

PRISON
SERVICE

JOURNAL





PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL

No. 32 New Series October 1978

Editorial Office:

HM Prison, Leyhill, Wotton-under-Edge, Glos. GL12 8HL

Editorial Board

DAVID ATKINSON
HM Prison, Leyhill

RICK EVANS
HM Prison, Bristol

GEORGE FERGUSON
HM Prison, Pentonville

Co-opted Member
FRANK GROVE
Home Office Design and
Illustration Branch

PETER QUINN
HM Prison, Long Lartin
Alan H. Rayfield (*Editor*)
P6 Division, Prison Dept. H.Q.

JOHN ST.Q. ROSS
South-west Regional Office, Bristol

Reviews Editor
RAY MITCHELL
Prison Service College, Wakefield

Contents

Alternatives to Rehabilitation <i>Philip Bean</i>	1
Opening a New Prison <i>Jack Shulman</i>	4
Another little Jubilee <i>Ken Beer</i>	5
History of the POA <i>Ken Daniel</i>	7
The Royal Visit <i>A. J. Webley</i>	10
Black Borstal Boys <i>David Wickham</i>	13
Letter to the Editor	18
Book Reviews	20

The editorial board wishes to make it clear that the views expressed by contributors are their own and do not reflect the official views or policies of the Prison Department.

Editorial

The "modern" Prison Service now enters its 101st year. The centenary is over, the Exhibition dismantled and put away for future occasions. Her Majesty has honoured by her presence what must have been a notable occasion in any country's penal calendar, has signed the book and gone. Now some 42,000 assorted felons and more than half that number of custodians, administrators and industrials, are left to get on with the routine business again. What are their prospects — not for the next 100 years (God save us from that kind of speculation!) but for, say, the next 10 or 20?

We do not happen to believe that the Prison Service can solve its own problems from within, for they are all — overcrowding, poor conditions, subversiveness, staff unrest — the by-products of the main society's unhappiness. The root causes are political, economic, social (and some would say moral). The state of the Prisons, though, now as in Howard's time, offers to the main society a mirror image of its failings, and perhaps one of our principal tasks is to ensure that the conditions, the futilities, and not least the high cost of the operations we perform for our employers, the public, are continually kept before them, and the questions continually asked — is this what you want? Are you satisfied with this in 1980? Can you afford it?

But there are, too, less fundamental ways in which the Prison Service can unilaterally improve its effectiveness from its present base. We can decentralize much more and delegate much more. We can consult more widely in the area of policy and planning, especially in the planning of new capital installations and major rebuilding. We can grasp the nettle of staff participation in prisoners' rehabilitation, and put an end to the seeming interminable debate about the "role of the Prison Officer". We can pursue a more outgoing, and less defensive policy towards the media. We can encourage experimentation and originality in regimes, and provide money from within our budget to support schemes which appear to be getting results. We can demand more imaginative moral leadership and better management at all levels, so that we not only cope as well as can be expected with the inevitable, but are also occasionally inspired to raise our eyes above the levels of pure expediency.

Alternatives to Rehabilitation

by Philip Bean

Lecturer in the Department of Applied Social Science, University of Nottingham.

He has a number of publications including *Rehabilitation and Deviance* and was formerly a Research Officer with the Medical Research Council.

THE penal system of the 1960's contained both certainty and optimism. Rehabilitation (or reform, or treatment—the terms can be used interchangeably) was the dominant theme. Supporters of rehabilitation argued that their aims and methods were the only satisfactory and humane way of dealing with modern offenders. Where difficulties existed they were seen as practical rather than ideological. For example, many penal establishments were said to be outdated, built for an earlier era of penal philosophy where punishment was the principal aim of the penal system. These institutions could not easily be adapted to modern methods of treatment. There were also acute shortages of manpower; the prison service contained too few psychiatrists and the probation service was said to be grossly overworked. However, the solutions were at one level relatively simple; hopefully new staff would eventually be recruited and trained, and new institutions could be built. The economy was expected to continue to grow and the necessary finances would doubtless be found somehow.¹

Rehabilitation may have been the dominant theme but its supporters had to coexist with others of a different ideology. Many lawyers and judges tended to ignore reformist thinking, preferring to "punish" rather than "treat" offenders (although by the late 1960's most juvenile court magistrates had succumbed to the rehabilitative ideal) and many police and prison officers remained sceptical or hostile to reformist aims. Relationships for those supporting rehabilitation were often tenuous for although reformists knew that their philosophy was in the ascendency they also knew that their opponents were still institutionally powerful. Education was seen to be the key-note; not in the sense that those with

the highest levels of education attainment were likely to support rehabilitation, for this has never been so, but in the sense that a patient and persuasive set of arguments would be expected to lead to a more enlightened attitude. Probation officers in the 1960's often spoke of "educating the magistrates" presumably hoping to bring them up to the probation officers' level of thinking.

The 1969 Children and Young Persons Act was the watershed of rehabilitation in the juvenile courts. In the adult sphere there was no single Act which encapsulated rehabilitation in quite the same way although the recent report on Young Adult Offenders came closest.² Yet suddenly, in the mid 1970's rehabilitation collapsed as a moral force, and the certainty and optimism of its supporters became severely weakened. Why did such a collapse occur, and what alternatives are available to replace it? These questions are important for they have a direct bearing on the type of penal system likely to exist in the 1980's. Here, I want to point to some features of rehabilitation and show why it lost its impact, and to point to some alternatives currently being discussed which could replace it as the dominant philosophy. I am assuming that a pure form of retribution or a pure form of deterrence is unlikely to return, but I am also assuming that retribution and deterrence will still exist in the penal system in some form, at least in the foreseeable future. Here, I want to discuss only the dominant themes of a modern penal philosophy, but recognise that other themes will retain some measure of influence.

It is difficult to find one authoritative statement which defines rehabilitation, for rehabilitation seems to consist of a number of related propositions. In an earlier paper I suggested that it was

possible to delineate two general features of rehabilitation,³ but these are in no sense intended to be definitive. Firstly, penal sanctions should, as far as possible, be related to the offenders' needs, or, in other words, sanctions should fit the offender rather than the crime. Secondly, and central to all rehabilitative programmes, the crime is seen as a symptom of some deeper psychological or social maladjustment. A demand for rehabilitation is another way of demanding that the offender be sentenced to be helped.⁴

In order to operate a pure view of rehabilitation a number of changes would have been necessary to adapt it to a custodial setting. First, there would need to be an indeterminate sentence which theoretically had a minimum of zero and a maximum of life.⁵ Secondly the type of sentence would be authorised not by the courts but by treatment officials who would claim to have diagnosed the offender's needs and would know the appropriate type of treatment. Thirdly, treatment officials would decide, if and when, the offender was ready for release. (Presumably they would claim to have identified some peak in the offender's treatment programme and decide on that basis). Finally, all features of the offender's period in custody would be monitored and be built into an overall treatment plan. Only in this way would it be possible to talk of a realistic treatment programme.

A pure view of rehabilitation has never existed. There are numerous reasons why this was so, one of which is that the closed prisons, and particularly closed local prisons rarely provided the opportunities or impetus for reformist aims. But the main reason is that the modern penal system has retained a basically retributive view of sentencing. There are

few indeterminate sentences and in almost all cases the maximum sentence has been fixed by the courts. The courts have never relinquished their hold on sentencing in spite of sustained and consistent pressure to do so. In penal institutions such as prisons there has never been a coherent treatment programme of the type described above. Certain forms of treatment may have existed, but they have tended to operate in isolation rather than as part of a specified programme of treatment. Certain other features of the penal system have been wrongly called treatment, but most were humanistic attempts at alleviating boredom. Playing games, such as table tennis or badminton, or watching television are the most obvious examples. Even so, in most modern penal institutions some forms of treatment have existed, albeit in a weak form, and it is those weak forms which are under attack—perhaps because it is feared that they may develop into stronger forms. There has for example, been considerable criticism of the Younger Report which recommends the introduction of the custody and control order. This order would offer a type of treatment as the decision to be released from custody would then lie in the hands of the executive. It would also increase executive power to a level which some would find unacceptable.

Criticisms of rehabilitation have operated at two levels. First there is the criticism which derives from the results of research; and then there are criticisms which are more ideological. First the results of research. From the early 1960's a constant flow of research reports have led to serious questions being asked about the value of rehabilitation as a means of reducing reconviction rates. These reports aimed at measuring the effectiveness of sentencing practices have consistently shown that different types of treatment make little or no difference to the reconviction rates—and may in certain circumstances make them worse. These research findings have now been officially recognized. An Advisory Council report recently stated "a steadily accumulating volume of research has shown that if reconviction rates are used to measure the success or failure of sentencing policy there is virtually nothing to choose between different levels of custodial sentences, different types of institutional regimes and even between

custodial and non-custodial treatment".⁶

On the other hand, supporters of rehabilitation have always insisted that reconviction rates are a poor measure of the effectiveness of treatment. Their point is well made for reconviction can depend as much on chance factors as on any general level of criminality (or as one criminologist has said, criminality or delinquency is simply bad timing). Reconvictions also fail to measure the impact of treatment on the offenders' levels of personal and social adjustment which, to treatment officials, is as important as reconvictions. The problem here is that if treatment officials are claiming to do something more than reduce criminality, then this has to be demonstrated, and they have failed to do, except at an anecdotal level, and must therefore accept evaluation on the same grounds as that which applies generally.

The low success rates for reformist measures—which incidentally are no better or worse than the success rates for non-reformist measures—are beginning to affect official policy. The Home Office Working Paper in 1977 had noted that "the broad policy implications of that (research) now have to be considered".⁷ Regrettably the Working Paper did not say how and under what circumstances they will be considered. One assumes that if nothing else, the research findings have helped produce a pessimistic view about the penal system, and that the Home Office is not alone in believing that a vacuum has been created in penal thinking.

The second area, which is no less important, can be called the area of ideological criticism. Support for rehabilitation has always seemed to come from a section of opinion that opposed traditional methods of dealing with offenders. The Fabian Society seemed to encapsulate this view in its evidence to the Royal Commission on the Penal System in 1966. "We are convinced of the sterility of the punitive-retributive attitude which still pervades our courts . . . we should like to see . . . (penal institutions) turned into genuine centres where residents would receive individual attention and where treatment would be flexible".⁸

It is now being recognized that the humanistic emphasis placed on rehabilitation may not be so humanistic after all. In order to operate a pure view of treatment it would not be possible to predict the length

of time taken to reform the offender. A pure view of treatment involves the courts in a limited function; they would only decide on the nature of legal guilt; the type and length of sentence would be decided by treatment officials. The insecurity created by such indeterminate sentences has been largely ignored by reformists who believed that as long as their intentions were sound and that the offender's "needs" were being met, the situation was satisfactory. Furthermore, reformists have tended to play down the nature of their power in reformist programmes, yet their decisions to release offenders give them powers which are akin to those of the judiciary, but without the same attention to detail or the built-in right of appeal. Roger Hood regards this power as a form of "resentencing" and doubts whether such power should be granted to members of the executive. In their eagerness to "treat" offenders Hood notes that basic forms of justice are being neglected.⁹

There are many other reasons to account for the loss of ideological interest in rehabilitation than those listed here. I have attempted to give only a very brief summary of some of the major criticisms. If we accept the recent Home Office Working Paper as representing official policy, then it is interesting to note that in a comparatively short period of time (it is after all only 12 years since the Fabian Society gave evidence to the Royal Commission) the rehabilitative ideal has lost its influence. It has also offended or at least is beginning to offend most areas of public opinion. If we take a wide political spectrum it is possible to argue that conservatives have always opposed rehabilitation on the grounds that it was either too soft on the offenders, or that it emphasized the "needs" of the criminal to the exclusion of the victim; or that it weakened the moral fibre of a society by appearing to condone crime. The fundamental basis of a conservative philosophy lies in the belief that an ordered structured society was necessary to preserve discipline and prevent the disintegration of the social order. Conservatives will not regret the passing of the rehabilitative ideal. Neither too will the socialists. They have always seen rehabilitation as a control mechanism used to tidy up the social junk produced by an avaricious capitalist system. The factor which is now crucial is the loss of support from the liberals.

for liberalism in its widest sense has produced the thrust and the intellectual credibility of rehabilitation. It is beyond the scope of the article to discuss the reasons for the liberals' loss of support, except to note that some areas of liberal opinion are beginning to re-emphasise their traditional platforms of liberty and justice.

New Problems and New Models

The demise of rehabilitation as shown particularly by the lack of enthusiasm in official circles has produced two additional problems. The first concerns the nature, or the future, of those services which have consistently held and practiced a rehabilitative approach. The Probation and Aftercare Service is the obvious example of a reformist institution. Where does or where should the Probation Service go now? In one sense the decisions have already been made. The introduction of parole in 1968 pushed the Probation Service towards a surveillance model as opposed to a casework one, and the proposals of the Younger Committee would, if implemented, push them further towards surveillance. In addition, decisions are being made in the Courts which are beginning to affect the Probation Service's future. The proportionate number of offenders placed on probation is declining and has been so since 1971.¹⁰ Of course many other facets of the probation officer's work have remained unchanged, but even so, the trend is becoming established. If we are to talk of the demise of rehabilitation, then probation officers will be left operating with a paternalistic stance towards the offender, and do so in a way which is becoming increasingly rejected by offenders and public opinion alike. The joke about "W(h)ither probation?" has both a serious and malevolent side.

The Probation Service is likely to be the most obvious casualty in any retreat from rehabilitation, but so too is the juvenile court and those areas surrounding juvenile justice in which I would include the borstal system. The likelihood is that juvenile justice will remain even more isolated from the main strands of the penal system. If so, then there will really be two types of justice operating in Britain—that for those under 17 and that for the adults, with no point of communication between them except perhaps suspicion. The

less obvious casualties are much more difficult to delineate. Many supporters of rehabilitation within the prison system may find changes occurring which are unacceptable to them. I am thinking particularly of prison welfare officers and prison medical officers, but there may also be many members of the discipline staff too. The full impact would not be clear unless, and until, Home Office policy changes were implemented in a more definite way. When they are, then we must expect certain casualties as we would from any change in penal philosophy, but the full extent of those casualties will of course depend on the direction of the change.

What then is to replace rehabilitation? Or, put another way, what sort of new penal system will this be? Will there be one dominant model or a number operating at varying levels of the system? Will the role of the prison staff be different in any way? We might also ask if we can afford in an economic sense, and accept in a social or moral sense, the same levels of custodial sentences as exist at present? Finally, what new models are available?

At this stage the number of new models available remains small. The one I have personally been advocating is for a return to a justice model. This has two features. First, there would be an end to all forms of reformation which have a coercive component, and second, an end to all indeterminate and semi-determinate sentences. This model does not prohibit offering the offender some form of help, and it would indeed encourage the provision of services to this end, but there would be no coercive reformation. By this I mean there would be no compulsion placed on the offender to receive that help.¹¹ This model has the advantage of reducing executive powers and it retains the link between the offence and the sentence—a feature noticeably absent from the reformist model. In practice, the justice model described here means a model based on humanistic deterrence as the justification for punishment. Humanistic deterrence means placing equal emphasis on both terms. The humanistic aspect means that sentences should be as short as possible with rigorous limits placed on control mechanisms whether they be institutional, executive, or both; and deterrence is a means or method of controlling action by acting as a

threat to the individual criminal and as a threat to other potential offenders.

