes which will be caused in the role of two specific groups, namely the two staff unions involved, the P.O.A. and the C.S.U. One of the sources of their importance and power so far has been the role they have been asked to play in speaking for the staff as a whole. Do the staff prefer more pay or more time off? Do the staff approve the proposed changes in uniform? Whenever staff opinion has been required up to now, on small questions or very big ones, the unions have been the usual source of such information, and as such have been very significant. This will no longer be the case, because it will be possible to ask all staff directly. In one important way, therefore, the status of the unions will be much reduced.

However, there is another, and to my mind possibly more important, role for them to take. We must remember that a computer is a big brother, the all-knowing control device of science fiction, only as far as we let it be. It cannot create fresh information, but only organise systematically that which it is given, and make some deductions by comparing everything it has been told. So the question of deciding what kinds of information should be required of officers is critical, and it is here that the unions should play a vital part. It seems to me a very reasonable, indeed totally justified, position for the unions to take to say that no officer must submit any information he does not wish, particularly anything personal or potentially embarrassing.

If he does wish to obtain the benefits of the machine service, however, he must communicate with it, and so for personal questions, especially in the matter of posting choices, the name of the officer is clearly necessary, as are the number and ages of children and so on. For the "census" operations, I cannot see at the moment any need for the officer to be identified personally, except at his local access point, so that his votes do not get counted twice. Generally

speaking there seems to be no reason why any individual officer need be compelled to contribute information at all. If he does not wish to state his preference for posting, he need not, provided, of course, that he does not then complain at whatever posting he may receive: neither need he take part in any census, although neither then may he fairly grumble at any policies taken as a result of the census, if he opts out. It also seems right and proper that each officer is entitled to know exactly what is entered under his name on his personal file, and above all his biannual report if it is kept there.

My general point can then be summed up as an assertion that some organised, significant body must exercise a very careful review of what is asked of staff members, what is required compulsorily of them, and what they are told in return; the unions seem the appropriate bodies to undertake this. This concern should be extended also to the difficult questions of right of access to information, and as this is a problem which is arousing concern in all areas where computer systems are used or may be used in social administration, it is worth a small separate look.

One great difficulty with the computer is that anyone who applies the appropriate message to the keyboard or whatever control is used can make the machine reveal any of the information within it. If this information is at all personal (such as an officer's periodical assessment report from his governor), the machine cannot tell if the recipient is an authorised person or not. In a prison situation, there seem to be two hazards in particular.

First, the information may fall into the hands of prisoners. It should be easy to stop them getting at the access point, by siting it between the governor's and chief's offices for instance; and even if they did manage that, the use of a simple but changing code, with the keybooks kept in a separate but secure place, would stop them making the computer actually cough up. But the information is printed out, particularly if it is for the use of separate individual officers, and may concern either individual prisoners or general staff attitudes; neither of these categories should fall into the hands of prisoners, and both could easily do so. Therefore it may be desirable not to let the information in written form out of the access point, and for security reasons require the officers to come to that access point and read and remember it there. Obviously I have not covered all the problems here, but I hope that I have written enough to show that there is a considerable difficulty and potential area of danger here. This will require keen and constant vigilance on the part of the staff organisations, to ensure that the situation is always under control.

There is one specific question which, again, cannot be considered completely here. The operators of the access points will be men who receive and transmit a great deal

of personal and classified information about all sorts of people. It is, therefore, of the highest importance both that they be men of unquestioned integrity and that they be given every protection from possible pressure *from any source whatsoever* to divulge what they know. For the sake of the morale of the staff, it seems desirable, and perhaps imperative, that they are already-serving officers, and not yet more outside specialists imported; such officers would also understand the security aspects of the job more deeply. They should probably be men who have proved themselves in the Service for some years, and so can be given the rank of principal officer; they should be given a particularly large allowance for the responsibility they bear and the special training they receive, while clearly understanding that any breach of confidence will result not only in dismissal from the Service but prosecution in Court. Their duties, and the physical location of the access point should be so structured that they *never* come into contact with prisoners. They should be transferred every three or four years, so that the possibility of their becoming an informal secondary source of authority within the institution is diminished. All these particular proposals may well be rejected for one reason or another by the staff unions: I include them only to give an example of the kind of care and thought which must go *from the staff side* into such a position.

This seems a formidable list of difficulties and potential disadvantages; but let us remember two points at this stage.

(i) All these problems can be dealt with, if prison officers care enough.

(ii) It is worth it, because the help that a computer-based information can give in improving the efficiency, quality and productivity of a prison service, and upgrading and professionalising the role of the staff, is probably greater than any other single change. It seems a reasonable prediction that the status and role of the prison officer will not stay the same. As society and the system change and perhaps, progress, prison officers will either become more involved, more professional, more important, and with that better paid and better thought of, or they will decline to the role of mere turn-keys who move the inhabitants of an institution around so that a range of outside or superior "experts" can deal with them. Their status and pay will suffer accordingly, and many members of the Service are already worried about the prospect of this.

The computer can be a great influence in ensuring that the first upward development is the one for the prison officer of the future. Social situations can change without anyone wishing them to. It could easily happen that, with every level of staff, all staff organisations and all aspects of Head Office deploring the possible decline of the prison officer, it still happened through

pressure of other social changes. It is better to do something about it, beyond passing militant resolutions or composing benevolent memoranda.

It is very difficult to measure status and importance, but one way which has been considered recently is in terms of information. Important people are those who produce (that is, are the origin of) significant information, and those who consume it (that is, take the decisions which affect the way things are done on the basis of that information). Thus any change in the system which increases the amount of information either produced or consumed by the everyday prison officer increases his status; if, as I have suggested, the machine will help to bring the prison officer into a key position in the information flow, so that he no longer just does what he is told, but knows why he is doing it, and by his production of information helps in some measure to control what he does, then the machine will be on his side.

Finally, it is worth it for a different reason. I started the main body of this article by saying that it is not a matter of "if" computers will be introduced, but "when". This is probably true within 15 years, possibly much sooner. No other system can match it for operating efficiency. Such machines are like fire, dogs and wives—if you are boss, they are fine, but if they are boss, you are in trouble. So that prison officers, perhaps only the youngest of the present generation, but perhaps many more, must decide whether they are going to accept the computer, and by making the effort to understand a little and think about the problems it brings, turn it into one of their best allies. Alternatively they can play ostriches and ignore it, only to find that they are the robots, and it is making the decisions.

Conference of Directors of Criminological Research Institutes

From *Forward in Europe*, the bulletin of the Council of Europe

About 100 specialists from 30 countries and several international organisations took part in the 7th Conference of Directors of Criminological Research Institutes, which was held from 1st–4th December last at the Council of Europe, Strasbourg. The theme of the meeting was "Identification of Key Problems in Criminological Research".

The conference, which had been enlarged for the first time, comprised not only directors of criminological research institutes from the 18 member states of the Council of Europe but also observers from Bulgaria, Spain, Finland, Hungary, Israel, Rumania, Tunisia, the U.S.A., Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Poland and the U.S.S.R.

The United Nations, the Penal Law Association, the International Society of Criminology, the International Penal and Penitentiary Foundation and Interpol were also represented.

The conference endeavoured to define the basic problems of criminological research and to compare them with the practical questions with which governments are faced in this field at the present time. Research workers and administrators will thus select the problems which should be given priority and will assemble data likely to assist the governments in crime prevention and the treatment of offenders.

Contemporary Theme

Punishment or Treatment: Prison or Hospital?

P. D. SCOTT, M.D., M.R.C.P., D.P.M.
Consultant Physician, Maudsley Hospital, London, S.E.5

Reprinted from the *British Medical Journal* 1970, 2, 167–169, by permission of the editor

A FEW WEEKS ago an interesting and humane letter in this journal from Geoffrey Gray and Peter Chapple (1969) raised this dilemma once again. "Is it not time", they say "our Prison Service abandoned punishment and substituted treatment and rehabilitation". The present article endeavours to examine this possibility more closely and to reach some conclusions.

The whole range of penal and therapeutic institutions, including approved schools, prisons, and hospitals, are periodically under fire following the real or alleged discovery of neglect or abuse and inmates increasingly secure their own publicity. A time-honoured method is to climb on to the roof, from which considerable vantage point feelings are forcefully expressed and interviews conducted. Recently an 18-year-old girl followed this pattern at Holloway Prison, and it is to this escapade that Drs. Gray and Chapple refer. They quote two Press statements: one that she had been advised "hospital treatment", the other that she had been sentenced to 30 days' "solitary" (we do not know that either was in fact recommended or applied). They assume that since she had been ordered hospital treatment she must have been mentally sick and express great disquiet that the mentally sick should be punished with solitary confinement. They refer to our sometimes very archaic prisons and plead that the prisoners be given adequate accommodation and greater freedom.

DEFINITIONS

Treatment is best regarded not as a passive process applied only by a doctor but as any approved measure used by anyone or any group (staff member, inmate, relative) to change a person in a desired direction. It is hoped that it will be

the person himself who desires the change, otherwise the change must extend only to abandonment of unlawful or manifestly self-damaging behaviour. This definition of treatment clearly includes that variety of punishment (perhaps better called conditioning) which is rationally applied according to the rules of learning and must sometimes include solitary confinement.

An excellent example of this is described by Brown and Tyler (1968) in an article entitled "Time Out from Reinforcement: A Technique for Dethroning the 'Duke' of an Institutionalised Delinquent Group". They employed an operant conditioning technique involving the immediate brief segregation of the youth every time he succeeded in manipulating the other boys into serving him or "toadying" to him; he was thus transformed, at least in that institution, from a disruptive and greatly feared individual to one who was co-operative and no longer harmful to others.

Obviously, then, punishment and treatment are not opposites. The objective is not to displace one by the other but to use both rationally, for both can be abused. Punishment can be used as retribution and this does nothing more than transfer tension, usually very temporarily, from punisher to punished. It is not only punishment which may be abused. Kenneth Dewhurst (1969) has brilliantly shown how the most modern methods of treatment—for example, tranquillisers and E.C.T.—can covertly be utilised as restraints. Such abuses might be very much more pernicious than solitary confinement. Fortunately there is no present need to define mental sickness, because the term does not reliably indicate action or outcome. The following case illustrates the point.

ILLUSTRATIVE CASE

A 13-year-old boy was delinquent and utterly out of control both at school and at home. In a child guidance clinic he was regarded as reacting to parental rejection. He was taken to a juvenile court and remanded in custody. There he was found to be epileptic and to have a grossly abnormal E.E.G. A psychiatric hospital accepted him as manifestly a medical responsibility, but after a few days returned him to the remand home because he was upsetting the ward and the nurses. In the remand home a personal nurse was obtained and this uncomfortably contained the problem for a while, but the effective solution was the impact of an experienced member of the remand home staff—a large and kindly man, but capable of looking very fierce when he wishes, able to out-talk any boy either in vocabulary or in volume, manifestly capable of removing anyone whether kicking, spitting or abusive; because of his obvious invulnerability he rarely has to do more than raise his voice, and he has never been known to lose his temper.

Under this housemaster's influence the boy's behaviour was not

only tamed but his epilepsy was improved, his medication was reduced, and a very friendly relationship developed between them. The master had in fact succeeded where the best of the hospital service had failed. No doubt he was aided in this process by having the backing and approval of a well-run and friendly institution which included provision for medical treatment and by knowing that the boy had been fully investigated medically and psychiatrically and that skilled advice was at hand if required. It was interesting to note that, after the boy improved, his father turned out to be a helpful sort of person, not so rejecting as previously had been supposed.

This boy had been variously labelled naughty, delinquent, personality-disordered, and mentally ill, but none of these had indicated the appropriate solution. It is usually not worth arguing whether the addict, or the pervert, or the delinquent is ill or not, for the answer either way is inconclusive.

Practical Issues

Before a person can be treated for disturbed or deviant behaviour there must be control, and before the patient can be controlled the institution must have a confident policy on the limits of aggressiveness that can be tolerated and what to do and who to call in when this is exceeded. Some institution must always be at the end of the chain: closed approved schools, closed borstals, prisons, and special hospitals. Society and all the open institutions owe a debt of gratitude to these last links, which absorb their most difficult members. Staff in these institutions work as a team; though as Stürup (1968) says, treatment of the antisocial by doctors alone is a sheer waste of time; nevertheless, doctors play an indispensable part in diagnosis, in treatment and in a staff-supporting role.

Most patterns of aggressive behaviour are well known to these teams and usually quickly diagnosed —panicky aggression of the frightened and inadequate, perhaps precipitated by their defences of stealing or homosexual behaviour; the crises and the smashing up of the intolerably frustrated or depressed, perhaps occasioned by unfavourable news from outside; the pathological outbursts of the psychotic or brain-damaged, sometimes grafted on to a psychopathic type of personality; the internecine antagonisms between prisoners of perhaps rather similar personality, the planned and corporate violence of the habitually antisocial. The skilled officer or nurse can often anticipate these events, and it is usually clear which persons need to be removed to the sick-bay or hospital ward, which need to be segregated for their own protection ("rule 43" prisoners), and which must quickly and firmly be locked up. On the whole the most difficult patients are those in whom several of these factors fall together—for example, a lifetime of faulty experience and frustration, together

with some personal weakness or releasing factor.

Physical Restraint

The fact of the matter is that the most disturbed persons are committed to custody, and in bringing all their problems with them the process of controlling them, or getting them to control themselves, is sometimes exceedingly difficult and restraints are inevitably sometimes necessary. Restraint is always potentially hazardous. It is not so much a question of replacing restraint by treatment as applying it as one stage of treatment. It becomes less hazardous or open to abuse if the following principles are observed:

(1) It must be applied only as a matter of policy approved by the highest authority. Each institution should know its limit of tolerance and exactly what to do and who to call in beyond this point. Staff and patients should know the policy and have the opportunity of debating it.

(2) It must be part of the therapeutic intention of the whole institution—not a retributive measure. It follows that segregation should never be for a predetermined time, but only for as long as necessary, and should be constantly reviewed; the patient must understand this.

(3) Chemical restraint must be used only when there is obvious disorder of the mind never to subdue normal excitement, passion, rebellion, even if the patient requests it (otherwise he is being pushed into drug dependency and an opportunity for realistic treatment has been missed). It is far better to seclude an unruly, angry person than to hold him down and give him an injection.

(4) The top security institutions, where restraint is most likely to be required, should have high priority for quantity and quality of staff and should be, so far as security allows, saturated with visiting specialists, students, and research workers, and be kept in the forefront of public attention, not by waiting for a crisis to be reported but by inviting approved representatives of the mass-media to come and see exactly what goes on and to take part openly in discussions between staff and inmates.

(5) Its use must be constantly scrutinised and discussed at all levels, otherwise it will regress to retributive punishment.

Hospital or Prison

Since no one is very clear where mental illness finishes and disturbed or deviant behaviour begins, it is inevitable that there will be doubts about whether certain sorts of persons should be in prisons or hospitals. The choice is often

arbitrary, and many years ago Penrose (1943) showed that the utilisation of prisons and asylums varies inversely. It is sometimes said that to permit the mentally sick within prisons would be to put the clock back a hundred years. This rather overlooks the fact that by even quite explicit standards there are already many mentally sick persons within the prisons. Rather than endeavouring, as in the spirit of the Mental Health Act, to lift the mentally abnormal out of the prisons into hospital (where experience shows that they are not welcome) it might be better to acknowledge that there are certain varieties of mentally abnormal persons, especially those in whom the intellect is largely intact, who are much better treated in prisons. This would have the great advantage that the requisite treatment facilities —doctors, nurses, and the skills brought with them—would be available for the whole prison system. This would be the exact reversal of the Mental Health Act principle of removing patients to be treated and of the implication that what remains needs none. It is already a fact that the medical complement of certain prison establishments is proportionately much greater than in many mental hospitals, and it is likely that, in future, prisons and hospitals will increasingly overlap.

Summing Up

The prisons are slowly showing changes comparable to those which have occurred in the hospitals and asylums during the last century. They will need all available help in overcoming inevitable resistances, notably a well-informed public and increased professionalism and responsibilities for treatment. It would be a logical and useful innovation to balance the necessary high-security end of the scale by introducing voluntary admission to prisons at the other. Every magistrate is familiar with men who commit silly and often very destructive offences because they are afraid of their impulses, or cannot cope with conditions outside. It should not be too administratively difficult to arrange for carefully controlled voluntary admissions of such persons to remand prisons for assessment and if necessary allocation, if they are known to have antisocial tendencies. Even a small proportion of voluntary cases, or self-sought terminations of parole, might make a great impression on the morale of the service.