The justice model is beginning to find support, but as Tony Bottoms says, there are as many types of justice models as there are exponents. Some limit their discussions to the penal system and appear to be seeking a new formalism in penal affairs, others operate on a much wider platform and attempt to link justice in the penal system to wider social philosophical issues about the nature of justice in society.¹² My own position would be nearest to the formalistic view although I recognize its limitations. First, formalism does not incorporate the activities of the police, who act as decision makers, but who operate their own brand of discretionary justice before they decide to prosecute. Second, this version of the justice model tacitly approves the courts as the legitimate agents of sentencing and implies that their decisions should be accepted uncritically as long as they are formally designed. The defects of formalism are, therefore, defects based on a lack of analysis.

The alternative model is described (though not advocated) by Tony Bottoms as the ice hockey or sin bin model. In this model "penalties are offence-based not offender-based; one serves time for the offence, one is not subjected to reformatory techniques which enquire into many aspects of the offender's personal life. At the end of the punishment one becomes fully reconstituted as a citizen of the realm."¹³ This model is called the sin-bin model for, as in ice hockey, players sit for a fixed period in the penalty box. No one does, or tries to do anything to them while they are there, but at the end of that period they return as full players without penalty or stigma. Many of the aspects of the model are appealing (i.e. the fixed period sentence; offence based; reduction in the role of the expert, etc.) but there are defects also. The sin bin could provide an excuse for neglect. It is also doubtful if the offender would be able to take his place in society without the stigma that is said to be absent from the offending ice hockey player. One suspects players get reputation for being "dirty" players and the reputation stays with them.

The third model involves pragmatism mixed with incrementalism (i.e.

continued on page 19

OPENING A NEW PRISON

Born 1927, London. Educated at Northampton School. Studied composition and piano; in youth work until 1960, when he joined the Prison Service as an assistant governor. Has served at Wormwood Scrubs, Maidstone, Rochester, Grendon/Spring Hill.

by Jack Shulman

NOTHING is new. The prison at Highpoint was formed by plans developed within the framework of the Project Control Team, and dating back to the period following 1970—the year in which the R.A.F. abandoned Stradishall camp. Some of the local population saw the first prison governor as the latest station commander. All remembered an earlier occupation of the disused camp in 1972 by migrant Kenyan Asians. The present part-time chaplain (who happens to know some Urdu) tells how he spent much time at the camp “when the Asians were here”.

I suppose I gave about 25 talks during 1977—mostly to W.I. groups, Young Farmers groups, Round Table and Rotary meetings. The questions were always the same: how do you treat offenders, and shall we be safe living near? There had been local opposition to the setting up of a prison, and a few neighbours continue to raise questions of safety (e.g. in the event of an escape or as a factor in allowing prisoners to work outside the prison). Efforts to set up a consultative group of parish council delegates proved abortive. However, the local M.P., a district councillor and one or two parish councillors still show an interest by writing to or inspiring articles in the local papers.

The Regional Director and I, with a district councillor (who has tried to formalise representations concerning a public warning system in the event of an escape) took part in an hour-long programme put out by Radio Orwell, Ipswich. Perhaps because the prison is 40 miles from Ipswich, nobody phoned in a question and the interviewer kept the discussion going by putting his own questions to us.

When I first went to Headquarters as prospective Highpoint governor, I was greeted with an exhortation not

to try and change the plans as some governors had done during earlier projects. I now believe that the laying down of detailed plans without any built-in machinery for changing them during development is not the best way to proceed. I think planning needs to be as open ended as possible until as late as possible. Detail needs to be filled in gradually; options should be left open, rather than closed, whenever possible. At present there is no provision for altering anything once it has been installed. The plan is regarded as infallible. It takes a great deal of time and effort to produce approval and funding for any change, however desirable. It would be easier if some provision for revamping the plan, within previously decided cash limits, were made from the beginning. Thus modification could be dealt with for what it is—a usual event—rather than an emergency.

A Highpoint Works Department had been set up some three years before my arrival. Senior foreman of works, Jim Tompkin, had been remotely in touch with the governor of Norwich prison, but principally had been seeing that contractors (and a small number of works staff) prepared services and buildings; these were to be used for the category C and D prison and in some cases were to remain for the category B prison.

I did not issue a blueprint for the regime at Highpoint. As staff arrived, we discussed what appeared to us to be future needs, and we planned ways of meeting them. It seemed to me that we were no more likely to overlook things than I alone should have been. This approach probably led to uncertainty among some staff, who would have preferred to be told. Yet the period of setting up was one of intense interest and activity by almost

all who were present. Considerable initiative was shown by officers in the acquiring of supplies and in their installation.

Before we had prisoners we had parties of local visitors touring the site. Their first questions were about wall to wall carpeting and fluorescent lights. The small dormitories for four or two men, with sash windows as left by the R.A.F. (i.e. without bars) evidently did not fit the picture of prison which had formed in the visitors' minds. Some of those who had toured the site joined our Board of Visitors, our Local Review Committee or our panel of Prison Visitors. Many came to our Ministerial Opening Ceremony. All were affected by the only escape incident which we have had during our first ten months. The early scaling of our two fences (both installed in readiness for category B working in 1984-85) gave impetus to local efforts which sought reassurance concerning public safety. (The Hughes incident also figured in local discussions).

Staff discontents have focussed on particular items of provision (such as a setting down point for the school bus, a shelter at the gate for the assistant gate officer and a shower for the P.E.I.s). Above all, it is manning levels which at any rate discipline officers have questioned through their representatives. Presumably the question of manning levels is bound to be current in any newly set up establishment, partly because of unique geographical layout.

People told me: “At least no one will say ‘This is how we do it at Highpoint’.” I was to have a fresh start. But of course each of us brings from previous postings experience of other regimes and from earlier life perceptions of “how it should be

continued on page 19

K. W. Beer joined the Prison Service as an Officer in 1967 and served at Portland and the then new Coldingley Prison. An assistant governor from 1970, he ran the Remand Centre at Cardiff, then became a tutor at the OTS Wakefield, and is now at Bristol Prison, where he is responsible for long-term prisoners, including 'lifers'.

Another little Jubilee

by Ken Beer

THIS year of 1978 has seen the centenary celebration of the Prison Service with many functions taking place all over the country, including the visit of Her Majesty the Queen to Leyhill, and a commemorative service in Westminster Abbey, but they have, unfortunately, kept in the background a milestone in the history of the Prison Service, namely the 25th birthday of the opening of what, today, we should call the first Pre-Release Employment Scheme Hostel.

For those readers who do not pride themselves on their mathematical ability, the year was 1953 when, under the direction of Duncan Fairn, then Director of Prisons, a decision was taken to try out what was known as the "Third Stage P.D. Scheme," the establishment chosen to run the pilot hostel being H.M. Prison, Bristol.

Duncan Fairn, now in active retirement, sends us this personal reminiscence:

How It Began

"Soon after the first prison hostel opened in the grounds of H.M. Prison, Bristol, in 1953 I visited and had a talk with the men from Parkhurst who were the pioneers. Of course their employers knew where they came from, but we thought it unwise to broadcast the facts to their fellow employees: we knew something of man's occasional inhumanity to man. One chap said there was a natural curiosity about where he lived. If he said 'In Horfield district' there was a chance somebody might say, 'What, near the prison?' What should he reply? I confess I suggested he might truthfully say he lived within a stone's throw of the prison wall: he was not called upon to say on which side!

"This incident illustrates but one of the difficulties we faced in opening the first hostel for convicted serving prisoners in England. Why did we start with preventive detention men, who might be judged, from their records, the least hopeful? PD as a sentence no longer exists, though the rarely used 'extended sentence' is in some ways its present counterpart, and it must be admitted that whether in its original form under the Prevention of Crime Act 1908, when Camp Hill was specifically designed for the accommodation of PDs, or in the revised edition sanctioned by the Criminal Justice Act 1948, it was never a success. The average PD was not a big-time criminal: he was more often a petty but persistent thief, guilty of nothing more earth-shaking generally than stealing milk bottles or bicycles, or of minor but frequent false pretences. He—as always women were in the minority—was the type who gave rise to the classic story of the old man of 72 (my age, so that I feel some sympathy) who was sentenced to 12 years PD. Asked if he had anything to say, he looked at the judge and exclaimed, '12 years my Lord, I'm 72; I shall never do them.' Whereupon the judge's face relaxed as he said, 'Well, do as many as you can!' There were some exceptions, naturally. There was one man, just over 30 when I first met him as he began 12 years PD in Canterbury. I followed him throughout, watched him get into Third Stage (I'll explain this later) and eventually out into the world. Basically he was a delightful chap, very different from the ordinary run. He is now remarried with two grand boys, he is a first-class worker with an immaculate home and my wife and I are proud

to count him and his family amongst our friends.

"As I remember it across the quarter of a century, we were determined to find out some way by which we might break the vicious circle of prison, discharge and back to prison again. The thought behind the operation, and the foreign examples we had in mind, are set out clearly in Sir Lionel Fox's *The English Prison and Borstal Systems*, pp317—322. PD, 1948 version, was served in three stages. Those who remained in second stage served five-sixths of their sentence, and sometimes we sadly wished we could keep them in for six-fifths. Third Stage men were eligible for release on licence at two-thirds and were selected after interview and recommendation by an Advisory Board, presided over first by Mr. Daniel Hopkin and after his death by Mr. Bertram Reece, both of whom were Metropolitan magistrates. With the chairman sat three members of the local Board of Visitors, a principal probation officer and a commissioner or assistant commissioner. (Captain R. C. Williams was the first commissioner until his retirement, when I followed him, though he continued to sit for a time as an additional member). We all were appointed by the Secretary of State. Rule 168 (3) provided that 'As and when suitable arrangements can be made, prisoners in this stage (i.e. Third), or in the latter part thereof, may be permitted to live in conditions of modified security designed to form a transition from prison life to freedom'.

"It was in the furtherance of Rule 168 that as Director of Prisons I was asked to organize the first hostel in 1953. There had been no need before,

as the relevant rules only came into operation on 15th June, 1949; the time-scale of the three stages meant that nobody was eligible for this 'tapering-off process', as it was called, before 1953. We had to find first a person with suitable premises in a town with a variety of employment opportunities available. Bristol satisfied all our requirements. After full discussion with the governor, Mr. A. C. W. Richards, I invited the Chief Constable of Bristol, the principal probation officer, the manager of the Labour Exchange, a representative of the Works Directorate and, I think, the chairman of the Visiting Committee to meet the governor and me at the prison. We met and discussed the plan and the probable difficulties, secured the whole-hearted co-operation of the PPO and the manager and the agreement of the Chief Constable. Works helped us with the preparation of the separate block in which the PD's would be housed: we judged it important for obvious reasons that the outworkers should be quite separate from the main prison. Then, with the active help of the governor, the PPO and the Labour Exchange, we got off to a good start. From that first experiment in 1935 the present hostel system has grown, with its important link in these days with parole. I took back on that Bristol venture as one of the least unsatisfactory jobs in which I was involved".

How It Worked

It does not take a lot of imagination to understand the feelings which must have been abroad in the service at the time when such an operation was mooted, especially bearing in mind the type of regimented and disciplined regimes operating, and that preventive detention and corrective training were only five years of age.

However, as Mr. Fairn describes, the nettle was grasped, and on 5th November, 1953, Tom Ryan, an assistant governor from H.M. Prison, The Verne, took up his post at Bristol as both the deputy governor and warden of the hostel, and lost little time in getting together with the governor, the Ministry of Labour and the Central Aftercare Association, in order to discuss the scheme.

The findings of this meeting were dispatched to the Commissioners on 10th November and on 21st November, a minute sent in return informed the establishment that the great day was to be 30th November.

Unfortunately, it appears from the records that management were dogged by communications problems even then, and horror of horrors, the news that a Mr. Tacey was in charge of the scheme at Head Office, was relayed to Tom Ryan by the steward! (Now more appropriately entitled administration officer). This was not the crunch, however, as Duncan Fairn had also increased the number of initial entries on to the scheme from three to five, and without any prior consultation.

Poor Mr. Tacey received the full blast. Those of us who have been privileged to work with Tom Ryan will know what that means. He was, however, lucky not to have to cope with those steel-blue eyes at the same time, eyes whose stare could enable the recipient to pass his last meal from his stomach through his intestines in one easy movement.

Suffice it, then, to record that the protestations were strong enough for Head Office to agree never to do such a thing again, and that arrangements laid down would be adhered to in the future.

On 30th November, 1953, the first five inmates serving preventive detention arrived from Parkhurst, the escort being under the control of no less a person than a chief officer, who felt he ought to make the trip "in order to see what was happening". Again, we can imagine what some of his thoughts must have been.

The remainder of the first day was taken up in explaining the scheme and helping the new arrivals settle down, and it was on 1st December that things really began to get underway.

In the morning, two of the men were taken to a brickwork company at Ashton Vale, and were immediately engaged to start work on 2nd December. During the afternoon, another man was taken on by John Lysaght and Company Ltd., and by Thursday, 3rd December, the remaining men had obtained jobs with the Brislington Tramways and Britten's Builders respectively.

The following days record the men being in good heart over their new-found situations, being allowed out until 10 o'clock some evenings and to visit outside churches on Sundays. By 24th December, their pocket money had increased to £1 0s. 0d. per week.

So the first hostel of its kind anywhere in the world came into being, a little unobtrusively perhaps,

even as it is today where it stands unnoticed outside the perimeter of Bristol Prison.

Yet, the very fact that the scheme has continued to grow and remain such an essential part of our system surely bears witness to its success and the foresight of its founders. The principal actors of the day have inevitably faded into retirement, and the last I heard of Tom Ryan was that he was enjoying increasingly better health at his home in Dornock, Sutherland.

Norman Golding, also retired now, who was involved at the time, sends us this typically light-hearted anecdote for good measure:

"In 1953 I was sent to Bristol—the governor was sick—and on my usual morning round came across an inmate (prisoner in those days) working on the foundations of a new building. On enquiry I was informed it was to be used for the new hostel scheme. The inmate had been a very truculent gentleman; however, when given this task, working on his own and starting a new project, he changed and became a worthwhile person—a good start, I felt, for the hostel scheme's future.

"Prisoners on the scheme were placed in work on the building of extensions to the University, and we had a fair number of failures. I spent some time on this site and got to know the foreman very well. He wanted good hard work from his men. Some prisoners had been sent to this work direct from prison and were too soft, and as the work became harder they left (one way or another). So, after an investigation into these failures, we commenced a 'toughening up' course at the hostel, and also asked other prisoners to try and find hard outdoor work for their transfers before sending them to the scheme. The success rate improved.

"We received one prisoner from Blundeston whom I knew very well. Within a few days on the hostel he was on report for being drunk. (He had already had a couple of warnings from the PO).

"I took him off the hostel scheme and a few days later an anonymous note was found in the post box. It read: 'The governor is a . . . and a bastard. His old woman is no better, she was on the game'. The chief handed me the note with a grin and asked what I was going to do about it. I replied, 'I'm going to find out what my wife is doing with the money'.

continued on page 19

HISTORY OF THE POA

by Ken Daniel

THE Prison Officers' Association is the officially recognized and representative trade union for all members of the prison officer class serving in penal establishments in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the nursing, occupations officers and ancillary staffs of the Special Hospitals.

Behind this simple statement is a history of struggle and achievement almost unprecedented in the history of staff organization in any branch of the civil and public services. The purpose of this contribution is briefly to outline that history. Volumes would be necessary to tell it in full.

In 1919 there was a strike among members of the police force. At that time, the police and prison officers were organized in a body known as "The Police and Prison Officers' Union". The strike did not affect any considerable number of prison officers. But one of its results was to withdraw from the police and the prison staffs the right which they had previously enjoyed, and which other civil and public servants continued to enjoy, of banding together in free organizations to protect and advance their working interests.