Most people harbour the basic phantasy of, on the one hand, a warm, permissive, liberally equipped, and permissive hospital system where treatment is applied by doctors and nurses to persons who are suffering through no fault of their own; on the other hand are the prisons where people are punished for wicked behaviour which they could renounce if they wished, and who should therefore be prepared to accept rigorous conditions and custodial turnkeys. Obviously neither side of the picture is correct; often enough, hospital patients

are just as blameworthy for their overindulgences and disregard of the primary rules of hygiene as are criminals for their perverse behaviour. Samuel Butler made the point a long time ago. Really, both sets of persons are greatly in need of guidance and retraining towards a better disciplined way of life, but because in the criminal his defaults *directly* endanger others he is the manifest problem.

The fact is that it is easy and gratifying to treat acute illnesses and injuries in pleasant surroundings, especially if you can send home those who do not respond. It is also easy and, unhappily, gratifying to punish wicked people, and if they "turn nasty" lock them up and go home to your tea. What is very difficult is to treat long-term problems of irrational or undesirable behaviour in persons who do not want to be treated. It may need compulsion, and the basis of the treatment is not usually medical or psychiatric at all, but simply the primary ability to be firm without being retributive; like any good parent, to have a policy, to insist on it despite being unpopular, and never to lose one's temper. Essentially this is the application of a well-formed and moral character to someone who lacks control. Given this the medical or psychiatric trimmings are easily added. The trimmings on their own, as in the epileptic boy, are insufficient.

I believe the penal and corrective institutions are more aware of these principles than any other public service, and that slowly and laboriously a reformation is occurring which will transform these institutions and that other services, including the hospital and educational systems, will have much to learn from them. By their very nature prisons and reformative institutions have *had* to study the painful problems that everyone else is inclined to sweep under the carpet yet which are everywhere so pressing—how to prevent, control, redirect, utilise our own aggressive-destructive impulses.

In this sense the prisons should no longer be the Cinderella of the social services and should no longer be tucked as far as possible out of sight—they might pay good dividends; and if we fail to face these problems we shall be displaying just the same weaknesses and irresponsibility as the delinquents and criminals themselves.

REFERENCES

BROWN, G. D. and TYLER, V. O. (1968). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 9, 203.

DEWHURST, K. (1969). *Practitioner*, 203, 658.

GRAY, G. and CHAPPLE, P. A. L. (1969). *British Medical Journal*, 3, 297.

PENROSE, L. S. (1943). *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 47, 462.

STURUP, G. K. (1968). *Treating the "Untreatable"*. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press.

"Just one small point Sir, that picture window done by 999 Smith, the one that you admired . . . it turned out to be a hole Sir!"

Reviews . . .

Care or Crime

MARTIN SILBERMAN. Published by the Royal London Prisoners' Aid Society 1970. 10s. 6d.

AN INTERESTING and well written book mainly concerned with the author's ideas and impressions concerning root causes of recidivism gathered while assisting Professor T. C. N. Gibben's fact-finding survey into the problems of after-care. The statistical analysis of the main objective factors of the prisoners' histories and situations are published elsewhere and the author's intention in this book is to examine certain aspects of recidivism which seems to have relevance to the rehabilitation of discharged prisoners.

The sample taken was all British-born, white convicted men, serving between 28 days and three years imprisonment and were interviewed at Pentonville, Brixton and East-church prisons, plus approximately one-quarter of the sample of 404, that had been recently released and were interviewed as clients of the Royal London Prisoners' Aid Society. The author is well aware of the debatable reliability of such interview-based evaluations and inferences concerning the character of informants, not simply because the informants wish to conceal activities, but because they wish to hide from themselves and from others, information and painful facts that would diminish them in the eyes of others. The total picture presented by those interviewed usually included observations of tone of voice, facial expressions, body-movements and smoking patterns. There was also full awareness that many tell the interviewer what they assume he wants to hear. Also, of the important fact that interviewers are inevitably limited by their own personal feelings and problems and that what is needed by the interviewer is insight into the nature of his own reactions and the effect they may have on informants. It is sensibly suggested that social workers, in assessing other peoples' personalities are in constant danger of becoming hide-bound by their own experiences. The problems of evaluating truth, untruth, evasions and omissions are examined, as is the almost universal contempt reserved for those suspected of "grassing" on prison life and the informal code

of prison conduct. Informality of approach may well be useful, but it is just as well to remember that the most co-operative of informants will not be immune to doubts expressed by fellow prisoners concerning the enquirer's *bona fides*. The writer underlines that although awareness of these problems does not, by itself, surmount these obstacles, it does at least contribute to a more realistic evaluation of such interviews.

Chapters on "Delinquent—Penal Involvement", "Resentment and the Limitation of Deterrence" and "Predisposing and Aggravating Factors" are clearly and thoughtfully written and contain many ideas and practical suggestions on how such factors influence recidivism. The fact that persistent delinquency can be found among extrovert, introvert, ambivert, schizoid, manic-depressive, neurotic, psychopathic, psychotic, narcisstic, masochist, sadistic, intra-punitive and extra-punitive characters, only proves there is little in common amongst the delinquents and that although many show evidence of personality disorders, delinquency as such, is not a psychiatric illness, but an adaption to life. Many informants experienced, at least occasionally, the wish to change their pattern of conduct, but their difficulties appeared to them to be within themselves and the circumstances which originally induced their delinquency, while appearing to recede into the background, still continued to exert an influence over their subsequent conduct, although they themselves were usually unaware of this. Many imagined that the attainment of some specific object would transform them, as if by magic, into law-abiding citizens. Yet while clinging to some fiction about themselves, they left little doubt that they would always find new reasons to explain their situations and failures.

In sub-classifying recidivists the author divides those interviewed into the three classes of "opportunity offenders" who succumb to temptation, "habitual offenders" who use every opportunity and the "professional offenders" who create opportunities. Amongst the property offenders it was possible to distinguish three basic positions, or reasons, for the commission of offences. The "distress" situation pertained to men who for a variety of reasons, were short of funds. The "acquisitive" situation pertained to men who committed offences to obtain more money than he could legitimately earn in order to increase his level of consumption. The "parasitical" situation pertained to men who, in the absence of legitimate income, resorted to crime for the purpose of gaining a more or less regular source of income. Amongst the latter group were the "near professionals". Whilst the incidence of acquisitive and parasitical offences declined with the frequency of imprisonment, those in which distress was the major factor usually increased correspondingly.

Amongst those who engaged

in delinquency primarily to avoid employment, were many who found it difficult to accept any but their own authority. Some wanted to give orders, some found it difficult to assert themselves and doubted their own abilities. They were aware that they were classed as "work-shy" but asserted that they worked quite hard when self-employed or if allowed to work without too much interference. It was common for men to use the proceeds of their offences in order to gain status. What seemed to matter most to them was the inadequacy of their legitimate earnings in relation to their requirements, rather than the avoidance of employment.

The chapter dealing with personal relationships covers ground that has already been well researched. Nevertheless, it deals interestingly with the problems caused by parental inconsistency, indifference or rejection. Marital relationships are examined and the results of imprisonment upon marriage. In the final analysis the author repeats the commonly-held view that recidivists often place the onus for making adjustments on others whilst regarding their own conduct uncritically.

Attitudes to after-care by prisoners and ex-prisoners are fully examined in the penultimate chapter and some of the opinions expressed come as something of a shock. The male social worker was often seen by his clients as a "failure" who could not succeed in other walks of life, like his client, living off public funds. He had "opted out of the rat-race" or was merely a tourist on the scene. Being never quite sure whose side social workers were, clients had some difficulty in deciding whether to accept them as friends or enemies. Alternatively, the judiciary, police and prison services could be more easily accepted. They knew where they stood in relation to these services and if a little kindness or understanding came their way from this direction, it was a pleasant and much appreciated surprise. The quote that impressed me most was "they tell you what they think is the matter with you; they tell you where you go wrong; they tell you what they think is good for you, and what they think you should do. They always think they know your problems and the answers to them . . . the trouble is it is their answer not yours". If ever any statement clearly defined the difficulties of "getting inside" another person, surely this does.

The title "Care or Crime" gave me the impression that the substance of the book would be mainly concerned with alternatives to present thinking and practice. In fact, only the final chapter is concerned with alternatives and concentrates mainly on the theme of properly-run rehabilitation hostels for discharged prisoners. The limitations of solely material assistance is clearly defined, the problems of the "cash versus casework" and "accommodation versus rehabilitation" issues are clearly outlined. The

only suggestion for new legislation is contained in the suggestion that "in some cases it may well be that hostels could be more effective if they were used as an alternative to imprisonment, though not as an equivalent".

W. I. D.

Put Away

PAULINE MORRIS. Published by Routledge and Kegan Paul 1970. 70s.

PUT AWAY is a study "aimed to examine the range and quality of institutional provisions for the mentally sub-normal; for example the physical setting of hospitals, the kinds of patients to be found in them, the staff who care for the patients, the life of the community and its contact with the outside world". The study was made possible by a grant from the National Society for Mentally Handicapped Children to the Department of Sociology in the University of Essex.

The first part of the study describes the design of the survey and gives an historical account of the provision made for sub-normal patients and the attitudes and beliefs that have prevailed about them. It is a succinct and lively review, both a useful introduction and a comprehensive review valuable for anybody concerned with the problems of subnormality. Mrs. Morris then takes us step by step through the various facets of institutional life. This is a brilliant descriptive study of institutions. Although specifically an account of institutions for mentally retarded, all those with experience of institutions generally will immediately be aware of the acuteness of the observation and the astuteness of commentary. The mentally retarded clearly share with the prisoner the problems of living in establishments purpose-built for an outmoded philosophy, together with converted country houses, both remarkable for their inconvenience and general decay. Hospitals are unique in their tripartite administrative organisation and, although reference is constantly made to this feature, this in no way detracts from those aspects which are generic to all institutions. The basic unit of staffing, the nurse, is clearly undergoing the now familiar problem of diminution of role satisfaction and lack of role description as the specialists appear to be eating away at the more interesting aspects of their daily task, a situation particularly highlighted when there is a lack of clearness about the nature of the task, whether it be nursing in the traditional medical sense or institutional care for long stay patients. The inevitable hostility that this produces

towards the specialists is clearly reflected in their observations about their own positions in the hierarchy. This type of hospital clearly has not resolved the problem of specialist integration, and graphically described are the complaints regarding lack of status, authority, ability to do the task and lack of clarity about the task. One is forced to enquire in this context, as in that of most institutional settings, what was the rationale behind the introduction of these specialists and who was responsible for their induction into this hospital service. Their disillusionment at the work given them, their varied interpretations of the task of the hospital and their specific function within that task, are all too familiar. The implications of this for the patient is not so clear, for although the staff come fully alive in this study, the patients remain a vague group. This is inevitable when attempting to get a response from a largely inarticulate population.

The descriptive excellence of this book is both its strength and its weakness. At the end of the examination of the departments, one is prepared, in fact anxious, for an examination of the organisation, the means of communication, and the general management structure. At this point the book attempts a detailed examination of two hospitals. I had hoped that this would produce the extant lines of communication and channels of instruction, but unfortunately the research degenerates into a recounting of back-stairs and gate-lodge gossip, of the usual recriminatory and unconstructive nature. No firm structure emerges and in consequence there is no real analysis of the organisation of any one or of the general situation in institutions. The failures of the system are all too apparent, but these hospitals do operate on a day to day basis, there must be lines of communication and structure and I believe it to be the task of such an examination to produce these for us.

The final section of the book is an examination of the ideology of treatment and contains recommendations for change. The recommendations themselves are quite exciting in their theoretical concept but one wonders about the administrative implications of their implementation. I would have hoped that in this section there might have been offered a short term and a long term plan, a broad general change such as Mrs. Morris recommends, but also an attempt to deal more effectively with the here and now, with the factors and the problems which actually exist.

One is aware when reading this book of the constraints of Goffman and his theories, as one is in reading much of modern institutional literature. There appears to be the need to discover all the areas he identifies and to apologise when they are not found or are found but are not having the effect prescribed. Goffman and his disciples may believe that they have discovered inevitable truths about institutions, but I

suggest the facts as they are available at the moment do not necessitate a determinist view. Goffman's findings may be present but often in a varying degree and not correlated with the degree of "totality" of the institution. If this is the case then it behoves anyone analysing institutions to attempt to direct the practitioner towards an amelioration of the deprivations of institutional living.

This book is a valuable contribution if only because it provides a clear account of the attitudes and frustrations of staff working in a specific institution or type of institution but which are generic to all institutions.

B.E.

Imprisoned Tongues

ROBERT ROBERTS. Manchester University Press. 37s. 6d.

ILLITERACY IS COMMON in British prisons. Out of 896 men tested in one local gaol, 265 were found to be "below average", 143 were "educationally backward", 31 "near illiterate" and 28 men could not read or write at all. With such startling statistics and, in view of his plea that little seems to have been written about teaching the illiterate and educationally backward in gaol, Robert Roberts had good reason to record some of his experiences as tutor organiser of a large local gaol. He describes in detail how he tests all men who come into his prison, thus enabling him to discover where their greatest needs lie, and how he then employs time, patience, considerable tact and even a little cunning, in persuading individuals to join the relevant class. (Though there must be many teachers who envy Mr. Roberts for being able to assume that his students will lose no pay by attending day classes!) Once in the class Mr. Roberts feels that the chief hurdle has been overcome.

The largest section of the book is devoted to the different methods of teaching required in these classes. I was interested to note the great stress Mr. Roberts lays on individual teaching in the early stages, and the following through of a coherent course—the simplicity of the work count being of far more significance to the embryo reader than the content. This has been borne out in my own experience, though it is necessary, even with the most illiterate, to offset the struggling reading about "run, John, run to mother", with more mature chat about the football results or topics of mutual interest from the daily papers. Such conversation in a class of this nature not only increases their powers of self-expression, but also helps to reassure the men that they are not totally "ignorant", and encourages

them to work all the harder to "fill in the gaps" in their knowledge. Mr. Roberts stresses the difficulty of keeping a reasonable balance between work and chat, and puts the new teacher on his guard against those who have joined the class merely to hold the floor.

At the end of the course, and Mr. Roberts reckons that most will achieve literacy within four months, a man may have the opportunity of moving on to a higher grade. To many teachers in prisons the very possibility of such "streaming" must seem idyllic! Here again Mr. Roberts puts forward concrete and interesting ideas on how the class may be handled, making some useful suggestions about teaching methods, and including some invaluable advice to newcomers about security. He points out that in their relationships with prisoners teachers are in a more privileged position than most other members of the staff, he even quotes one prisoner as saying: "It's nice to come in 'ere out of the nick!" I wish he had made some reference here to the tensions that this attitude from a prisoner may cause between the teacher and other staff, who may resent his special position.

Throughout the book Mr. Roberts demonstrates his sincere and sympathetic understanding of the men he is called upon to teach. Not hoodwinked by the wicked, nor duped by the con-men (and they exist, even amongst the illiterate) he clearly maintains a balanced, yet intense, interest in each individual—and not merely in his intellectual attainments, but in the "whole man". He introduces the new prison tutor to the illiterate and semi-illiterate long-term prisoners through lively pen portraits, delightfully characterised class-room discussions and through the prisoners' own works, many of which are quoted in the main part of the book and in the appendix.

In the final chapter Mr. Roberts attempts to set this teaching of illiterates within the framework of the prison world, and to show how prisons and their methods are changing and developing. He gives a thumbnail sketch of the staff structure within the prison and discusses some types of officers, describing most feelingly the plight of the man who hoped to do social work and finds himself merely a turn-key. He acknowledges the existence of the non-uniformed staff, "the governor, one deputy governor, two assistant governors, together with welfare, medical, clerical and trade staff". And that is that. Do these officials have no connection at all with what Mr. Roberts is doing in his classes for illiterates? It is true that, earlier in his book, Mr. Roberts mentions the possibility of referring the men's "social problems" to the welfare department; he might even question a psychologist or doctor about some of the more serious psychopathic and medical problems he meets when dealing with his classes. He says himself: "A word in the right quarter may be of service both to student and staff". But

where does he do this, and when, and how? Is there any existing machinery which enables these various members of staff to meet together and pool their information and ideas concerning the individuals who are in their care?

Mr. Roberts makes the point that of habitual offenders an abnormally large percentage have some form of physical or character defect. How many of these problems, which must have been noted and maybe being treated by the doctors, are discussed between the teaching and medical staffs, so that the work of the one may be augmented and strengthened by the other—or simply so that time is not wasted? I know of an extreme case where a teacher persevered for many weeks in an effort to get through to a borstal boy in a hospital class before she found that he was so heavily sedated that he was incapable of response! Similarly there must be many cases where a word from the welfare officer or assistant governor would help the teacher in his dealings with an individual.