Representative Boards took the place of the free organizations in the prisons and related services. These boards were part of the administrative machine. They were financed and very largely controlled by the authorities; there was no appeal against the decisions of the Home Office in England, the Prison Department in Scotland, and the Ministry of Home Affairs in Northern Ireland.

Representatives of the staffs serving on these Representative Boards worked under the greatest of difficulties. The risk of victimization was always present, and it has been said with a good deal of justification that many a fine officer ruined his official prospects by the vigour and sincerity with which he fought for the rights of his colleagues. Pay was bad, hours

were long, overtime payment was meagre; in short, almost every single condition of employment called for radical change.

For nearly 18 years the staffs fought their hopeless battle for better conditions against reactionary influences; a battle in which the prison staffs were isolated by administrative decree from their colleagues elsewhere in the civil and public services and the organized trade union movement.

In the early days of 1938, a few stalwarts, who had striven unceasingly in the interests of their colleagues, decided that drastic measures must be taken if conditions were to be made tolerable for the men and women who, day by day, carried on their tasks under the most difficult and discouraging of circumstances. Taking risks which in these more enlightened days it is almost impossible to conceive, they made contact with the then leaders of the Civil Service Clerical Association, the late Messrs. W. J. Brown and L. C. White. To them they explained not only the grievances but the impossibility in existing circumstances of securing any remedy. A series of secret meetings were held, from which emerged the first effective challenge to the dictatorial methods of the authorities that had confronted them for nearly 20 years. Viewed today, that challenge seems harmless enough. It was no more than a demand to the then Home Secretary, Sir Samuel Hoare, that prison officers should have the right to appeal to an Independent Arbitration Board against the refusal of the authorities to improve their intolerably bad conditions, and to be assisted in the presentation of their case by persons not employed, or under the control of, the authorities.

This demand was well timed. The then Home Secretary had, on more than one occasion, publicly announced his strong desire to improve the conditions under which prisoners were

detained and his intention to introduce measures of reform, some of which subsequently emerged in the Criminal Justice Act, 1948. The Home Secretary was reminded that the officers, as well as the prisoners, had grievances. It was suggested that some of the zeal for prison reform could, and should, be utilized to improve the conditions of the men and women on whom fell the very difficult task of the day-to-day control and administration of these establishments.

The Home Secretary yielded to this reasonable demand for arbitration and, from the moment when that measure of freedom was won, prison officers and those engaged in similar undertakings have never looked back.

In London, this victory (for, trivial as it may appear now, it marked the beginning of a new area) was celebrated at a meeting in the Blue Gliss Hall, Acton, on 5th April, 1938, which will always stand out as one of the highlights in this struggle. Men and women came from all the prisons in London and the surrounding areas; colleagues were present in force from Broadmoor. The enthusiasm born of a new hope was tremendous. Men and women who had suffered for years under the intolerable conditions which had grown up in the prison service knew that at long last changes were on the way.



"General Secretary of the Prison Officers' Association. Joined the Prison Service in 1955, resigned in 1962 in order to take up full-time employment with the POA. Formerly Deputy General Secretary and Editor of the Prison Officers' Magazine. Aged 50 years and married".

Mass meetings, inspiring as they are, are merely a preliminary to real action. The staffs, who were later to comprise the membership of the Prison Officers' Association, really went into action in the middle of the following May, when the claim for improved pay was presented to an independent arbitration board. For five days the case was argued by those who subsequently became the Association's advisers, W. J. Brown and L. C. White, and was opposed on behalf of the Home Office by the then Chairman of the Prison Commission, Sir Harold Scott, who was later to become Commissioner for the Metropolitan Police. The court was crowded with men and women from establishments all over the country enthused by the new situation in which their rights could be publicly demanded, and those who were denying those rights compelled in public to justify their actions.

The 1st June, 1938, was the next red letter day in the development of this struggle. It was the day on which the Arbitration Tribunal announced its award. In the light of the progress that has been made and the improvements that have been achieved in the years that have followed, the award appears much less spectacular and satisfying now than it clearly did at the time. The minimum of the prison officer pay scale of 50 shillings was increased by five shillings a week and that of the chief officer by 15 shillings to 125 shillings a week.

In the years that have passed since the gross underpayment in the prison and allied services received its first effective challenge, much progress on the pay front has been made. But this is only part of the story. Hours have been reduced and overtime rates have been secured which are better or at least on par with those operating elsewhere. Subsistence allowances, etc., have been brought into line with and, indeed, are in some respects better than those paid generally. Significant improvement in superannuation conditions have been won which in two respects in particular are the envy of the rest of the non-industrial Civil Service. Promotion opportunities are greater as a result of increases in the number of higher posts, and the constant pressure maintained on the authorities for providing more opportunities to the men and women in the prison officer ranks to use their know-

ledge and experience in the governor grades. Indeed, it may truly be said that there is no single condition of employment today that has not been improved as the result of the work of the Prison Officers' Association.

It is of interest to make a reference to the introduction of a discipline code for prison officers. Prior to 1943, there were no set rules governing the conditions under which prison officers charged with disciplinary offences could adequately defend themselves. Charges could be framed by the prosecution in any form of words they cared to choose and, very frequently, the wording of the charge was designed to "colour" the case against the accused officer. The officer saw no statement except the bare charge until he was actually being adjudicated upon. He could, it is true, have a "friend" to help him in his defence but since that "friend" had to be a member of the same establishment it was inherent in the very nature of things in those less enlightened days—especially if the local hierarchy had to be attacked—that the "friend" laboured under a great handicap. Efforts to amend the disciplinary procedure were frustrated with all the vigour that the Official Side could command. Indeed, the Staff Side were told, following representations that a "friend" might be a serving officer of any establishment or a full-time officer of the Association, that they have never had that right and they would never have it. Towards the end of 1941, an officer was charged with a serious offence which might have resulted in his dismissal. The Association was refused the right to appear on his behalf at a disciplinary enquiry which it was proposed to hold. In order to prove to the authorities that the Association was determined that the officer should have a fair and adequate hearing, a writ of libel was issued against the governor concerned. The case was lost but it was more than adequately justified when the authorities informed the Association that they proposed to draw up a Code of Discipline. The draft of the new code allowed a serving officer at any establishment to act as a "friend" to an officer accused of a serious offence. Whilst the code was a considerable improvement on anything which had gone before and whilst it widened the scope for the defence of an officer, it still debarred full-time officers of

the Association from undertaking the defence. In 1952, following negotiations on the Departmental Whitley Council, the code was redrafted and full-time officers may now appear for the defence. This matter is mentioned at some length in order to show that the progress made since 1938 has not been without its difficulties and that there has been no royal road to a satisfactory conclusion for our members.

One needs now, to consider the circumstances in which the grossly inadequate machinery of Representative Boards gave way to the new organization, the Prison Officers' Association. In that hectic period during 1938, the staffs realized that, whatever material gains might be achieved, the real fight would not be won until they had achieved for themselves the right to organize in a free Association which, unhampered by authoritarian control, would provide the medium through which the legitimate grievances and aspirations of the staffs could be expressed. Improvements in pay and other betterments never deflected the staffs from this course, and it was again in the Blue Gliss Hall at Acton, this time on 25th October, that an enthusiastic mass meeting launched on its final stages a campaign for the right to set up the Prison Officers' Association. That right was finally won and officially recognized in May 1939, when the Secretary of State for Home Affairs formally agreed the abolition of Representative Board machinery and the recognition of the Prison Officers' Association.

Today, although the Association does not compare in size with some of the larger Civil Service unions—as, indeed, it can never hope to do because of the limited area in which it operates—it is numerically, in relation to its potential membership, one of the best organized Associations in the Civil Service. The Prison Departmental Whitley Council, which was created after the Association came into being, is as an effective body of its sort as anywhere in the country. The Staff Side comprises solely of nominees of the Association; the Official Side representatives of the Prison Board. A record of the matters discussed, and the agreements reached, would require a separate document if they were to be adequately recorded. Even more important from some points of view, however, is the relationship which has been established with the Civil

Service National Whitley Council—the body responsible for legislating on all general Civil Service matters. In the early days agreements reached on the National Whitley Council did not automatically apply to the Prison Service. Even when they would have been applicable they were denied or applied in a very limited manner. Today the Association has a seat on the National Whitley Council and every agreement made designed to improve any piece of Civil Service working conditions, which is appropriate to the Prison Service, is applied without question or qualification.

This record of the tremendous progress which has been made since 1938, and speeded up since the right of free Association was won, would be incomplete without some reference to the work which the Association has done to improve the status and the standing of prison and allied workers among the public, in the Press and Parliament. In the days before that freedom was gained, little was known outside the Prison Service of the difficulties of our tasks and the circumstances in which they had to be carried out. It would have been unthinkable in those days for the views and the advice of members of the subordinate grades to be sought by official bodies set up to deal with problems of prison administration.

Today, the situation is markedly different. The Association has responded to official invitations to give evidence to bodies appointed by the Home Secretary to investigate various problems of prison administration. It has represented members before judicial enquiries resulting from allegations of ill-treatment of prisoners, and on two outstanding cases it has secured not merely their exoneration but a commendation of the way in which they discharged their difficult tasks.

Since its inception, the Association has been responsible for the preparation of memoranda for and giving evidence to Royal Commissions, Select Committees of the House of Commons, Departmental Committees of Enquiry and, indeed, to any body that has sat to enquire into matters affecting staff, prisoners or the administration of prisons. In this connection it is interesting to contrast the experience of members of the Prison Service before and after the formation of the Association.

In 1923, following the Report of the reorganization of the National Whitley Council for the Civil Service,

the then Home Secretary appointed a committee "to consider and report whether any and, if so, what changes should be made in the remuneration or other conditions of service of officers at the prisons and borstal institutions in England and Scotland and at Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum." The chairman of this committee was the Earl Stanhope. It should be remembered that the men and women comprising the Prison Officers' Representative Board were all serving prison officers, untrained and unskilled in negotiation, and the preparation of any documents to the Stanhope Committee had to be done in "out of duty" hours. Moreover, they were denied the opportunity of seeking help from full-time officers of other Civil Service Associations. In their visits to establishments, the members of the Stanhope Committee were ushered around by members of the prison hierarchy to the almost complete exclusion of the representatives of the members of the rank and file.

In the circumstances, it is not to be wondered at that the recommendations of the Stanhope Committee came as a distinct shock to all ranks below the governor grades. In effect, the conditions of prison officers were, in at least two cases, worsened, and some of the favourable recommendations were never implemented.

In 1953, the government appointed a Royal Commission to report on conditions in the Civil Service generally. The Association did not give evidence before this body since its terms of reference confined it to dealing with general service classes rather than departmental grades or specialized groups of civil servants, such as the Prison Service. But on 8th October, 1957, following the report of the Royal Commission (now generally known as the "Prestley" Report), it was announced in the House of Commons that a committee would be set up under the chairmanship of the Hon. Mr. Justice Wynn-Parry "to enquire into the remuneration and conditions of service in England and Wales and in Scotland of the prison officer grades up to and including chief officer, and the grades of assistant governor and governor; and in England and Wales of assistant commissioner and director; to recommend what changes, if any, should be made, having regard to the efficiency of the service and the need

for recruiting and retaining a sufficient and suitable staff".

The difference between the "Stanhope" and "Wynn-Parry" reports is remarkable and it is a reasonable assumption that the greatly increased benefits which accrued to members under "Wynn-Parry" were due, in part at least, to the fact that the Prison Officers' Association provided an efficient and independent channel through which the views, hopes and aspirations of prison officers could be adequately expressed through the memoranda prepared and presented. This early example is but one of many which have since followed.

In the Press and in Parliament the Association has over the years created a better appreciation of the difficulties in which men and women in the prison and allied services have to do their jobs; and there is an enlightenment today about the public attitude towards these matters for which the Association may justifiably claim a substantial measure of credit.

Of course, a great deal more has yet to be accomplished. Better pay and an improvement in overall conditions; job satisfaction is a top priority too, for the unrivalled knowledge—born of day to day contact with and the supervision of inmates—needs to be put to much better use than has ever been the case in the past. Real involvement of prison officers in social work in our penal institutions will be achieved because the prison officer himself wills that it shall be so. Only the Canutes can fail to recognize this.

This article in the main concentrates on the years prior to and immediately following the creation of the Prison Officers' Association. This is so because it is our history and serves as a timely reminder to all of the struggles in which our forebears joined and the victories which they shared.

Finally, a comment on that something which is always rather intangible—the psychological effect on members which derives from the knowledge that they have behind them a free Association, well-equipped in all the complications and difficulties of the Prison Service. The mere existence of that strong protective body should provide men and women with a feeling of independence, and an assurance of justice, and a pride

continued on page 19



The Royal Visit

by A. J. Webley

IT was at 11.55 hours on July 21st, 1978, that Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II arrived at Leyhill from Buckingham Palace to mark the Centenary of the Prison Service.

At that precise point in time, it is now recorded, a unique and historic occasion began to unfold. An occasion which we may justifiably claim will not be forgotten by those associated with it, whether as guests, organisers, staff on duty, fellow agencies, or perhaps many of those who wished to be there but somehow failed to gain a place.

The weather was clearly set fair for that day. Sunshine, a slight breeze, high cloud. Two hundred local children, flags waving, greeted Her Majesty as she alighted from the Royal car to be received by the Home Secretary. A brief pause, two lovely lucky girls presented their Queen with flowers. Then, with the Director General of the Prison Service, Her Majesty walked through the Welcome Arch into the

courtyard to be welcomed warmly by the hundreds of invited guests and operational staff. There was no doubt about the warmth of that welcome.

Following presentations by the Director General to Her Majesty of the members of the Prisons Board and their wives, Her Majesty entered the main building. At once the Royal Standard was raised over the entrance of the building, to join the Union Jack flying from the main flagstaff nearby.

So began this memorable day. A day filled, it seemed, with a special sense of unity, happiness and well being. The feeling that the Prison Service was on show to this unique visitor, and through the various media to the country as a whole. But let me not pretend that this, and all to follow, came about by accident, without effort, without problems. Let me put the subject in perspective, for when I was invited to write this article it was not intended that

I should present rose-tinted views of the event, ignore the difficulties and frustrations, or for that matter ignore the achievements of the many people involved.

Somewhere in the Prison Service there is an individual who I am quite sure gets satisfaction from telling me that he knew of the Royal Visit before I did! There are six more who have told me that they knew before he did! But there is another again in the service, who first thought of the idea of sealing our Centenary celebrations with a Royal Visit. Shall we ever know his or her name? Perhaps not. Whoever that person is, little did he know the machinery he was setting in motion. Let there be satisfaction that someone, a hundred years on from the beginning, had the sense to stop us in our tracks and demand a moment of recognition worthy of the past and present effort of those who served, and continue to serve, the Crown in this Prison Service.

A document confirms that some time ago a member of the Prisons Board attended the Palace to discuss the possibility of a visit by Her

"Jim" Webley joined the Prison Service in 1952 as an officer (later hospital officer) at Dartmoor, after serving in the Royal Navy in Burma and Korea. Promoted assistant governor in 1956, he has served at Wormwood Scrubs, Hatfield, Portsmouth (all young offenders) and later as deputy governor at the Verne prison. Was chairman of the S.E. Selection Board, then governor of Guys Marsh borstal and joined the O.T.S. (Leyhill) as principal in 1977.

Majesty the Queen to the Prison Service in its Centenary year. That document contains suggested events, and schedules, and compares remarkably accurately with the final plan issued by the organizers shortly before the visit took place at Leyhill.