Mr. Roberts clearly gets through a great quantity of work to discover who are the illiterates and to enable them to become literate. Doubtless he also has a great deal of other work to do for the abler inmates, who also require instruction, some of it to a high standard. These aims are wholly admirable; but is there not a squandering of resources when a prisoner is tested by the psychologist *and* by the tutor organiser? And could not the assistant governor, or social worker in their normal rounds of the wing, help in persuading men of their need for classes? They in their turn could be helped in their understanding of some of their most difficult prisoners by the tutor because, in Mr. Roberts' own words "With such men the teacher will spend many hours for many months together in a relationship far closer than that of anyone else in the prison".

E. T.

The Correctional Community—An Introduction and Guide

Edited by FENTON, REINER and WILMER (1967). 119 pp. University of California Press. 21s. 6d.

THE "THERAPEUTIC COMMUNITY" concept is very attractive and perhaps appeals to the Utopian aspirations we have. The work of Maxwell Jones and Denis Martin in developing "community concepts" and applying them in mental hospitals indicates to us, in our more ideal moments, that a similar approach in prison could be helpful.

This is not just a hunch either. Polsky tells us clearly that individual treatment in institutions is seldom as potent to the deliquent as the inmate culture which reinforces delinquent attitudes. We know, too, from the institutional literature that prisons tend to be harmful through stripping, deskilling, depersonalising and reinforcing dependency. It is hopeful when one discovers community concepts which concentrate on using the positives of the institutional situation, especially high interaction, and offer greater rewards to staff and trainees.

A lot of work has gone on in California since Norman Fenton's book on group counselling in 1957 and *The Correctional Community* describes the present state of development. The book consists of eight papers by seven men involved in implementing community regimes in Californian "corrections"; it describes the basic structure of community meeting, small group and individual interview and indicates areas of difficulty, anxiety and success. The papers hang together well and hold a consistent, constructive note. Practicality and freedom from jargon increase the ease of reading; accounts of group meetings are neat and help the text along. The bibliography is largely American, but incorporates English work on the community approach in mental health.

The book is full of ideas though not all will be enthusiastically embraced by everyone. For example, the community meeting for an hour early each day will raise some anxieties in most of us and will be anathema to those advocating the conditioning of prisoners to work. But the authors advise developing a unit at a time with staff who are prepared to try a new method after training and progressive experience. One advantage is that all staff and trainees can participate and are expected to do so. Again, the high degree of interaction between staff and trainees which becomes conscious to all proves stronger than the restrictions of the prison code. These are great gains. Subjective evaluations of results is also encouraging but techniques of rating results through isolating variables and matching are too much in their infancy to substantiate or refute the apparent value of the "correctional community". One author claims that he sees no reason why this form of treatment should not benefit all delinquents in all institutions but, while the regime is operating in all types of institution from maximum security prison to open camp, it does depend at present on verbal volunteers. This makes evaluation more complicated for not all delinquents have this constructive anxiety about themselves and it is a good indicator of success in itself; however, it also preserves the non-verbal and the "non-amenable" from a possibly negative effect if P.I.C.O. conclusions apply.

One last thought: "To the extent that the patient does not oppose the situation of being hospitalised, he

has a tendency to be satisfied with his state of being sick and the chances of recovery are compromised. On the other hand, if he opposes his situation, and if this opposition is not utilised therapeutically, it will be expressed by the refusal of treatment or even by escape or violence" (p. 57).

M.D.J.

Borstal Recall Delinquency and the Cloward-Ohlin Theory of Criminal Subcultures

ROY FISHER. *British Journal of Criminology*, January 1970, vol. 10, No. 1

AMONG SOCIOLOGICAL writings in the field of delinquency the theory of criminal subculture advanced by Cloward and Ohlin has found widespread acceptance. This theory postulates that underprivileged lower-class youths are disadvantageously placed in the legitimate competition for income, status and other rewards; and being unable or unwilling to revise their aspirations downwards certain lower-class youths explore non-conformist avenues to these goals. A criminal subculture is formed offering illegitimate alternatives to conventional competitive means and generating its own normative system.

Fisher argues that to accept this theory is premature until it can be shown that persistently delinquent working-class youths do, in fact, apprehend a discrepancy between goals and the possibility of legitimate achievement, and subsequently adopt the subcultural values postulated. He also queries how far the theory is applicable to delinquency in this country, being based as it is on observations of American delinquency where the gang structure, which is generally agreed not to have any close English counterpart, is the chief mechanism of criminal subculture.

By means of a structured interview schedule, Fisher compared a sample of persistently delinquent working-class youths (borstal recalls) with matched non-delinquent

working-class controls, and with a middle-class sample, to see how far there were differences in attitudes and values of a kind which would accord with subcultural theory. In the areas investigated—schooling, work opportunities and perception of social class differences—the results obtained showed little support for the Cloward-Ohlin theory. Borstal recalls hold negative attitudes to their schooling in general, but more for reasons of having little capacity or desire for scholastic honours, which they recognise and admit, than from having high expectations of education which the school failed to meet, as would be expected on the Cloward-Ohlin postulates. Similarly in the work area recalls do not aspire to roles presently dominated by middle-class derived people. They do not, on Fisher's results, aspire to work at all if they can avoid it; but in so far as they acknowledge the economic necessity for work their delinquency would appear unrelated to perceived frustration of competitive drives. Nor do Fisher's delinquent subjects show much class consciousness; what views they hold tend to be unsophisticated, apparently because class is neither interesting nor urgent to them.

These results would suggest then, that subcultural theories based on class-linked educational and work opportunities need to be subjected to fairly thorough research studies before receiving such widespread acceptance among sociologists of deviance and others as has tended to be the case. The research design used by Fisher is very sound and productive both of useful information and ideas for further study. It would be interesting, for instance, to explore how far the low aspirations and lack of class consciousness of the recalls (which contrast markedly with the high competitiveness and class consciousness of non-delinquent working-class controls) derive from psychological as opposed to social factors. Or perhaps this lack of awareness and drive for conventional social rewards may, on deeper investigation, turn out to be a passive form of manifestation of subcultural attitudes—a kind of opting-out shown by casualties of a complex, competitive society.

Fisher concludes by asking a question of some importance to people with a social or work interest in reducing delinquency: "If criminality is linked to delinquent subculturers, where are these subculturers located?" He answers it by saying that whilst a sizeable number of his delinquent subjects also had delinquent kinsfolk, the only *criminal* subculture borstal recalls had experienced was the inmates' informal social systems within institutions!

T.J.A.

Sociology and the Stereotype of the Criminal

DENNIS CHAPMAN. Tavistock 1968. 45s.

Who is the Criminal?

RICHARD OERTON. Zenith Books 1968. 15s.

CHAPMAN HAS GOT hold of something important. The central idea is simple: "When people define situations as real, they are real" (pp. 15–16). The book is about the self-fulfilling prophecy, about labelling, about the reality of criminality that is made by society's preconceptions, prejudices, stereotypes. This is a line of thought that has been developed by Lemert, Erikson, Scheff and Wilkins and appraised by Bordua, Cressey and Schur. There are lots of people in the service who know, perhaps to their own discomfort, that this is a challenging idea. Entertaining the idea is fun; the way people and agencies respond to the challenge is the all-important issue.

This is where the crunch comes in reviewing this book. One thing has to be said loud and clear: all kinds of people, not simply those in the penal game, ought to be wrestling with the central message of the book. They should use the book in two stages. First, they ought to read enough of it to get the message. Second, they should look at it with a determination to make up for its deficiencies.

TITILLATION

Boy, is it deficient! As an argument to support the central message it is whimsical, partial, rash, undisciplined, opinionated and quite unappreciative of the trap it sets itself. It may well be injudicious as well. One of Chapman's techniques is to draw on the observations of a collection of radicals and on the Press to distil little beads of stuff that can be threaded on a tantalising necklace of conjecture. He exaggerates: ". . . apart from the factor of conviction there are no differences between criminals and non-criminals" (p. 4).

He is wilfully impractical, e.g., when he argues that various processes: ". . . operate to select individuals from a larger universe of individuals with identical behaviour, both objectively and symbolically cued, and . . . therefore no

test of the familiar hypotheses about crime is possible unless the scientist selects his subjects independently of the social system" (p. 4).

He is dreamily authoritarian: ". . . this study will present tentative arguments based on fragmentary and anecdotal data not crucial in themselves but persuasive enough, it is hoped, to compel consideration of the argument" (p. 5).