Whether or not you consider the weight of dialogue, the planning, the programming, produced for this Service a successful day I must leave to you. It may assist you to come to a conclusion when I tell you that the Deputy Chief Constable responsible for police organisation on the day, and who was present throughout, remarked on the quite unusual family atmosphere which existed during the visit and questioned why he and his colleagues had not experienced this at similar functions which they had attended. Again, at the close of the day, as the Royal motorcade departed, the timing was found to be just three minutes off schedule! It may well be, commented the police, that we should not underestimate Prison Service organisational ability.

I first came to hear of the Royal Visit in January of this year. The fact that Leyhill was to be the venue was incidental. Her Majesty the Queen was visiting the Prison Service on its Centenary. Any suggestion that buildings, or individuals, might take on some mantle or aura was to be deplored. The buildings and individuals were to be merely vehicles to make this a successful and happy occasion for the Prison Service. Now that was not a difficult attitude for local staff to take on board, and with their planning colleagues this they did throughout the months which led to July 21st. One will never forget the team spirit, the manner in which the two establishments concerned endeavoured, with a marked degree of success, to carry on their day-to-day routines, the school remaining totally operational to the late afternoon of July 20th, much to the surprise of all involved.

The central co-ordination was managed by the Centenary Unit based at Headquarters, and to and from this central structure passed instructions and advice, both to the local co-ordinator and to the various departments and outside agencies involved. It was in those early days of planning that one came to appreciate the full meaning of the protocol surrounding such events, the need to tread warily and with caution along paths previously not known to us. For instance, was Leyhill in Glou-

cestershire or in Avon county? It was important. If the Lord Lieutenant concerned, the personal representative of Her Majesty, was not advised then protocol had been breached. But these problems were resolved, and amicably, and there gradually came about the close liaison between the local and central organisation teams. The question of the most suitable, and secure, route from the railhead to the venue and the necessity to make sure that the timing of arrival, and departure, was accurate. The need to maintain the closest contact with the local police authority. Such items demanded full attention from those concerned.

A hospital officer in the region put forward an idea to have a first-day cover to mark the Centenary year of the Service and the Royal Visit. Surely it would never get off

the ground, surely it would never get accepted with so many other details to think about and, if it did, would it succeed? It did get off the ground, and was a success. The clamour for one-of-those-with-a-signature-on-it echoes down the corridors of the Service. Oh, where did they all go, and so soon

Somewhere, around the month of February, the meetings began. Meetings to make secure every aspect of the Visit, meetings to clear lines of communication. Meetings to confirm tasks lists issued from Headquarters. Meetings to clear the way for the heavy burden of work which would inevitably come the way of the local Works and Farms and Gardens departments. Meetings to meet the requirements of the local police authority, the regional information departments controlling



the media who would record the visit.

Architects got to work on designing a tented complex of facilities for a centenary exhibition and a D.I.F. display, for catering and other essential items. The dog team personnel began to plan their display on site, the Suffolk Punch horses and the Dartmoor cattle would require arenas in which to display their titles, to be present before Her Majesty. The organisation made demands of a kind which begged for mutual respect between all departments, all individuals, and that respect was evident throughout all the months of planning that followed.

It would be quite ludicrous to claim that locally the planning did not have its effect. Local staff responded in a most admirable manner to the demands made upon them and their establishments. It is without doubt a credit to all concerned that this was so, for one recalls, vividly, the hustle and bustle of it all, the number of times

when all one asked for was some slight respite, a respite which rarely came, and yet, with a desire to meet this most important commitment, to make it a success for everyone, staff produced that high degree of patience and understanding.

The final week is, as one might imagine, more a blur than a memory. No matter how one plans any event there is always, it seems, that hurried pre-event period. But this was such an event that the timing became almost cruelly crucial. Security matters, vehicles arriving with artefacts and materials, seeking ownership. D.I.F. materials for the display. The Suffolk Punch stud arrive. Catering, accommodation, who needs what? The Dartmoor cattle, who had arrived some days before, were making it obvious that if they were going to be paraded before the visitors then whoever was going to do the parading would not forget in a hurry these hilly-billies from the Devon



moor! Despite all of this activity one, nevertheless, detected a confidence in the air, that all was going to be well on the day.

On the night before, at a late hour, one saw that the planning and anxiety, the frustration, the effort by so many hard-working individuals, both locally and at Headquarters, had paid off. The Prison Service was as ready as it ever would be to present itself. The yesterdays, the today, and perhaps a little of the future was here for all to see.

July 21st, 1978, was here. Staff of the local establishments with their headquarters colleagues, with specific tasks allocated, were now in station. Security marshals, ushers, first aid parties, vehicle controllers, organisers of children, staff responsible for the sale of souvenirs, for information to visitors, staff engaged in close liaison with police on communications, all of them now ready. Dog handlers, grooms, paraders of cattle, all ready. Works staff accountable for emergencies, fire, police and ambulance personnel all closed up to their positions.

So, Her Majesty the Queen, accompanied by the Home Secretary, the Director General of the Prison Service, the Lord Lieutenant and others, entered the main building. The Royal Standard was raised and Centenary commemoration day began for the Service. Her Majesty visited the exhibition illustrating in quite remarkable fashion the 100 years of our

continued on page 18



BLACK BORSTAL BOYS

by David Wickham

David Wickham joined the Prison Service as an Officer in 1968, serving at H.M.D.C. Aldington, Kent. In 1972 he became an A.G.II taking up a post at Usk (Prescoed Camp) Open Borstal, South Wales. He is still currently enjoying his second posting at H.M. Borstal, Rochester, from where he has attained (part time) a University of London Diploma in the Educational Rehabilitation of Young Persons and has just completed a sabbatical year to obtain a M.Sc. degree in Social Policy and Institutions.

THE characteristics of the young offender population in certain institutions have changed with the arrival of immigrants from the New Commonwealth. Their sons (those who arrived with their parents, those who came later and, more recently in growing numbers, those born in this country) who have become delinquent, have needs in common with all young offenders. They also have special needs, and above all the majority populations' reactions to them and, in particular, to their colour.

Experience has shown that problems arising from a multi-racial society have been manifested within the young offender penal system. The black presence in the institutional environment is seldom readily accepted by white inmates and staff. From my personal experience prejudice and discrimination does exist. Black trainees, too, hold prejudicial attitudes which can generate friction, hostility and even fights between themselves and white inmates. This inevitably produces a stressful situation in which it is extremely difficult for staff and inmate to remain impartial and resist the natural tendency for loyalties to become polarized to black or white.

Such conflict situations, until resolved, hinder the rehabilitative goals of society and the institution, and from an institutional policy and management viewpoint maintaining control and training can be almost impossible.

Therefore, the key issue facing reformers today is the extent to which the conventional young offender system requires modification to ensure equality of opportunity for black and white, also racial harmony and ways in which any necessary modifications can be achieved.

The Problems

Although black offenders constitute only a small proportion of the total young offender population in the

country as a whole, their concentration is such that, in areas like Greater London, they account for a large proportion of the relevant population. Such uneven distribution means that institutions serving these particular areas are faced with a greater and urgent need to cope with the "treatment and training" issues and associated problems that ethnic sub-groups present.

In the south-east of England several young offender institutions are experiencing unfamiliar problems which permeate all aspects of institutional life. The inevitably tenuous but simple "us and them" relationships that have always existed between staff and inmate have become complicated as each has had to adjust to new highly sensitive black/white situations. For instance, at one detention centre in 1976 stresses were experienced when their black population reached 30 per cent and when it was noted that a high proportion of the black trainees were suffering from urban deprivation. It was this group which had already developed its attitude to the police, was largely unemployed and was noticeably anti-authority. The majority of warden's reports involved black trainees and their attitude to discipline which was casual and indifferent. It was not this factor which caused the main control problem but the possibility of group action triggered by a "chance" factor such as a fight breaking out in the dining hall. If it involved two white trainees, staff could easily intervene, but when it was between a black and a white trainee, the tendency was for the black trainees to leap to their feet and join in the melee, making the restoration of discipline that much more difficult. The West Indian detention centre trainee does appear to have committed more crimes against the person than his white counterpart and within the institution he seems to direct his aggression mainly against other trainees by "leaning" on them, or by threatening and bullying.

To alleviate the pressure of this difficult and sophisticated population, originating entirely from Greater London, and to make the population of this detention centre more heterogeneous, fresh catchment areas were drawn up.

At least 18 other establishments have experienced racial problems since 1973. These incidents and occasional crises are rarely a simple "black man—white man" clash. They appear to be part of a more complex network of inter-relating issues and circumstances.

Such issues and circumstances, and the reasons for the dramatic increase in the number of black trainees in borstal require explanation. The purpose of my research was, therefore, to examine the nature of such problems at one institution, H.M. Borstal, Rochester.

West Indians

Theories about the social backgrounds of young offenders can be applied to black and white. The self-perpetuating characteristics of family criminality (Ferguson 1952), the constellation of adverse factors including large families, bad neighbourhood, poverty, broken homes, low intelligence, unsatisfactory parental child rearing behaviour, etc. (West 1967 and 1973) all increase the likelihood of a boy acquiring a delinquent record—whether black or white. But if all such youngsters face similar problems then how do the problems of black youth differ from those of white youth?

It is really a matter of intensity, and to understand the intensity of these problems it is necessary to place them in historical perspective. If we take, for example, West Indians, who make up 32 per cent of the adult coloured population in Britain (HMSO TSA Pub. 1977) and who form the largest black group in our institutions, their general background illustrates the point.

Overlooking early slavery of Africans and West Indians between the 17th century and late 19th century (well documented by Patterson 1965 and James Pope-Hennessy 1967) it was not until the turn of the century that the number of West Indians rose.

This came about with the settlement of seamen from Asia and Africa in Britain's major docklands, and coloured labourers and munitions workers recruited at the time of the First World War.

During the Second World War 8,000 West Indians joined the Royal Air Force and many more augmented the depleted manpower of British industry (D.E.S. Youth Service Development Council 1967). There was a chronic shortage of employment in the West Indies and the peasant population of freed slaves had multiplied vigorously, (Norris 1962).

In 1952 the United States government passed the McCarran-Walter Act which blocked West Indian emigration to the United States. Thus the flow of West Indians to Britain, in search of employment and betterment, became significant.

By 1967 it was estimated that there were 525,000 West Indian workers and their dependants in the United Kingdom (Daniel 1968).

The West Indians came mostly from English-speaking islands of the Caribbean, were schooled in English history and culture and regarded themselves as being British. They came expecting to be totally accepted, as citizens of equal merit, in what many West Indians referred to as "the mother country". Their high expectations only led them naively, but trustingly, into social situations for which they were ill-prepared. For instance, the cultural background of many West Indians had encouraged them to internalize the British norm of colour prejudice so that "white" came to be associated in their minds with what is good and superior, and "black" to be regarded as something of which to be ashamed (Rose et al 1969).

Just imagine how the West Indian settlers here have felt, arriving with such high expectations, only to find white men actually performing menial tasks and perceiving them as immigrants competing for white jobs and housing. Donald Hinds (1966) captures the poignancy of this moment beautifully: "Now I was seeing my colonial society in a terrible light, I had never hoped to challenge the whites in Jamaica for a job. I realised in the confusion of the crowded station

that I was starting on a desperate phase of life. If the white man was sweeping the streets, then any job I asked for would mean a challenge to him. I was not one of the "mother country's" children. I was one of her black children."

Thus the West Indian has unique problems of identification and discrimination in British society, and the resultant effect could be serious psychological damage. Rose (1969) summarizes, "West Indians had many illusions about the British and British society which were to be shattered, and in the process they began to lose their own sense of identification with Britain".

Indeed, Kardiner and Ovesey (1962) suggest that conflict springing from simultaneous identification with, and hate of white culture may lead to an aggressive channelling of defensive measures, whilst Deutsch (1960) found negro juvenile delinquency and crime a way of striking back at white society. Dondy (1974) describes such teenagers as forming "a culture of resistance," refusing to take the menial occupations which white society hands down, and preferring to remain unemployed.

The young black has watched his parents try to work through the system and achieve nothing. Unlike the older black community he cannot remember the black professional class back in the West Indies or compare his situation with what it was like back home, and only sees blacks working at menial tasks. The West Indians born in Britain and schooled here also have more education and higher aspirations than their parents and are thus more resentful of low status jobs.

Those of us working with young West Indian offenders know only too well that many of them would rather not work than accept menial jobs with London Transport, British Rail, or local councils, etc., as this would be an admission of failure. Often the fact that their parents have occupied such jobs only reinforces this attitude.

Among West Indian youths I have known this attitude usually manifests itself in dress, music, social attitude, political opinions, and in extreme cases they "live" their protests as "Rastamen" (Ballard and Driver 1977).

Too many young West Indians find this struggle for cultural identity hopeless and employment problems irreconcilable, with the alarming result that they eventually find themselves in penal institutions. Humphrey (1972)

sums the situation as follows, "The tragedy of this situation—and it augurs badly for the future—is that almost all of those youths expect to be in some sort of trouble with the law before their twenties. Many have come to see it as an inevitable part of growing up in the black ghetto. Some consciously refuse to work in the sort of positions where they feel their labour is being bought cheaply, and earn their bread by any other means at hand, or by "living off the man," all are in danger of being contaminated by the crime that is part of the ethos of the area in which they live.

Leaving open the debate about crime and police relationships, the weak structure of the family is another unique and disadvantageous facet of West Indian life in Britain.

The migration process has often caused maternal deprivation, when, following the father, the mother emigrated from the West Indies, leaving the child in the care of the maternal grandmother. This all too common situation results in children suffering a second deprivation of a maternal figure, when some years later, the parents established in the United Kingdom, send for them. Bowlby (1965/69/73) highlights just how damaging such a double deprivation may be, making the individual maladjusted to his own social group in this country.

According to Bowlby, anger and hostility towards the separated mother or other attachment figure, may well be displaced onto others.

This problem of adjustment is often exacerbated when the migrant West Indian child arrives in Britain to join a family containing unfamiliar siblings or a new step-father and step-siblings. Many young West Indians therefore experience family tensions and uncertainties with respect to allegiance and identify and become victims of the unstable West Indian marriage and co-habitation patterns that exist (Patterson 1965).

The West Indian child also becomes involved in a conflict of cultures when he finds that parental beliefs about education, family life and discipline are questioned by their British equivalents. This conflict often results in the unsatisfactory reconciliation of West Indian behaviour and attitudes with those of teachers and peer groups.

Children can then become alienated from parents who already feel disappointed that their children treat them as strangers. Sellin (1938) suggests

that culture conflict may take a second form, being internalized by the very young and second generation immigrant who, before totally accepting the conduct norms of the host society, may reject those of his parents' society and thus become normless and confused, unsure even of his own identity. Such an identity conflict may lead to a delinquent outcome.

These youngsters often drift in society, having no apparent roots, many in fact leaving home in an atmosphere of parental rejection.

Dangerous Practice

Other ethnic groups have equally disturbing problems plus, of course, serious language difficulties. These black ethnic groups are very different from each other, far more so than white sub-groups. The former represent a collection of religious, kinship patterns, and ways of doing things which are as different from each other as from those of the host country. It is a dangerous practice to think about them all in stereotype terms, lumping them all together on the basis of skin colour, or the belief that they are recent arrivals in this country.

Nonetheless, evidence does suggest that xenophobia is a cultural norm (Patterson 1965), people do hold stereotype images (Patterson 1965), and are prejudiced (Tajfel 1973 and Smith 1977). Furthermore, in the Morris's Pentonville study (1963) they state, "the general view of the prison staff (is) that the majority of 'coloureds' and 'ethnics' are West Indians, a belief which is related to the general trend towards xenophobia which is characteristic of both prison officers and prisoners alike".