Dizzirama

Chapman is having a bit of a tilt at scientific method. But he's lunging drunkenly about with his top-heavy lance knocking everything down in the process. In pursuit of his malevolent windmill he keeps taking bearings on previous landmarks, unaware that they are no longer where they were. It isn't all that surprising that he soon runs himself grimly through his own large intestine. What is rather charming is that he doesn't appreciate this, blithely pulls himself through the hole and carries on regardless.

Essentially, the trap lies in the point that Chapman chooses to knock the basis of pretty well everything that scientific method has sought to achieve in criminology. But he's tempted into using the fruits of this very method for at least some of his "fragmentary and anecdotal data". What the book cries out for is some rigour in setting out how far the central thesis is supposed to apply and this is just lamentably missing.

To be fair, Chapman doesn't pretend to be doing anything different from what he *is* doing. The point is really whether Chapman, his publishers and readers should be satisfied with what he has done. Chapman sets himself up in such a way that he could probably conscientiously declare that he doesn't have to be satisfied and nor does anybody else.

Saloon Bar Strategy

In a way, he's right. In a way, he's not. He's right in the sense that if the development of the study of crime is to be settled by natters in the saloon bar then he could make a pretty effective contribution: "The present system of justice and punishment has the effect of making a small number of persons, drawn mainly from the poor, the ill-educated, and the unskilled, into designated criminals" (p. 246). But he's wrong in the sense that he has no sound evidence for continuing: "In prison they become socially isolated and culturally disorientated and often deteriorate intellectually, and on release are more vulnerable to petty misdemeanour and to detection and arrest than any other group. Once caught in the system, their disorientation is progressive. The fact that the process that desocialises them is alleged to cure them provides the occasion for the increase of hostility with which they are regarded through time" (pp. 246–7). And this is where he may well have been injudicious. There is little sign that the book will do anything to advance the search for evidence while Chapman is satisfied with opinion. Chapman may well

live to wish that his book had been printed in rapidly fading ink.

Short and Sweeter

The series in which Oerton's gentle book appears is aimed at "those just taking their place in society today". Well, there are lots of folk around who could do with back-tracking and taking a second chance. Oerton's book provides them with a good opportunity. It is short and sweet, coherent and clear. The author picks up two of Chapman's emanations: "Too often we tie labels around the necks of our fellow men and then imagine the whole truth about them is to be found in the words on the label" (p. 15). "The authors of many books approach the criminal as a naturalist might approach an unfamiliar insect. They classify his every feature and peculiarity. . . . But this is not going to be that sort of book. . . . I shall try to work towards a deeper insight into the nature of those who commit a criminal offence. . . . We ought if possible to imagine ourselves living in his (the criminal's) body, seeing the world with his eyes . . . responding to it with his emotions. . . . Only by doing this do we earn the right to voice opinions about crime —the right, that is to say, to step outside the body of the criminal once more and take responsibility for the way in which we treat him" (p. 14).

Oerton pins a lot of hope on prevention and, incidentally, objects to conditioning as treatment on the grounds that it makes doctors into policemen. Policemen could justifiably ask where this leaves *them*. He also makes the liberal objection to prison—partly on the grounds of the frustration and bitterness it engenders and on the suicide rate it produces (p. 103). Chapman peeps round the door again: "The real tragedy about imprisonment is that far too often the prisoner is worse equipped to lead a law-abiding life when he comes out than he was when he went in. . . . The whole system is therefore designed to crush the prisoner into unquestioning obedience" (p. 104).

True, he goes on to make some slightly more reassuring noises. But the lesson of this and Chapman's book must surely be that writer's are themselves victims of their own stereotypes and that some quietly effective corrective is necessary. If all school-leavers were to share Oerton's "understanding", much of the problem of criminality would have been cracked. But it is arguable that what was left over might have been made even more intractable as a result of the public being encouraged to withdraw more and more from the *real* problems of the prison.

M.B.

They Can't Fit In

JOY HOLLOWAY. Bedford Square Press of the National Council of Social Service, 26 Bedford Square, London W.C.1. 12s. 6d. or 13s. 6d. by post

THIS BOOK describes a research project into the twilight area of the homeless, rootless and deprived young adults who drift into the City of Leeds, seeking refuge in St. George's Crypt; usually, having aspirations of London as their eventual Mecca.

The study is penetrating and thorough, presenting clearly the many problems which were uncovered. The authoress emerges as a person of warmth and sensitivity with a dedication to her task which conveys her own enthusiasm to the reader, and highlights the hopelessness of these misfits in society. The survey demonstrates her concern for the growing number of young socially-inadequate persons who appear unable to cope with small difficulties and petty inconveniences; sample case histories give colour to the findings, showing concisely the process of deterioration in behaviour patterns.

The desirability of suitable hostels is discussed with a knowledge and competence which stimulates thought towards the pressing need for more such accommodation to be provided throughout the country.

The study is of topical interest to all those concerned with case-work and the rehabilitation of young people; a commendable survey, excellently researched.

R.G.

The Case for the Interview

MUNRO FRASER. *Personnel Management*, January 1970

THIS ARTICLE, which deals with the realities of personnel selection will come as a pleasant surprise to all those engaged in this work and no doubt it will be found to be extremely instructive, helpful and encouraging.

The author points out that in spite of all the scientific research that has been directed to this subject, most appointments are still made on the basis of judgements by personnel officers and other staff and that time could be more profitably spent in improving the method of the interview.

He suggests that the first requirement in a selection process is a framework where the attributes required for a job can be set out

systematically and the selectors' assessment summarised. To this end he outlines a scale under five headings, viz.: impact on others; acquired knowledge; innate abilities; motivation and adjustment; and then deals with each separately.

For my part I would have been happier if these headings had been dealt with in greater depth, particularly "motivation" which, it is interestingly suggested, can be measured by what a man has achieved in certain situations previously. It is generally accepted that past performance is the most reliable guide to future behaviour, nevertheless, there will be some who feel that what a man does is not necessarily as significant as his reasons for doing so.

The paragraphs on "Essentials of the Selection Process", "Effectiveness of the Interview", and "Personality Research" are obviously written by a man with a great knowledge of the subject and demand careful reading and re-reading.

The whole thing appears to have been written with those fortunate interviewers in mind, who have only a limited number of vacancies to fill from an adequate number of well-qualified candidates and unfortunately (for us) does not discuss the special problems that face those who are recruiting for an undermanned service. Here experience has shown that the highly rated and the lowly rated are more easily accepted or declined; it is the in-betweens, those we term "marginals" who require long and sometimes searching interviews. This is simply because there are not sufficient suitable candidates being attracted.

It would be unrealistic to turn away a man who could eventually be helped to become a useful prison officer and even more unrealistic because of the urgent need for recruits to accept a man who was unlikely to adjust emotionally to the demands of this exacting work. It is, therefore, necessary in these circumstances, to consider an aspect of personality not fully dealt with in the article—that of *potential* or as some may prefer—*capacity to be trained.* This is particularly true when considering the younger candidate.

Thus in contemplating these special problems we find that in addition to "Selection" it is necessary to bring into the scope of our thinking "The Attraction of Sufficient Suitable Candidates" and "Training". These three important areas really form part of the same picture. It may well be that closer liaison between those engaged in these fields could be beneficial to all.

Finally, despite the author rather depressingly pointing out the cold fact that the margin of error in selection will always be fairly high, those engaged in personnel selection may take heart from the concluding paragraph of the article—"biographical interviews conducted systematically to provide evidence on which defensible judgements can be made, do have a predictive value".

F.R.P.J.

Organisation for Treatment

D. STREET, R. D. VINTER and C. PERROW. *The Free Press* 1966. 63s.

EVERY ONCE in a while a book appears without much publicity and with scant attention from reviewers. This is such a book yet it is important because it is one of the first attempts to compare and classify different strategies for treatment in terms of institutional organisation; up to now, surprisingly little attention has been given to the organisational aspects of institutions as a means of achieving the maximum effectiveness of their goals.

This is the "book of the research". Sponsored by two universities, this research is one of the most ambitious to have been undertaken in penology. Although the basic data were collected in two years it took eight years to complete, and a dozen or so research workers were employed; they gained five Ph.D. degrees and were credited with 24 published papers for their efforts. So, it is a pity that with so much invested in the study, the style of writing and presentation of this book is so dreary and off-putting. It certainly is not designed to win penal administrators as friends and influence them; yet this would seem to have been one of the aims of the project.