Rochester Study

The study sample at Rochester borstal included only 318 trainees, and their birthplaces are shown in Table 1. This table reflects societies growing multi-racial complexity in terms of family settlement.

However, tabulating trainees by birthplace does not directly distinguish black and white trainees. Thus, when relating birthplace to skin colour, trainees born in one country to natives of another are classified incorrectly. The total black population in the sample was 58 (18.24 per cent) comprising West Indians, Africans, Indians and South Americans.

The social backgrounds and institutional progress of the sample were surveyed to identify any significant

differences between black and white trainees.

The main findings over a wide variety of indices are that black and white trainees have much in common. They are mostly single, of the same age range, have a similar number of previous convictions and institutional experiences, have had the same type of education, and been exposed to the same degree of family disintegration. Nonetheless, black trainees have committed more (proportionately) serious offences against the person, more black trainees live in London, and more black trainees are from one parent families.

Overall, the black trainee comes from a more stable family structure and has presented less serious social problems in the community and the institution.

Educationally, black trainees have presented more serious problems of specialist needs (ESN etc.), of attendance, and behaviour, and yet more black trainees have gained some form of qualification.

At employment in the community and the institution the black trainee appears to have fared better in both regularity and type of employment.

In terms of institutional behaviour and progress the black trainees have proved a relatively well behaved, conforming and remarkably opportunist group, particularly at sport. However, this response is not reflected in the number of black orderlies, numbers on community projects, or on home leave or temporary release granted.

On the evidence of this small survey at Rochester it appears that black borstal trainees are certainly no greater a challenge or problem to borstal training resources than white trainees.

Staff Perceptions and Attitudes

This general response should be encouraging to staff, but this is not so in practice, as staff often have different views about black trainees. Therefore, using a covert approach (an attitude scale which referred to a range of institutional elements and included distractor items) staff attitudes to and comments about black trainees were elicited.

The findings point to a staff who perceive their inmate population as inferior allocations, personally, socially, and criminally, but yet not hopeless.

Staff recognize the limitations of trade training and educational opportunities for trainees at Rochester, and also the staff communication problems that make any positive reinforcement of trainees' achievements unlikely.

Of the elements presented in the attitude scale, almost all staff hold positive attitudes towards personal relationships, but there appear to be inevitable organizational dysfunctions and ambiguities contained in role definitions—as conceptualized by Merton (1940)—that cause some relationships to remain at a most superficial level. The Rochester personal relationship programme in its present form was strongly criticised by staff.

Staff appear to have a consistent and relatively positive attitude toward individual West Indian trainees, finding them no different to the indigenous population when compared on "best—worst" extremes, or in their individual response to borstal training.

However, on other criteria volunteered by staff the West Indian group is perceived as very different and troublesome. Communication is more difficult because of language misunderstandings, and the staff lack knowledge about the backgrounds, habits and norms of another culture making personal relationships almost impossible. Traditional borstal case work methods are failing with this black group, which is also perceived by staff as being anti-authority and reluctant to take orders.

West Indian group cohesiveness and solidarity constitutes a threat to system and staff, and consequently they hold far greater disruptive potential than white trainees. Furthermore some staff believe that such groupings lead to pressure groups and institutional thuggery. This latter view is held in spite of evidence of indiscipline suggesting this is not so.

TABLE 1—COUNTRY OF BIRTH
(Figures expressed in per cent of total sample, 318)

Country of Birth	Trainees	Fathers	Mothers
Not known ...	Nil	1.57	0.94
England and Wales ...	86.79	63.21	65.09
Scotland ...	1.57	3.77	5.03
N. Ireland ...	0.94	1.89	2.52
Irish Republic	0.94	7.23	5.97
Europe ...	0.94	1.89	2.52
Greece,			
Turkey, Cyprus	0.63	1.57	1.57
West Indies ...	5.35	14.46	13.52
India and			
Pakistan ...	0.63	0.63	0.63
Africa ...	0.63	1.89	0.94
Elsewhere ...	1.57	1.89	1.26

Troublemaker Experiment

To examine institutional "troublemakers", black or white, and the accuracy of staff perceptions, it was decided to adapt and follow a technique employed by Wood, Wilson, Jessor and Bogan (1966), who studied the various differences of perceptions of the institution between troublemakers and non troublemakers in a youth centre in Colorado.

Using their technique it was possible to see how trainees labelled as "troublemakers" by staff are found to differ significantly from other trainees in the way they perceive their borstal training. Without actually singling out black trainees as a separate group, this method of investigation enabled me to examine their perceptions of, and responses to, borstal training in relation to the indigenous population at Rochester.

It also facilitated covert staff and trainee involvement in a normally sensitive subject matter.

The focus of this study is on how trainee, black and white, perceive or interpret the meaning and nature of borstal training. In particular the trainees' definition of borstal training as:

1. an opportunity structure;
2. an authority structure;
3. a predictable environment where future events are contingent on one's behaviour.

A trainee who sees borstal training as an opportunity for positive development and accomplishment should be motivated to adjust to the borstal and co-operate with staff. Those who do not are perhaps merely "doing bird", seeing it all as punishment or exposure to negative influences—all producing opposition.

A trainee who sees borstal rules as reasonable and necessary and who regards the officers as helpful, interested authority figures should find it appropriate and in his own interest to comply with rules and staff. Defining authority differently increases the likelihood of problem behaviour.

The general perception of borstal training as an arbitrary situation, controlled entirely by external forces, chance or luck, and not contingent upon what the trainee does or how he behaves is also relevant to troublemaking behaviour. A trainee seeing training in this light is less likely to work towards borstal training goals since he would not see such efforts as effectively determining what actually happens to him.

Without going into details of the experiment here the basic hypothesis was that troublemaking behaviour in borstal should be related to the trainee's definitions of the borstal situation as a negative opportunity structure, as a negative authority structure, and as an arbitrary and externally controlled environment.

The results of this experiment show that staff at Rochester can accurately identify its trainee troublemakers. These trainee troublemakers, among whom is a disproportionately high number of black trainees, generally hold negative attitudes towards borstal training time, and engaging in troublemaking behaviour is also unrelated to borstal training time.

Because unfavourable definitions appear to be brought to the borstal initially, and the trainee's adaption is related to the way he perceives his training, staff should concentrate their efforts to counter unfavourable views and past experiences at the beginning of training, especially with black trainees.

As the evidence indicated that black trainees were proportionately over represented as "troublemakers", and thus more prone to holding negative perceptions of borstal training, an attempt was made to interpret this by further examination of the attitude scale sub-categories. The results were inconclusive, but did indicate that black troublemakers had a more positive self identity, saw more opportunity for interpersonal skills, and had more negative attitudes to staff, than did white troublemakers.

Some Recommendations

Rochester borstal is becoming a multi-racial young offender institution, and as such reflects the diversity, confusion and realities of race relations in the outside community.

This is a fact which demands of staff heightened awareness of attitudes and identities, for when people of different cultures meet there is infinite scope for misunderstanding and confusion.

The finding that trainees, particularly troublemakers, bring unfavourable definitions into the borstal, stresses the importance of an adequate reception or induction programme. Such a programme must impress upon black and white trainees that equal opportunity exists, that authority is benign and unprejudiced, and that internal control and predictability is feasible in borstal. Only in this way, at the start of training, can staff hope

to counter unfavourable views and past experiences.

The research has also exposed the nature of the relationship difficulties and conflict that exists between staff and black trainees. It is obvious that staff are ill-prepared for dealing with such potentially highly sensitive confrontations and situations to which they are unaccustomed. They are trying old methods on new problems with little success. What is needed is some special in-service training. The first initiative has already been taken by the Prison Department by including instruction in race relations in one or two training programmes. However, as it will be some time before such programmes have any impact, the onus for such staff training falls locally to each institution.

What can be done locally?

First, as a short term measure, staff must be more flexible and tolerant when dealing with trainees from other cultures, and make a genuine effort to understand and to control their reactions to unusual aspects of trainee behaviour. Staff, whilst remaining firm, fair, and in control, must try to avoid negative discrimination and denigration of black skin, and possess skills to isolate argumentative black troublemakers in confrontation situations. It must be impressed upon staff that it is activist leaders rather than the concentration of numbers per se which cause trouble. The significance of large numbers is that it allows for serious escalation.

Second, staff must be helped and encouraged on a long term basis, to find out the cultural patterns of black trainees, and use them to interpret their behaviour properly.

Where a black community exists near to an institution every advantage should be taken to secure the benefits arising from interaction with local black communities. Such interaction could benefit black trainees by bridging the gap between community and institution (resettlement plans, employment, outside interests, etc.) and encourage them to see opportunities of borstal training. At the same time staff would have interaction with responsible black people which may help to iron out some of the cultural differences and misunderstandings that can result in institutional conflict.

Such proposals are not always readily acceptable. Should staff aim to ignore or strengthen ethnic identity, and just how important and practical are special provisions for cultural needs?

The only conclusion I have drawn from personal experience, research and literature is that there are many issues involved in striking a harmonious chord between black and white in our institutions, and that it is wiser to recognize the mutual problems and try to do something about it.

Integration cannot be achieved if black trainees are segregated. The most sensible approach is to disperse black trainees among the institutional living units, but at the same time recognize the value to them of their personal and group identity. It is proper to permit them to have some group activities that do not impinge upon other white trainees. After all, experience shows that denial of such a facility is impractical, anyway. Such recognition should allow books, posters, periodicals, and music, and perhaps even a room or area to call their own. To suppress such basic pleasures must lead to even further unnecessary conflict. This policy is also helpful in creating a healthy open atmosphere in which it is possible to discuss true feelings towards migration and colour, etc., which can enable black youth and staff to gain some insight into institutional and community problems. Staff must be aware that we should not be trying to create some kind of Englishman from a black man, whether he is West Indian, African, or Pakistani, but on the contrary, we should be trying to develop in the black man an attitude of ambivalence, genuinely identifying with his ethnic group, but being realistic about the problems of living in a predominantly white society.

The education system has already faced up to similar stressful situations, and much can be learned from their experiences, i.e. Meredith (1971) describes a school with 45 per cent West Indians on roll and says, "The school's initial response to them was a period of breakdown, low staff morale and trying to cope with new difficulties by using old methods. This became a period of progress when issues were clarified and new methods developed".

I have no doubt that the Borstal system will also adjust to its changing composition, develop new methods in time, and emerge with success and merit.

REFERENCES

Ferguson, T. *The Young Delinquent in his Social Setting*. a Glasgow study. London, Oxford University Press, 1952.

West, D. J. *The Young Offender*. Pelican books, 1967; *Who Becomes Delinquent*. Heinemann, 1973.
D.E.S. (G.B.) Youth Service Development Council: *Immigrants and the Youth Service*. (Hunt Report). London, HMSO, 1967.
Training Services Agency (Dr. M. A. Pearn): *Selecting and Training Coloured Workers*. HMSO, 1977.
Patterson, S. *Dark Strangers, A study of West Indians in London*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1965.
James Pope-Hennessy. *Sins of the Fathers; The Atlantic Slave Traders, 1441-1807*. Sphere Books Ltd., 1970.
Norris, K. *Jamaica: The Search for an identity*. Institute of Race Relations with Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1968.
Daniel, W.W. *Racial Discrimination in England*. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1968.
Rose, E.J.B. et al. *Colour and Citizenship - A Report on British Race Relations*. Oxford University Press, Institute of Race Relations, London, 1969.
Hinds, D. *Journey to an Illusion*. London, Heinemann, 1966.
Kardiner, A. & Ovesey, L. *The Mark of Oppression*. New York, World Books, 1962.
Deutsch, M. *Minority Group and Class Status as related to social and personality factors in scholastic achievement*. Monograph No.2, New York, Society of Applied Anthropology, 1960.

Dondy, F. *The black explosion in schools*. Race Today 6, 44-47, 1974.
Ballard, R. & Driver, G. *The Ethnic Approach*. An article in New Society, 16th June 1977.
Humphrey, D. & John, G. *Police Power and Black People*. London, Panther, 1972.
Bowlby, J. *Child Care and the Growth of Love*. 2nd. edn. Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1965; *Attachment and loss: Vol.11. Separation, Anxiety and Anger*. Hogarth Press and Inst. Psycho-analysis, London, 1973. *Attachment and Loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. Hogarth Press and Inst. Psycho-analysis, London 1969.
Sellin, T. *Culture, Conflict and Crime*. Soc. Science Research Council, New York, 1938.
Tajfel, H. *The Roots of Prejudice: Cognitive Aspects*. In Watson, P. (ed), "Psychology & Race", Harmondsworth, Penguin Books 1973.
Smith, D.J. *Racial Disadvantage in Britain: The PEP Report*. Penguin Books, 1977.
Morris, T. & P. Pentonville. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1963.
Woods, B.S. et al. *Troublemaking Behaviour in a Correctional Institution. Relationship to Inmates definition of their situation*. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol.36, 1966, 795-802.
Meredith, G. *The changing response of a secondary modern school in Handsworth, 1958-1970*. In McNeal, J. and Rogers, M. (eds.), *The Multi-Racial School*. Harmondsworth. Penguin Books. 1971.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FELLOWSHIP

... is geared to serve over 300,000 retired Civil Servants and their widows throughout the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. This large organization is accomplished through a network of 111 Branches, and over 700 local groups of retired Civil Servants, who provide quite voluntarily on an 'expenses only' basis a very necessary social welfare service.

Home visits to housebound, sick and lonely colleagues are nearing the million mark, and social activities organized by the Branches and Groups for the more active are many and varied; including economical holidays at home and overseas.

This voluntary organization is open to retired and serving officers of all ages to subscribe by deduction from pay or pension, a modest sum of 10p per month, or a single payment of £7.50 to secure life membership. Both methods of subscription also cover the spouse for membership. Please consider helping now.

Further details from General Secretary, Civil Service Retirement Fellowship, 15, Penrose Street, London SE17 3DP. (Telephone: 01-701 0257/0258).

Letter

THE EDITOR,
Prison Service Journal,

Dear Sir,

Among the hazards of attempting correctional treatment in a custodial setting is the difficulty of providing an experience for inmates which is relevant to their "outside" world. People cannot learn from their mistakes unless they have opportunities both to make mistakes and to experience the consequences. Until this difficulty can be overcome, inmates will probably continue to await the passing of time without learning anything useful about themselves and their criminality. A correctional institution could be made more like a microcosm of the "outside" world by confronting each inmate with real choices, so that he could practise in a secure environment the skill of making decisions.

Like any other dream, mine is

fantastic, hazy and highly-coloured. In it, I see offenders sentenced not to a period of time but to a sum of money—some might be paid like a fine, but some would be paid from earnings in the institution. The amount of each kind of payment would be determined by the judge.

On reception, therefore, each inmate is faced with paying a known sum from earnings to purchase his release. Each earns wages according to the nature of his work and his productivity. Each contributes weekly towards his release whatever amount he chooses. For any goods and services beyond a basic standard of food, accommodation and clothing the inmate must pay. The institution supplies goods and services according to demand—separate rooms, choice of menu, a bar, a betting shop, perhaps even a brothel. But each inmate pays for his own lux-

uries and entertainments if he wants them.

Some opt for a shorter sentence in spartan conditions. Others choose a longer period of greater luxury. A few might choose to have hot and cold running chambermaids (if they can afford them). None may be released until they have paid. In each case, the inmate governs his own lifestyle and release date.

For those lacking sufficient skills to earn high wages, trade training courses might be provided. For those lacking sufficient motivation to work hard, a long sentence at a basic standard of living "on the dole" ensues.

So inmates faced with the same choices and temptations which confront us "on the out," and they might learn to live wisely.