Organisation for Treatment considers six public and private institutions in the United States which cater for young male offenders, with an age range 14–19, convicted for offences ranging from petty to serious crimes, including murder. The accommodation ranged from 25 to 350 places. These institutions have widely differing aims from the primarily disciplinary to the educational and to the treatment centred (therapeutic).

The method of study was that the researchers stayed in each of the institutions and collected data by observation of daily occurrences, by interviews with staff and by a questionnaire-cum-attitude survey administered to all staff. A similar questionnaire was given to all the inmates. The concern was with the formal aspects of institutional life rather than the informal, giving particular attention to such features as staff complementing; staff ratios; staff structure; distribution of power; roles; sources of conflict between staff; and staff opinions about inmates and vice versa. The various methods staff used to maintain control were also looked at.

A classification into three basic types was derived according to the

main objective of each of the institutions, namely obedience/conformity, re-education/development and treatment—where:

Obedience/conformity. Emphasis is placed on habits, respects for authority and training in conformity. The technique is one of conditioning. There is little differentiation in treatment between inmates; all are treated alike.

Re-education/development. Inmates are changed by training, acquiring new skills and are provided with opportunities for personality growth. There is an emphasis on education, i.e., didactic training.

Training. Focuses on the personality of the individual. It emphasises a wide variety of activities and settings within which the inmate is helped to resolve personal problems and prepare for community living.

It is suggested that these three types form a custody continuum based on beliefs about each institution's ability to change its inmates and furthermore, that the aims of each of the institutions reflect the staff views of the nature of the delinquent and his treatment. Thus, pessimistic and simple views, supported by coercive methods, characterised the obedience/conformity senior staffs, whilst the treatment staff were generally more liberal in outlook, more optimistic and prepared to experiment. A critical difference in approach being whether staff members were expected to *act upon* or *engage with* inmates in the process of change.

The reader by now will have guessed who are the goodies and the baddies and have spotted the eventual winner. And this is a flaw in the argument of the book. In an endeavour to obtain critical differences between institutions there is an undue polarisation of positions which is not always supported by the evidence. Some evidence in fact, is surprisingly lacking. For instance, whilst "success" was judged on the basis of attitudes and organisational efficiency, there is no information about the backgrounds of the inmates, their criminal records or even reconviction data for the institutions—similarly staff records are slender.

The main conclusions are:

1. Sufficient power must be given to staff units and staff members to allow them to operate effectively—i.e., there should not be an excess of power at the top.
2. To carry out effective treatment, special steps have to be taken to win over the local community and to gain their support.
3. Treatment programmes necessitate a high degree of organisational flexibility with a capacity to tolerate interference with routine as well as the decentralisation of decision-making processes.
4. Effective leadership by senior staff is crucial to producing change; they have to create a

sense of mission to overcome the drift back to custody/conformity amongst staff.

5. The research indicates many of the limits upon the capacities of penal institutions and their senior staff to effect major change but suggests that whilst it may be relatively easy to change an obedience/conformity institution into re-education/development it is very much more difficult and demanding in resources to change these in the direction of treatment.

But, after all, it is questionable whether the (psychiatric) treatment institution is the ultimate in institutional care for offenders. Certainly such institutions demand considerable resources of staff, skill and patience. But it is not necessary to look for models on a continuum from conformity to treatment (if indeed there is such a thing); alternatives are available. There is the factory concept which inspired the institutions at Kumla in Sweden and Coldingley in Britain. Maybe we already have the makings of a welfare/community care model. The advent of welfare departments, parole, outworking schemes, home leave, hostels, half-way houses, Recidivists Anonymous, after-care and N.A.C.R.O. suggest a distinct trend in this direction. Up to now, these elements have been tacked on to existing regimes rather than forming the basis for an institutional philosophy.

In the study, the institutions were comparatively simple in their organisation. A similar study taken in this country would have to give attention to organisational matters such as staff deployment, including "bell scales". Here too, a centralised administration provides a career structure for all its staff which has to be replicated in the institutions. These considerations did not apply in the institutions in the United States where the staff were hired and fired locally.

It is easy enough to draw attention to some of the limitations of this work, yet this is a thought-provoking piece of research and should prove stimulating if exasperating to those interested in the planning and development of regimes.

R.T.

Men in Prison

TOM CLAYTON. London, Hamilton 1970. 35s.

"THERE IS NEED for a purely descriptive work", Mr. Roy Jenkins, then Home Secretary, said publicly in July 1967, "to enable the public and the Law to know more about what is happening in prisons".

"I took the Home Secretary at his word", writes Mr. Tom Clayton

"and wrote a memorandum outlining a design for reportage in prison". He goes on to say (p. 2): "It may be possible to depict the prisoner through a technique equivalent to the one used by visual artists in "exploded man" illustrations to technical articles—the prisoner as seen by the governor, psychiatrist, chaplain, prison officer and, not least important, by his fellow prisoners. One might be able to bring him into focus through his own words".

If only this were possible! Mr. Clayton has certainly succeeded in depicting himself and he emerges as an exact but warm and intelligent observer. His wish (and, for that matter, Mr. Roy Jenkins' wish) to describe the complex of experience known as imprisonment is probably foredoomed to failure.

The difficulty as seen by this reviewer is that human suffering and degradation are not things to be communicated by writing or by television. To be known they must be experienced. Who knows what it feels like to be mentally ill? To be a drug addict? To be a compulsive gambler? The ex-prisoner who writes sensitively and perceptively about prison will be understood by many other ex-prisoners. Who else, with the best will in the world, *can* understand? This is why the occasional request for magistrates and judges to spend a period of time in prison as observers is ill-founded. This is why prison officials who may have spent a life time in closed prisons cannot know what imprisonment is like.

The general public, one suspects, would miss the prisons if they were to disappear. No longer would there be an intriguing back cloth for the television serial; no longer a fertile source of copy for the newspaper cartoonist. But there is still a substantial minority of people (including prisoners, ex-prisoners and prison officers) who are deeply concerned about prison as an institution and would wholeheartedly support a move to replace this curious survival from the past by a process designed to be rational and helpful to the whole of society.

Mr. Clayton, when he ceases from "depicting" and starts to be constructive, gives some very good pointers.

"If", he writes, "the Home Secretary gave me the right to introduce one reform, it would be the substitution of a written professional code for the Official Secrets Act. This would imply the recognition of the professional status for which some officers are striving". How, he is saying in effect, can officers be enabled to change the environment of the prisoner so that the total effect of imprisonment (where this is really unavoidable) can be seen to be remedial and helpful.

The Prison Officers' Association made very imaginative and far sighted proposals in 1963. It is interesting to speculate to what degree these proposals would now be current policy if there had existed a professional code backed by a truly professional organisation.

Prison officers are much like other men. They are, however, as a

group exposed to two polarising influences. On the one hand they are members of a closed society which is more subject than most to the deadening effect of institutionalisation; on the other, they are constantly recruiting a minority of men who share the ideals of probation officers and other social workers and who, with the backing of a professional code, could exert an influence out of all proportion to their numbers.

In a chapter dealing with "Recidivists Anonymous" (good pull-up for ex-cons.) Mr. Clayton refers to the work done by Mr. Richard Hauser in Wandsworth Prison in the early '60s. This remarkable exercise in rehabilitation—perhaps the most strikingly imaginative project since Paterson's attempt to vivify the borstal system—had the support of 30 officers (one-sixth of the staff).

The strength of this project was that it was not designed simply to palliate the conditions of a tough nick. Prisoners (and officers!) were being asked: "What sort of people are you?" "What are you doing here?" and "What can you do to help yourselves, your families and men who come after you?" These are unusual questions in a prison but the response was unexpectedly warm: and if other prisons are beginning to ask the same questions today and if there exists a core of ex-prisoners who are willing to take a lead in reintroducing true rehabilitation it is because the H. and K. scheme at Wandsworth existed and Recidivists Anonymous came into being.

Understandably, perhaps, Mr. Clayton says little about men after they have left prisons. It is safe to say that as soon as prison officers begin to concern themselves with the preparation of men for leaving prison and with the actual condition of men when they have left they will have begun to achieve real professionalism and will themselves have begun to be the instruments of change.

C.J.