D. A. GODFREY
*H.M. Prison Service College
Wakefield*

THE ROYAL VISIT *continued from page 12*

history, signed a bible in which so many years ago Prince Albert had also signed his name, visited the display of D.I.F. products and, after meeting guests informally in the library, took lunch with them.

Afterwards, in the most informal manner, Her Majesty visited the display of Suffolk Punch horses, now looking so grand in formation; visited the now well-behaved Dartmoor cattle and was then introduced to the Prison Dog Service team. Moving up and on to the main lawn, Her Majesty passed among the assembled guests, chatting at length to many, eventually leaving them to visit the colourful conservatory. There had been flowers all the way, from the beautiful arrangements, created by a lady member of our Service, throughout the main building, to those all about the grounds of the estate.

Finally, to the warm applause of the guests, assembled now in the arboretum area, Her Majesty planted a tree to commemorate her visit. A final handshake for the Home Secretary and the Director General and it was time for the visit to come to a close. There can be little doubt for those who were there that Her Majesty confirmed in those moments

of farewell that she had enjoyed her visit to the full.

I close by acknowledging that some may find little pleasure in occasions of this kind. Reasons for feeling that way are personal and sometimes cannot be expressed in words but in some form of non-participation. But participation has been a byword of this service of ours for 100 years. The Prison Service does not enjoy the fullest measure of reward, and just once in a while we require to blow the service trumpet to drown the

noise of the critic, the cynic. This official visit by Her Majesty the Queen on July 21st, 1978, cannot be denied. It took place, it is recorded, was acknowledged to be a resounding success and not only by service personnel. It now forms part of our history. We are, at this very moment, adding to that history. Let each of us acknowledge that we had a Centenary commemoration, be proud of it, and of being a member of so loyal and dedicated an organization in the public service.



ALTERNATIVES TO REHABILITATION

continued from page 3

the science of muddling-through). This model is not so much a model as a mixture of numerous arguments designed to concentrate on urgent pressing problems. The most obvious problem now which could be dealt with by this approach is the need to reduce prison numbers. Those supporting a pragmatic incremental view would argue that certain measures were available which would achieve this end. Sentences could be controlled by statute, thereby reducing the maximum sentences or prohibiting certain types of offender from being sentenced to prison. Other laws could be removed from the statute book altogether, e.g. drunkenness to bring down prison numbers. The pragmatist would argue that problem solving becomes a piecemeal method of dealing with situations as they arise. The pragmatist would hope that in the meantime other agencies such as the Probation Service would perhaps have evolved different strategies to cope with the changes being forced upon them and these new strategies would then be incorporated into an assessment of the next urgent problem.

The difficulty of course with this approach, is that it lacks an overall world view and, by definition, pragmatism is bereft of any ideology. Without an ideology there is a lack of a coherent penal philosophy. This is not to deny the value of pragmatism. It is at best a stop-gap which assumes more importance when no ideology is available. The crisis in the prison population, for example, cannot wait until a new ideology emerges. The dangers are also clear, the most obvious being that it becomes a substitute for a future ideology, or that it is justified on the grounds that ideologies as such are inherently dangerous.

Whichever model is finally selected—and it may be quite different from those given here—some discussion is required now. Perhaps some of the pitfalls of the past will be avoided and lessons will be learned from earlier mistakes. The time is right for change, and hopefully this will be used wisely.

REFERENCES

1. The optimism was never more openly expressed than in H.M.S.O. *Penal Practice in a Changing Society*. Cmd.645, 1959.
2. H.M.S.O. *Young Adult Offenders*. Report of the Advisory Council on the Penal System, 1974.

3. Bean, Philip. *Rehabilitation: Some Issues and Implications*. Justice of the Peace, July 16th, 1977. pp.413-415.
4. see Bean, Philip. *Rehabilitation and Deviance*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974, for a wider discussion on these issues.
5. Sentencing and Rehabilitation is dealt with by McGee, R. A. A new look at sentencing, Federal Probation, June 1974 and July 1974.
6. H.M.S.O. The length of prison sentences, Advisory Council on the Penal System (Serota Report), 1977.
7. H.M.S.O. A review of criminal justice policy, 1976. (Home Office Working Paper), 1977.
8. Evidence to the Royal Commission on the Penal System. H.M.S.O. 1967, Vol.4.
9. Hood, r. g. The case against executive control. Criminal Law Review, 1975 pp.542-552.
10. Quoted in Home Office Working Paper op.cit.
11. Bean, Philip. *Rehabilitation: Some issues and implications*. op.cit. p.415.
12. Bottoms, A. E. The Coming Crisis in British Penology, University of Sheffield, 1978 (unpublished—quote by permission).
13. Bottoms, A. E. Law, Order and Authority, University of Sheffield, 1978 (unpublished—quoted by permission).

OPENING A NEW PRISON

continued from page 4

done". I have encouraged the growth of some tendencies, and have said a clear "no" to others. I have asked for courtesy and efficiency—both necessary if a secure and yet humane regime is to develop. I have been aware that it is easy to make a prisoner of a person, but much more difficult to make a person of a prisoner. I certainly felt the need to remind local audiences that yesterday's citizen—today's prisoner—is due in most cases to become tomorrow's citizen. To date, the result has been a relaxed but watchful regime in which inmates can consider themselves human, while staff whenever they wish can offer an interest in how the place is managed and can, within limits, produce their own modifications and developments.

The present Highpoint prison has as its industrial task the building of a category B style prison during the next six years or so, with demolition of most of its existing buildings. In a short while 250 of its 300 inmates will be building or training for building (seven construction industry training courses are planned). Deep snow and ice could therefore bring unemployment to three quarters of the inmate population next winter. That is what opening a new prison is about. It is taking on yesterday's plan and being ready to meet the resulting outcomes. Midwives cannot instantly determine the life of an infant; they can however assist the infant's healthy onset and robust early development.

ANOTHER LITTLE JUBILEE

continued from page 6

"About 14 days later the Blundeston prisoner came in on application, and as he left I said 'Many thanks for your note. You are certainly wrong over one point. I have a photo of my mother and father'. He said he did not know what I was talking about, but the next day he was on application again to admit posting the note and to apologize!"

From such simple beginnings, in which the perceptions of Commissioners and governors (not to mention prisoners) did not always coincide on details, an experiment began to grow into what some of us consider the most successful single achievement of the post-war period.

A visitor to the governor's office in Bristol will be forgiven if he misses a small piece of paper enclosed in a simple wooden frame, along with a model layout of the prison and other interesting pictures on the wall, but in some ways we might call this the P.R.E.S. birth certificate. It is, in fact, a greetings telegram, dated 30th November, 1953, with the message: 'Greetings—Governor, Warden and five Pioneers, H.M.Prison—Bristol. God Speed Heroic Venture. Fairn.'

Pioneers indeed. But God (or someone) does continue to speed this venture, even in these days of high unemployment, high security and restrictions of all kinds—and that is perhaps as remarkable as the original concept itself.

HISTORY OF THE POA

continued from page 9

in the great work they are doing which was seldom to be found in the bad old days from which we have now happily emerged.

Much has been achieved, but many more of our objectives have yet to be attained. There are still many tasks to be accomplished before the P.O.A. can feel satisfied that the prison and allied services offer to the men and women engaged in them all the conditions and rights to which they are reasonably entitled. Equally important is the necessity to ensure that what we have won in the struggle of the past shall never be lost. Members must not falter in their determination to maintain the Association in its present position of strength and effectiveness, for, trite as the saying may be, it is demonstrably the case for those represented by the Prison Officers' Association that "United we stand : Divided we fall".

BOOK REVIEWS

Reviews Committee:

RAY MITCHELL *Prison Service College, Wakefield*

RICK EVANS *HMP Bristol*

MARK BEESON *Leeds University*

DAI CURTIS *Officers' Training School, Wakefield*

SHOT OF CASEWORK

Prison Welfare: an account of an experiment at Liverpool

A. J. FOWLES Home Office Research Study No. 45
H. M. S. O. 1978, 75p.

In the State capital, Governor Horu is up against it. The Legislature wants to know what gives in his territory. In a bid to get the low-down, he appoints fast-gun Maggie Shaw as Sheriff of Garstomb and Ashknife. With a team of hired hands wearing only case-work for side-arms, Maggie cleans up. Everyone's a good-guy in Garstomb now, and Ashknife's not far behind. The heat is on the Governor to make the rest of the State fit for decent folk, but Maggie has left town. Horu hires a fresh hand to take on Scouseville, a scene running with small-time desperados.

The mist is rolling over the bay as Tony Fowles, the loner, first hits Scouseville, his jerkin stiff with sweat and his horse good for nothing but the coyotes. He knows he's on a one-way ride as he takes in the sinister silence that hangs over the adobe huts of the settlement. The screens twitch as the hoboes sneak glimpses of the stranger. But Tony's no mean totter of the chi-squared shooter and the whole town waits . . .

Tony and the small band he rustled up leave town as the sun sets.

Their empty case-work canteens bump on their saddles and the dust of the desert stretches before them. Back at the saloon, the sins of Scouseville rage unchecked. In the capital, Horu grimaces. What will his inscrutable adversary Poa and the unpredictable Napo do next?

Margaret Shaw's *Social Work in Prison* (1974) showed, on evidence from Ashwell and Gartree, that intensifying the work of welfare departments in prisons could have a pay-off in reducing the recidivism of prisoners after release. The discovery of these beneficial effects was controversial and ran against the usual story that no amount of extra effort in penology made the slightest difference. Nevertheless, the service encouraged the development of exercises to extend the welfare work within prisons while Tony Fowles evaluated his research at Liverpool, carried out in 1973 and 1974. Put badly, his results show no benefit from lowered case-loads and more intensive work for welfare staff, at least as far as reconviction goes. This must blunt the enthusiasm which greeted Margaret Shaw's earlier work: "... extending the provision of social work on the level employed at Ashwell and Gartree, or Liverpool, to the whole of the prison population is not justifiable", says Fowles.

The Home Office Research Unit sees its job as research. Its reports carefully do not tangle themselves up with the policy implications of their work, though they do, very carefully, indicate the caution that is necessary in going from one set of research findings to another. In the case of this report, it is very short, very readable and very inexpensive. It is vital that everyone with an interest in the prisoner, the prison officer, and the probation officer should have every opportunity to read and argue about what the results mean for each and every prison. (It is preposterous for the report to say: "It is not intended that this account should contribute to the debate on the role of prison officers in prison welfare work . . .

As an account of a monitored 'experiment', the report is rather slight. There has to have been a great deal about setting up and running the exercise which has simply not been presented. The report raises the possibilities, too, that some groups among the prisoners may have benefitted (while others, presumably may have suffered), but it proved impossible to find any identifiable groups which had. Perhaps the most concrete finding was that, given more scope, welfare staff did make much more contact with prison staff, though the main avenue for action was still predominantly the outside probation officer. The report does

also show the very low level of contact between probation staff and prison staff in the orthodox welfare arrangement.

There are two major troubles with research in penology. The first is that the people concerned very seldom read it—often because it is indigestible. The second is that, by the time the research findings appear, the whole penal enterprise has moved on elsewhere. In the case of this research, there can be no reason for those concerned not to read it and react to it, bearing in mind that it refers to men in Liverpool serving between two and twelve months who did their time in the local. On the second point, it is true that we should no longer be looking to one-to-one casework between prisoner and welfare worker as the way to incorporate "care" into the prison—and this seems to be the way in which the experiment approached the welfare function. But, while the service weighs up what has happened in the "exercises" conducted at five selected prisons, and while it sorts out how it aims to follow these up, there should be an unprecedented demand for this pointed and timely offering from Tony Fowles.

MARK BEESON
University of Leeds

ALBANY

Albany: Birth of a Prison—End of an Era

ROY D. KING and KENNETH W. ELLIOTT

Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978, £8.25.

I should declare an interest from the outset, having worked at Albany when the research upon which this book is based began, and having kept in touch intermittently with the authors during the long and painful period when the work was being written up. I therefore have the advantage (if advantage it is) of first-hand knowledge of the task

the researchers set themselves and the disadvantage of selective memory and distortion through the passage of time.

This account of Albany's development from being a "caravan in a field" (a description fathered by Albany's first governor) to an "electronic coffin" (the less pastoral description offered by a prisoner) makes compelling reading. But it is rather more than a simple account of the growth and development of one new institution, treating as it does a whole range of issues of relevance to those who plan and administer penal institutions of all sorts.

The book is divided into four sections. The introductory section provides valuable comment on the style adopted by the research team and a review of earlier projects. The critique of the Morris' work is especially valuable.

The care taken by the researchers in establishing themselves at Albany is worth a special mention, since it is often alleged that the conclusions reached by academics are invalidated by their failure to understand and take account of the 'special circumstances' prevailing in penal establishments. King and Elliott offer a faithful description of the time and care they took in explaining what they were doing. But I think they took time and trouble far in excess of strictly professional requirements in establishing themselves and, perhaps more important

demonstrating a continuing interest in how the prison was developing. One hopes that the lessons will not be lost on those who follow them in this difficult area.

Part II is primarily concerned with pre-dispersal days. It was the honeymoon phase for Albany. The account certainly conveys the flavour of optimism mixed with the anxiety, tensions and struggles which were evident at the time. The early excitement and belief that we were engaged in a worthwhile breakthrough is properly tempered by a record of the fumbings and inadequacies which were also apparent. What is new for me in this section is the review of Home Office thinking about the regime to be developed, particularly the models code-named "Folkstone" and "Worksop". So far as I recall

this work was not available to staff at Albany. At one level, this now seems to have been an appalling omission: at another, it is a little reassuring in that it provides a corrective to the belief that frailty at the operational level was the only reason for lack of progress. Local struggles are thus put into a new perspective.

Part III traces the history from the first change of governor, which roughly coincided with the decision to disperse high-risk prisoners to several prisons, including Albany. But in addition, this part deals with issues at other levels. In essence, it is a story of the search for stability in circumstances hardly conducive to such a condition. At this time, the lines were being drawn for a wholesale shift in emphasis. Security was to be upgraded and radical changes were planned and implemented which affected the pattern of work for prisoners and styles of management. The attempt to combine realistic work and attend to prisoners' social training needs was abandoned. All this took place without the advantages of the earlier ideas having taken root. The whole enterprise rested on fairly insecure foundations. There was no institutional memory on which to draw. It is hardly surprising that the earlier enthusiasm and willingness to innovate were replaced by cynicism and pleas to return to what were regarded as sound, well established practices and procedures as followed in other places. This yearning for stability was articulated by staff and prisoners as a desire to "know where they stood".

All this will be familiar to those who have experienced working in newly opened establishments and in those institutions in which innovations have been attempted. But in the case of Albany, one is left wondering what might have been had there been less rapid change in so many key areas. What is exposed in this work is the fragility and lack of confidence in meeting new situations. One is left in no doubt not only that the honeymoon soon ended, but that the point of irretrievable breakdown had been reached.

The final section is the shortest and, in my view, the most contentious part of the book, dealing —among other things—with the revision of Rule I, dispersal policy, and research in prison. It really deserves separate and more detailed treatment in its own right. I doubt that many will quarrel with the need to rewrite Prison Rule I. What I think is doubtful is whether King and Elliott have provided a satisfactory answer.

I am not persuaded by their arguments for a reappraisal of the dispersal system and the new distinction between security and control risks. The proposals do not seem to differ markedly from present arrangements. Reposing hope in greater flexibility in transferring prisoners hardly seems an answer.

With so much of value to be taken from this book it may be churlish to offer further criticism. But I think comment is justified on two counts. First, I wonder whether in widening the scope of the book to include more of the theoretical framework of research,

and particularly adding the final section, the authors may have fallen between two stools. At one level, one might look for an account of a developing prison community and leave out the wider considerations. This is really arguing for a primer on what to do and what not to do in setting up a new prison. The book tends to dodge from the particular to the general in a way that makes the whole rather indigestible. Secondly, there is a danger that telescoped history is overpowering and may distort. Perhaps there is no way round this problem. Nevertheless, the impression is of an inexorable movement towards disaster. That is not how it seemed. Some ground was gained, some lost; some painful lessons were learned, some missed. At the end of the day, those intimately involved were concerned to salvage what they could from radical ideas which, with the advantages of hindsight, first saw the light of day at an inopportune time. There is really no need for the authors' disclaimer that they resisted the temptation to "write a sensational account of a notorious prison". The fact is that a straight recounting of events has something of the sensational about it. The experience for many who lived through all or part of the time covered by the research was undoubtedly brutalizing. Many were hurt in the process. Institutional and personal recovery after such experiences is slow and painful.

A. J. PEARSON
Governor, Gartree Prison

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

The New Law of Bail

BRIAN HARRIS
Barry Rose, 1978, £3.00.

This publication is in two distinct parts. The second half consists of the text of the *Bail Act 1976* and its schedules, interspersed with the author's notes. The first half begins with a brief description of the events preceding the *Act*, some of the controversy which has surrounded bail decisions in recent years, and the problems confronting a court when it takes such decisions. The major part of the author's work is a guide to the main provisions of the *Act*, illustrated by reference to court cases decided, inevitably, before the introduction of the new legislation. The guide concentrates on the exceptions to the general presumption in favour of bail, the factors to be considered by courts when taking bail decisions, the creation of the new offence of failing to surrender, the changed position regarding sureties and the new provisions for giving defendants reasons for bail decisions.

Harris states that, in his opinion, one of the *Act's* main achievements is "the laying down of clear reasons for the refusal of bail and the differentiation between these reasons and the evidence which may support them". Yet, when he describes the work carried out at Camberwell Green Magistrate's Court to

collect authenticated evidence about the background of defendants, he does not seem particularly sorry to conclude that "with a few notable exceptions . . . the Home Office encouragement of the Camberwell experiment seems to have fallen on barren ground". In the Leeds catchment area, this encouragement to courts to provide themselves with evidence on which to make bail decisions has fallen on *totally* barren ground, at least as far as the prison is concerned, and one assumes the same may be said of the courts. Even the work begun at Brixton Prison, largely in conjunction with Camberwell Green, has not expanded as was at one time expected. Harris says of Home Office circulars that "like the elderly they suffer from poor circulation" but he also describes some of the difficulties in implementing the 1974 circular on bail.

For offences punishable with imprisonment, the court may refuse bail where there are substantial grounds for believing that the defendant will fail to surrender, commit further offences or obstruct the course of justice. Although police sources voice increasing concern about the commission of further offences on bail, the main reason for denying it is to ensure the presence of the accused at the next hearing. Harris comments that "where the only objection to bail is fear of absconding there should be few cases indeed where the court cannot by calling for adequate and sufficient sureties and by imposing suitable requirements ensure the attendance of the accused." At first sight, this seems a rather startling proposition, even if it is restricted to cases where absconding alone is feared and even though "few cases indeed" gives no idea of the actual proportion of cases in the author's mind. If the courts are equally confident, there may yet be further declines in the remand population.

Harris makes no reference to the controversy about the differing success rates of applications for Judge in Chambers bail when they are privately financed and when they are made through the Official Solicitor. The *Bail Act* does not explicitly deal with this procedure and, if the *Act* results in more bail being granted by magistrates and the Crown Court, the matter may become of less importance. Nevertheless, one of the difficulties faced by defendants who apply through the Official Solicitor is that they customarily make their representations without knowledge of the prosecution's objections to their release on bail. Harris sums up part of the new legislation as follows: "In order to enable a defendant to consider making an application in the matter of bail to another court the court (but not the police) must give to any defendant enjoying the general right to bail its reasons for withholding bail or for imposing conditions of bail or for varying or adding conditions of bail". That at least is a beginning, although the prosecution's objections to bail given to a Judge in Chambers may not be the same as those given to and accepted by another court.

Among other misprints in the

Act and its Schedules, there is an extraordinary addition to Section 5 (4) on page 33 which causes the *Act* to state that a note of the decisions described in the quotation above should be given by a court only "where that person is represented by counsel". An aspect of the *Act* which is not commented on by the author, but which is relevant to prison administration is that, even where the court does grant bail, a copy of the record is given to the defendant only if he requests it. If he then goes into custody to await the obtaining of sureties, there is nothing in the *Act* requiring him to be informed of the details of the court's decision, which may not be put into effect until days or weeks later.

Section 11 (5) of the *Bail Act* deals with cases "where a person who is to be sentenced or dealt with for an offence by a magistrates' court or the Crown Court is to be kept in custody to enable enquiries or a report to be made to assist the court in sentencing or dealing with him for the offence". In such cases it is, in the author's words, "mandatory, subject to means, to grant any application for legal aid". Harris also states that Section 11 (6) "makes it clear that the new mandatory conditions of grants (subs. (4) and (5)) do not require the court to . . . make a full legal aid order as distinct from a legal aid order limited to bail purposes". Reluctant though one is as a layman to comment, this interpretation seems contrary to what is said in other parts of the *Act* and Section 11 (6) itself. If the author is correct, however, does this open the door in very limited circumstances to legally aided Judge in Chambers applications?

Another curious interpretation is made by the author on page 21 where he states: "If anyone other than the court refuses to accept a surety, he may apply to the court which fixed bail, or to any other magistrates' court for the same petty sessions area". The *Act* itself (Section 8 (5)) appears to say quite clearly, "the surety may apply to . . . a magistrates' court for the petty sessions area in which he resides". This is quite different.

It is difficult to know whether this publication is good value for money. For most practical purposes, it is likely to serve the limited needs of prison staff admirably. However, we are more inclined to be interested in whether the "new law of bail" reduces the prison population or, for example, what a solicitor's responsibilities are to his client who has bail but is still in custody because he is without sureties.

DEREK TWINER
Deputy Governor
Leeds Prison

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A Review of Criminal Justice Policy 1976

Home Office Working Paper
1977, £1.25.

This review was prepared by the Home Office Crime Policy Planning organisation to assist in the development of criminal justice

policy. It traces the development of these policies since 1966; sets them in a strategic pattern; examines the assumptions upon which policy rested; and considers to what extent these assumptions remain valid for the future. It acts both as a means of taking stock and of looking ahead.

In part I, the general objectives and particular preoccupations which have shaped the development of policy during the decade ending 1976 are listed with a refreshing clarity. It is particularly interesting to see the objectives of the prison system in the context of the wider criminal justice policy. Part I also contains a useful summary of the statistical material presented in the Annexes. This highlights that whilst it has been the policy to reduce the prison population by increased use of non-custodial sentences, the proportion of sentences to probation (and since the *Children and Young Persons Act 1969*, to supervision) has fallen markedly during the decade. The proportionate use of custodial sentences for persons age 17 and over has also fallen, but to a lesser degree. The proportionate use of borstal training and detention centres for those under 17 has, however, risen over 150 per cent. This may suggest that the new non-custodial sentences are being used by the courts mainly to replace old non-custodial sentences, rather than as alternatives to custody.

Part II contains a short review of the achievements of the criminal justice agencies during the decade. Realistically, these are very limited given that recorded indictable crime almost doubled during the period. The report may be clutching at straws when its major claims are that a reasonable level of public confidence in the system has been maintained and that no part of the system has actually broken down. The continuing rise in the prison population, despite an increased number of alternatives, is a matter of obvious concern. Suggestions for treatment, however, seem to be directed at the symptoms rather than the cause of the condition. Increased use of parole, reducing sentences and increasing remission tend to be palliative rather than curative.

Perhaps the most enjoyable section of the paper—enabling one to indulge in nostalgia and also gain a useful perspective—is Annex A, which gives a year-by-year review of the period 1966-1976. Under the sub-headings Legislation, Police, Prison Service, Parole, Probation, and Miscellaneous, it traces the changes which occurred during each year. Whilst one accepts that change is often necessary and sometimes even beneficial, one wonders how a sense of direction can be maintained when so many changes appear as a result of political expediency rather than related to long-term policy.

It is rare that I can recommend a publication to all our readers, but anyone interested enough to read the *Journal* will also find something of interest in *A Review of Criminal Justice Policy 1976*.

RAY MITCHELL
Prison Service College
Wakefield

International Exchange of Information on Current Criminological Projects in Member States

Council of Europe, 1978

About 350 pages, detailing current research work throughout Europe, fifty of them devoted to the U.K. These refer to work ranging from touchy questions like the involvement of ethnic minorities in crime, to hardy perennials like media violence, football hooliganism and mugging. The prize for quaintness goes to Greece whose correspondents believe that "it is very difficult . . . for a young man to keep his temperance when he receives the terrible pressure of the libido, brought by the obscene and pornographic publications". The translations often drive one cross-eyed, but it is useful to know where to find a note of what researchers are about.

M.B.

Criminological Aspects of Economic Crime: Collected Studies in Criminological Research Vol. XV

Council of Europe, 1978

A run-down by three writers on cartels, the abuse of grant funds, computer crime and swindling insurance companies, fraud of various kinds, and other business rackets. The sorts of crime considered are "those which . . . attenuate the confidence of the public in the honesty of commercial practices". Georges Kellens' paper is the most colourful, giving lots of examples. Although it is encouraging to see this sort of crime getting attention, the report will only interest the specialist.

M.B.

Representation in The Juvenile Court

RICHARD ANDERSON

Routledge and Kegan Paul
1978, £2.95

Richard Anderson traces the history of juvenile justice from the 1854 *Reformatory Schools Act* up to the *Children and Young Persons Act 1969*, indicating the change of attitude towards juvenile crime in the recognition that deprivation and delinquency have little or no difference, when one examines the character and needs of the child. From the Ingleby Report of 1960 and the White Paper, "The Child, The Family and the Young Offender," issued by the Labour Government in 1965, came strong proposals that courts should move away from their traditional legal role and should be more concerned and have regard to the welfare of the child. This concept was to be embodied in Family Councils which would deal with all cases involving offences as well as with children under 16 years in need of care and protection. Although the emphasis of the *Children and Young Persons*

Act 1969 moved towards 'care', the Juvenile Court system has been maintained. Thus the juvenile justice system operates with two varying views: a court of criminal jurisdiction, a formal legal structure acting as an agent of social control and, at the same time, a welfare agency, looking at the interests of the individual.

It is against this background that the author attempts to give specific meaning to the concept of representation and examines the practical effects of this by focusing his study on two courts with widely differing interpretations of role and function.

He describes the physical environment and organisation of "Court A", which sees itself as exercising criminal jurisdiction and is therefore formal, concerned with impartiality, orientated towards deciding on matters of fact and, consequently, concentrates on the protection of society, the control of crime and its deterrence. This court is in a building which deals with adult cases four days per week and its layout is consistent with a formal setting. In contrast, "Court B", which identifies itself as having the welfare of the child as its priority, is in a building specifically designed for juvenile work. The layout is far more informal with desks and chairs strategically placed so that those participating in the hearing can hear and understand what is going on.

The activities of social workers and probation officers are examined against the differing philosophies of the two courts. The compilation of Social Enquiry Reports which are designed to meet the requirements of the two separate regimes show distinct differences in their emphasis. In "Court A", the purpose of the Social Enquiry Report is seen as providing the court with background information which is relevant to the court's assessment of his culpability—"culpability here may be taken to mean the degree to which he was involved in the committing of a deliberate offence of which he is guilty in law, or the extent to which factors in his background and personality which may be taken as diminishing his responsibility for that act".

The contrast with "Court B" is striking. In the words of a magistrate: "I am expecting a report to be written in the terms of understanding: family dynamics, family pressures can highlight the problems which have arisen within the family and therefore draw out of that, in the context, the reasons why that kid is where he is, in front of us that day".

It is, therefore, not unnatural to expect, since there are these variances in the two courts studied, that the role of the social worker (more acceptable and seen as important in "Court B") is in direct relation to the importance attached to the solicitor in "Court A". Examples of these distinctions are given which amply demonstrate the ambiguity of the whole juvenile system and make for the frustration which both the legal and social work professions encounter within it.

For those with limited contact with the juvenile court, I feel the

book ably compares two very different juvenile courts; but for those who have had experience of various juvenile courts in differing parts of the country, I am sure the points highlighted regarding inconsistency are only too obvious.

GEOFF HALE
Operations Services Officer
Department of Social Services
Leeds

Women, Sexuality and Social Control

EDITED BY CAROL & BARRY SMART

Routledge and Kegan Paul
1978, £2.95.

International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology

Volume 21 Number 3

Association for Psychiatric
Treatment of Offenders, 1977

Both of these works represent a welcome addition to a sorely under researched area in the behavioural sciences. With the growth of the Women's Movement and the accompanying popularity of writers such as Freiden and Morgan, attention has been drawn to the paucity of research conducted into such topics as female deviancy and criminality. As Oakley points out in her book, *The Sociology of Housework* half the population is conspicuous by its absence in virtually all social research models. The feminine facet has too often been dismissed as merely a complication factor, particularly in the areas of deviancy and criminality, where numerically women figure very little. In recent years, however, attention has been focused not only on this area of academic neglect, but also on the whole way that the 'female condition' has been defined and examined in the past—by male researchers.

The book of readings, *Women, Sexuality and Social Control*, is written in this highly critical style. In the introductory paper, Carol Smart sets out the primary aim as that of concentrating on "such neglected topics as the position, status and treatment of women and girls in the areas of crime, delinquency, sexual promiscuity and prostitution and the discriminatory practices of the law and of the legal and medical professions".

Most of the papers are written from British research which is a pleasant change from the mainly American work in this area. Two papers are from Norway, where the almost total sexual equality is reflected in a greater overall awareness of the feminine perspective. Dahl and Snare use the concept of privacy in order to better understand "women's" low participation in criminal life" and so draw attention to the way that the common denominator of most hypotheses on women's low criminality is the concern with sex, rather than with the socio-economic sex-specified differences which are at the root of the problem.

My major complaint about this book is that of style. Like so many

other feminist and/or sociological texts, much of the writing is 'jargonized' with long and complicated sentences which add little to the overall analysis. I can only urge perseverance as each paper has a contribution to make towards a broader understanding of the social mechanisms employed towards women. I particularly recommend Mary McIntosh on "Who Needs Prostitutes?" and Lesley Shacklady Smith on "Sexist Assumptions and Female Delinquency".

This edition of the *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* concentrates on female criminals and women victims but is of a totally different style to that of the Smart book. It is a much more orthodox (some might say complacent) view of female deviancy. The style is much more straightforward and, although it is an American journal, the papers collected in it come from all parts of the world.

After reading *Women, Sexuality and Social Control*, I found the journal papers rather superficial in their analysis of research material, with the exception of Bauernmaster's wide ranging paper on "Rapists' Victims and Society". In the main, I found little to excite my interest or enthusiasm and was annoyed to discover that some papers were quite old, "Trends of Juvenile Delinquency in Greece" having been written in 1974. It does, however, provide an excellent model of traditional approach to female deviancy criticized by Smart as concentrating exclusively on sexual characteristics of a biological or psychological nature and highlights the need for more research and analysis along the lines of the Smarts' edited papers.

SUZANNE ANTHONY
Assistant Governor
Syal Prison

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Salford's Prison

Edited by TONY FRANKLAND
Salford Local History Society
1978, 30p.