The Natural History of an Inmate Community in a Maximum Security Prison

PETER G. GARABEDIAN. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science.* Volume 61, No. 1. March 1970, pp. 78–85

EFFORTS TO CHANGE attitudes of individuals in prison are commonly conducted in competition with an inmate social system which is opposed to the authorities. A few attempts have been made, mostly in juvenile institutions, to change the social structure itself. Peter Garabedian has tried to do this in the less promising setting of the maxi-

mum security block of the Washington State Penitentiary (*Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, volume 61, No. 1, March 1970, pp. 78–85).

Four groups of 11 inmates each were formed, group I with inmates categorised as antisocial or asocial, group II with pro- or pseudo-socials, and groups III and IV with mixtures of these four types. For each group a work project and daily discussion session were arranged and there was a meeting for the whole group, including staff, at the end of each afternoon. Neither work nor meetings were compulsory; rules were by any standards minimal. (Garabedian does not say how the staff reacted to the introduction of this unaccustomed permissiveness.)

Various forms of anti-social and prohibited behaviour began to be committed, mainly by the asocials—drinking, gambling, taking extra portions of food. Tension increased, and when some of the group II inmates were threatened with assault, four members of that group brought some of the goings-on into the open at the large-group meeting. One of the tough asocials from group I, although he himself had been involved in the delinquent behaviour, began to discuss the need for rules and presented to the meeting a plan for reaching collective understandings. Others then followed his lead and the group took steps to implement the plan. Without the previous uncertainty and conflict, resulting from the non-directiveness of the programme, it is doubtful whether this problem-solving phase would have occurred.

A questionnaire after four and ten weeks indicates a small but consistent shift of inmate opinion in favour of the programme. Ten weeks is obviously too short a time to assess the programme itself, let alone its after-effects which will be complicated by variations in parole supervision and so on. But experiments of this kind clearly need to be made and it is disappointing that so little is being attempted in this country.

M.W.

———::———

In the next issue of the Prison Service Journal

Lord Stonham's review of Gordon Hawkins' book and, to mark the end of the Dickens Centenary Year, Dr. J. J. Tobias, of the Police College, writes about Victorian prisons.

Prison Problems and the Mass Media

IN "NEW SOCIETY"

There's no doubt about it, readers of this column get value for money. For the last issue, I grubbed through *New Society* on the trail of Geoffrey Parkinson ("I Give them Money"). Lo! on the very day the journal appeared, the same fellow was all over the Women's Page of *The Guardian*, still a "basic grade probation officer". And still, his original argument—that it sometimes pays to forget deep case-work and hand over some money instead—hasn't been answered. Meanwhile, he remains in *New Society's* stable, putting the boot into some favourite social work dogma from time to time.

It has been a good quarter: "The Blanksey Boys", Christopher Neubert and Mary Loughton, 21.5.70. "Becoming a Policeman", Peter Watson, 28.5.70. "Adolescents under Stress", Moses Laufer, 11.6.70. "Feeling is Believing", Ann Faraday, 2.7.70. "Who's to Blame", Jerome Liss, 16.7.70.

Outside the main articles, there are useful things buried elsewhere almost every week. There was, for example, a note on N.A.C.R.O.'s competition to find new ideas in after-care. Top winnings were shared between a Durham inmate and a psychiatrist—very appropriate. The column called "Grapevine" got hold of the reshuffle of prison governors (4.6.70) and made even more of a mystery of it than there usually is. This kept up "Grapevine's" reputation as the worst informed source of nonsense in British journalism. My grapevine tells me that it won't be long before "Grapevine" is quietly dropped. Mind you, if I'd paid attention to it I might have managed to watch "Man Alive" on 15th July when they did the second of two items on borstal.

The important thing about *New Society* is that the articles keep. It really is possible to go back over the issues, winkling out the odd article here and there that's good for a hammer and tongs argument. Occasionally it is like the rest of us and produces talk that's best forgotten—like election predictions—but it is not one of those things like *TV Times* which has to be thrown out the minute the next issue appears, if not before. Going back through the issues is a helpful way, too, to recall all the shattering experiences

you've forgotten—like the World Cup and Enoch Powell and, by the time this gets into print, the Glorious Twelfth.

Anyone who has to run a group session and is at a bit of a loss to know what to throw in could do worse than prepare himself by skipping through half a dozen issues to see what they offer. And, of course, he'll be sitting pretty as long as no one else has happened to read them.

Radio and Television

Last time around, I made a bit of a plea for some devoted watcher and listener to step into the breach and take over this section. This time I'm desperate. There are two rather good reasons for this. Firstly, I've found, from mid-June onwards, that television and radio have made me feel as if I've been orphaned and promptly adopted. The only things I've noticed seeing or hearing have been news bulletins about Mr. Heath, Sir Alec, Mr. Carr and I've had trouble believing that these are members of the Government. I keep thinking that it must be something to do with the silly season.

The second reason follows on. There have been four "Man Alive" programmes on Wednesday evenings that have dealt with prisons and borstals. I missed every one. If that isn't a qualification for not saying anything about them, I don't know what is.

The first programme (3rd June) dealt with Wandsworth; the second, a week later, dealt with Coldingley, following some of the same men. The third and fourth (8th and 15th July) looked at Portland and Hatfield. I gather that Harold Williamson did some of the interviewing, having made a name for his interviews with children on "Look North" and "On the Braden Beat". It would be interesting to know whether anyone in the service picked up any tips on how to manage an interview.

Anyone who has had anything to do with radio or television knows but will seldom admit that the journalist is pretty near the surface and that he's generally an entertainer. But the production team of "Man Alive" do seem to have won a place where they can genuinely set out to inform and represent. With this in mind, it seems ludicrous that the care that is likely to have gone into these particular programmes should be cast aside on a single showing. The programme could be tremendously useful, I'd have thought, within establishments for both staff and inmates. It could be useful to the B.B.C. too, if they got some idea of what sort of reaction the programmes met with from people in the service or in its care. It could offer the start of a real two-way exchange on an issue where the Prison Service is most in need of help—the issue of demanding public responsibility for the task it undertakes. To mis-quote Wedgwood Benn, the problems of running the penal system are too important to be left to the broadcasters alone.

M.B.

CONTRIBUTORS

Mrs. J. E. KELLEY, assistant director (women and girls' establishments), *Prison Department, Home Office.*

R. W. BURNHAM, formerly assistant governor, now with the United Nations Social Defence Research Institute in Rome, is a graduate in criminology in the University of California.

"TAYLOR", our cartoonist—Officer A. Taylor, Onley Borstal.

REVIEWS—handled by the Review Committee under Roy Taylor, principal psychologist, Staff College (members: Mark Beeson, John Cape, Ian Dunbar, Phillip Harrap)—from Capt. W. I. Davies (governor, H.M. Prison, Manchester); Brian Emes (governor, Thorp Arch Prison); Elizabeth Tyndall (the wife of Nicholas Tyndall), who teaches in penal establishments, formerly of the Staff College, now chief officer Marriage Guidance Council; T. J. Ager (principal psychologist, H.M. Prison, Coldingley); Roland Greeg (deputy governor, H.M. Prison, Leeds); F. R. P. Johnson, the chief officer attached to the South-west Prison Officer Selection Board; Cyril Jenkins, chief officer at Wandsworth Prison; Martin Wright, the librarian of the Institute of Criminology, Cambridge.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE—INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY

CROPWOOD SHORT-TERM FELLOWSHIPS

THE INSTITUTE OF CRIMINOLOGY, thanks to an anonymous benefactor, is again offering Cropwood Short-term Fellowships to persons having responsibility in the field of criminal justice and the treatment of offenders. The object is to enable the Fellows to be attached to the institute for a period of study concentrating on a definite objective. This might involve: undertaking a specific piece of research (or completing an enquiry already begun elsewhere) and presenting the results in the form of a short monograph or article; preparing special lectures; or intensive reading on a particular topic of direct practical concern.

Fellowships will normally be tenable for a period of six weeks, three months or six months, their exact duration depending on the scale of work which is proposed. The award will be sufficient to cover living expenses in Cambridge. Fellows will have full use of the institute's extensive library; accommodation for study will be provided. The senior staff of the institute will be available for consultations or guidance.

No formal qualifications for candidates are laid down, but it is essential that they should have relevant experience of work in the field of law enforcement, the administration of justice, or the prevention or treatment of crime and delinquency (prevention will be interpreted widely to include aspects of child-care and youth work). A well conceived plan of study is required as evidence of capacity to take full advantage of the opportunities offered.

Applications should be sent to the secretary of the institute at 7 West Road, Cambridge, to reach him not later than 30th November, 1970.

Printed at HMP Leyhill, Wotton-Under-Edge, Glos.