This booklet, based on an Inspector's report of 1836, contains a succinct description of conditions in the New Bailey of that period. Cells, food, labour, and punishments are amongst the topics described. Despite its brevity, there is a wealth of detailed information in the booklet. For instance, included in the information on food, is the fact that "stew for the males is made with one cow's head for every twenty, seasoned with pepper and salt; the stew for the women is made with one cow's head for every forty".

Internal discipline was based on the 'silent system', a regime demanding absolute silence between prisoners, the breaking of which resulted in punishment. However, the Inspector complains that the system, which was widely advocated in the first half of the nineteenth century, was not operating effectively in the New Bailey. As reasons, he highlights inadequate supervision

by staff and the inadequacies of the building itself. He concludes with a list of recommendations, aimed at enabling a more successful operation of the 'silent system'.

Also included is a plan of the prison, and interestingly, a complete list of staff and their annual incomes. The Governor received £550 together with "House, coals &c.", whilst the female turnkeys received £46.10s. and "House, furniture &c."

There is a growing interest in the history of the prison system and, hopefully, this publication might encourage other history societies to publish material they possess on their local prisons. In this particular booklet, the reader is given a great deal of insight into the daily life of an old prison, and into the type of regime which was finally abandoned throughout the country later in the century.

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

In the Clink

E. J. BURFORD

New English Library, 1977, £4.95.

The Clink prison was situated in Southwark for six hundred years, and is still remembered as a slang term for prisons. Southwark enjoyed a great deal of independence from the neighbouring City of London, and was in the diocese of the Bishop of Winchester. One result of this independence was that brothels flourished in the area, and the Clink was originally opened in the twelfth century to imprison unruly prostitutes and pimps, besides the other vagabonds which the area naturally attracted. To have simply closed the brothels would have meant the Church losing a considerable amount of money in rents, and the debt that the professional ladies who worked in them owed the Bishops of Winchester can be gauged from the fact that, for centuries, prostitutes were often known as "Winchester Geese". In the book, Burford traces the history of the Clink from this period until it was finally burnt down at the end of the eighteenth century.

The Clink withstood the tests of time, revolution and civil war, and its history makes very interesting reading. The barbaric practices of the medieval prison system and the appalling conditions of the Elizabethan prisons and of later centuries, when a prisoner's standard of treatment (which might have meant the difference between life and death) depended upon how much money he could pay the gaolers, are discussed by Burford. Some of the important events in prison history, including the introduction of imprisonment for debtors in 1352 are also described. Amongst other topics discussed, is the first use on a large scale of imprisonment for prisoners of conscience, in the second half of the sixteenth century. Initially, the Clink was one of the prisons used by Queen Mary to hold protestants, only to be chosen a little later by Queen Elizabeth as one of the prisons to detain the Catholics who resisted England's move away from the Church of

Rome. Throughout its history, however, a major section of the Clink's inmates continued to be whores and, as there was no segregation of prisoners, prostitution was rife within its walls. Drinking and gambling were also commonplace, and it was not unusual for orgies to take place. As these forms of inmate association would mean a large number of fees for the gaolers, they usually went unchecked. By the eighteenth century, the Clink was in a state of some decline. By 1732 there were only two inmates confined in the Clink. It was finally burnt down in the riots of 1780, by which time it had become a ramshackle building.

Of the Clink itself, little written material has survived, but Burford makes good use of that which does exist. His history of the Clink is augmented by contemporary descriptions of other prisons and punishments. The result is an interesting although sometimes rather sketchy commentary on the Clink and six centuries of prison history.

MARTIN BAGGOLEY
Probation Officer
Salford

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

The Barbican Centre Now...

Gloucestershire Probation and After-Care Service
1978, 25p.

The Barbican Centre—a day centre in Gloucester for ex-offenders and other adults—was featured in an article in the *Prison Service Journal* for July 1977. This progress report on the project, obtainable from 1a Barbican Road, Gloucester, is extremely readable. Anyone who has visited the Centre several times can vouch that it reflects the lively atmosphere of the whole venture and that even the pamphlet puts the Centre's philosophy into practice by letting everyone be responsible for his own contribution. Each section therefore is by that staff member who is involved in the workshop, crafts and education (including literacy and numeracy schemes), administration, career counselling, social club, playgroup, meeting and encouraging members, and the co-ordination of the project, and is rounded off by offerings from the members themselves. The report includes photographs, appendices showing usage of the Centre, and, above all, evidence of the enthusiasm and involvement surrounding the project.

R. E.

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Biosocial Bases of Criminal Behaviour

Edited by SARNOFF MEDNICK and KARL O. CHRISTIANSEN
Gardner Press, 1977, £16.20

The arrival of this book on my desk had me leaping in excitement: Sarnoff Mednick and (the late) Karl Christiansen are respected criminological researchers, well able, as the dust-cover promises, to tell us how "neurophysiological and genetic factors can help us to understand better the role of the family

and society in the learning of anti-social behaviour". At last, in one place, here are the valuable researches based on the Danish population registers which allow one to follow up complete cohorts of the general population with a thoroughness which does not seem to be possible in any other country of the world.

The book opens with Mednick outlining his theory of criminality. He argues that we start to become law-abiding through being punished for bad behaviour. This punishment results in a feeling of fear when we are anticipating an offensive act. But if that act is inhibited, the dissipation of that fear constitutes an immediate reward for toeing the line. How powerful this reward is in controlling our behaviour will depend upon our training, our fear response and our ability both to anticipate fear and to dissipate it quickly after we have stopped being offensive. The book is devoted to substantiating this position which is right in line with current 'passive avoidance' orthodoxy. So it is surprising to find little mention of similar theoretical proposals: Mednick's emphasis on both the interaction of learning and inheritable characteristics and the link between criminality and maternal psychiatric disorder suggests, to a British reader, a possible overlap with Eysenck whose theory (mysteriously, since the two men know each other) is not mentioned. Perhaps this is because Mednick's theory is something of an afterthought and the real concern of this book is with heritability studies. Thus, while many readers may find the chapters on psychophysiology interesting, these will, and should, take second place to the chapters on inheritance.

The scene is set gently by Christiansen in an able review of studies of twins. As everyone knows, these invariably show that identical twins follow each other into crime, especially serious crime (or Schizophrenia, or alcoholism or academic distinction) more frequently than do non-identical twins who are genetically no more similar than two brothers. The argument is that because two genetically identical people more often show similar behavioural characteristics, then genetics must be, in part, determining behaviour. What is not so widely appreciated is that few of the so-called "objections" to twin studies have stood up to research and that twin studies are still regarded as methodologically sound. But adoption studies, which allow one to separate 'nature' and 'nurture', are even more powerful. Using them in conjunction with the Danish police and population registers, Hutchings and Mednick demonstrate that whether or not a child adopted at birth becomes convicted of an offence depends not merely on his adoptive father's life of crime, but also on whether his biological father fell foul of the courts. There can be little doubt that this is a real genetic effect which is shown to hold even when the child is adopted away before his father started being convicted. Although this result is, of course, entirely consistent with what twin studies have been telling us for

half a century, it is still criminologically stunning. But Hutchings and Mednick, with commendable research thoroughness, do not rush us to conclusions. We are reminded about the low overall levels of prediction, that nobody is claiming that all crime is genetically pre-determined, that we are more likely to be able to see genetic effects in leafy Denmark than downtown Detroit, where there could be said to be extensive environmental impact, and that there are residual scientific difficulties with the new technology of adoption studies.

But these results, and others like them in this book, will breathe much-needed new life into psychophysiological studies of criminality. Just what is it that is inherited? Might not *this* factor provide some general explanation of offending? Much of the rest of the book is devoted to this.

Now for the bad news. Apart from the chapters I have mentioned, there are few bright spots and too many previously-published articles strung together with too little editorial attention. Some of the chapters seem irrelevant: others, like the study of XYY and XXY men by Witkin *et al.* seem criminologically naive. How do we treat the view that XYY men are more criminal because of their lower I Q rather than because of their propensity to violence when the rationale of linking I Q and crime is so unclear?

For these reasons, and because of the form, style and presentation, this book is unsuitable for the general reader. Specialists will also find it unnecessarily hard-going but will have to lump it in order to gain access to some of the most criminologically crucial research for some time. Do the data support Mednick's theory? Yes, but then I suspect that they support most psychophysiological-based theories of anti-social behaviour, including Eysenck's. And those who argue that individual differences are irrelevant to understanding crime will have to work harder for a living in future.

HUGH MARRIAGE
Principal Psychologist
South East Regional Office

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Health Problems in the Prison Setting

LLOYD F. NOVICK and
MOHAMED S. AL-IBRAHIM
Charles C. Thomas, 1977, \$14.

I found this a very readable book although it will be of limited value in this country where we have long enjoyed a Prison Medical Service employing full-time medical officers, part-time and sessionally-employed doctors in various disciplines, all linked to the full facilities of the National Health Service, and supported by highly skilled hospital officers and nurses. One cannot help but reflect the wisdom of our forefathers for having expressed in the Prison Rules such sentiments as "... Every prisoner shall have a Governor, a Chaplain and a Medical Officer ..." and "... The

Medical Officer shall have the care, physical and mental, of every prisoner ...".

Section I of the book is directed towards the health needs of prisoners and readers may be led to suppose there is a difference in the health needs of prisoners and the community at large. I believe the authors were attempting to draw attention to the peculiar problems associated with those whose liberty is temporarily curtailed but, unfortunately, the second section of the book which is a catalogue of medical conditions from which prisoners may suffer serves only to support this wrong impression.

There is little doubt that a person in prison may be subjected to a variety of psychological pressures of varying intensity and duration not normally encountered in the community and these must be recognised. The principle of primary health care, however, is always the same.

It is evident that on both sides of the Atlantic, prison doctors are experiencing an increasing degree of resistance from outside hospitals to the temporary admission of prisoners requiring mental health care, and the authors rightly draw attention to the fact that many outside physicians are just not aware of the facilities available and problems facing prison doctors.

The main criticism of this book is that a substantial part of it is devoted to the description, aetiology, recognition and treatment of medical conditions found in prisoners which, of course, are exactly the same as those found in patients the world over, and well known to every practising physician. Since the problems of prisoners are closely related to violence, drug abuse and psychiatric difficulties, I would like to have seen far more from the field of forensic psychiatry and its role in the total pattern of pre-trial assessment, custodial management, rehabilitation and the provision of an after-care network.

Those involved in our penal system will find the book interesting if only to understand the problems facing our American colleagues in delivering a health care service where the basic system of community health care is so different from ours, where at the present time 16 per cent of jails have no internal medical facilities, and 66 per cent have only first aid facilities. Add to this the administrative fragmentation of the American correctional system, and the magnitude of the problem emerges.

DR. R. C. INGLEY-SENN
Assistant Director
Directorate of Prison Medical Services

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Forensic Medicine: A Study in Trauma and Environmental Hazards Volumes I, II & III

Edited by C. G. TEDESCHI, WILLIAM G. ECKERT and LUKE G. TEDESCHI
Holt-Saunders, 1977, £65.00.

Forensic medicine may be defined as the application within juris-

prudence of medical knowledge and the findings of its underlying sciences to the solution of questions of law. This massive, three-volume work, therefore, brings together the professions of medicine and law; acting as a bridge between two disciplines resting on the foundation of theoretical principles deduced from practice or observation and pursuing in parallel paths the same goal—the search for truth and the amendment of grievance.

The book contains contributions from the world's top physicians, surgeons, lawyers and forensic pathologists and covers all kinds of problems arising from the study of victims of trauma and hazards. The medical and legal implications of the topics studied are given equal treatment and the text is supported by hundreds of photographs and diagrams.

In these days of increased litigation, many Governors have discovered an increasing need for an awareness of the law. This book has a contribution to make as a reference in such topical areas as self-inflicted wounds, the battered child, bombs and explosives, drug abuse, sex crimes and murder.

R.M.

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

The Rise and Fall of the British Manager

ALISTAIR MANT
MacMillan Press, 1977, £5.95.

In this book, Alistair Mant has succeeded magnificently in setting himself up as the anti-hero of the management theorists. But this ought to be a review of the book and not of the author, so where do we begin? With the title, I suppose—it's as good a place as any: *The Rise and Fall of the British Manager*. Did he fall or was he pushed?, I asked myself. "When did he rise? I must have been looking the other way", says the bloke looking over my shoulder. What has happened to the much-pilloried British manager? Mant says that at least part of the blame can be laid at the doors of the management gurus of the past 20 or so years.

Whatever one feels about Herzberg, however, the wholesale and even slavish adherence to the then current management orthodoxy was a mark of the mid-60's to mid-70's manager. Things have changed quite dramatically since then; the dream has turned into a nightmare from which it seems impossible to escape. But what did go wrong? Why did so many good intentions fail? The answer that Mant would suggest is very simple. Managers have, by and large, forgotten that their prime job is to run things properly. Managers have too often tried to escape from the uncomfortable real world so that they

can "look at the broad picture" or "stand at the boundary". As most of us *really* know the detail of management is critically important. Managers have to care for the mucky details as well as having an idea of the overall plan, and that is as important in running prisons as it is in making raincoats. "I know that the only really successful managers I have met manage to do both—to keep an eye on the big things that count, while paying meticulous attention to the little things that count as well", Mant asserts.

Where did the flight from concern with detail start? Mant suggests that Francis Drake was the culprit. Drake made good by criminal activity (buccaneering), gave gifts to the rich (Queen Elizabeth), and was subsequently ennobled (that his end was unfortunate is overlooked). Drake must take the blame for teaching the nation that nothing can be done through the system and that it was OK for piracy to be rewarded by a place in the squirearchy. Applied to modern organisations, Drake's approach means that the real world of the prison is cynically left behind in favour of 'ivory tower' jobs. The *real* sorrow here, of course, is not for the managers who do this but for those who are left behind doing the dirty work, and for those who come after them and *do* try to get involved in running things properly. The 'dirty workers' have been for so long without real attention from senior staff that there is not much credit left in that particular bank for a real working manager.

After spending some time on a more academic approach to his ideas, Mant goes on to elaborate on a chilling analysis of why workers in Britain, almost uniquely in Europe, see themselves as fighting management rather than joining with management in the fight against others. And who are the others? For business; the competition. For prisons; well, your answer to that will show on what side of the game you are.

This takes us half-way into the book and the remainder could be left unread without much loss. Mant uses the second half of the book merely to elaborate the basic thesis.

I'll end with the closing sentence of the book: "... we (do not) accept, on the whole, that we exist in a crisis of LEADERSHIP and that management has something to do with leadership, however difficult it may be to prove".

Now, haven't I heard something like that before, although a long while ago?

MIKE GANDER
Assistant Governor
Wakefield Prison

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Staff Appraisal and Development

EDGAR ANSTEY, CLIVE FLETCHER and JAMES WALKER
George Allen & Unwin, 1977, £8.75.

This book reports the research into appraisal undertaken by various

departments of the British Civil Service in the years following the publication of the Fulton Report and the acceptance of its recommendations.

Extensive literature describing established methodologies in commerce, industry and the armed forces has been available to the Civil Service Department. Happily, it would seem that the criticisms often levelled at us that we tend to lag behind established practice in the industrial and commercial field for once seems to be in our favour. We have been able to introduce some of the more tried and unquestionable benefits of a personnel package while discarding, or at least closely questioning, those aspects that have caused problems in organisations with greater experience of appraisal techniques.

I would recommend this book to anyone anxious to broaden his knowledge of the appraisal process in order to increase his effectiveness as a manager. Perhaps its greatest benefit is that it goes some way to answering the sort of questions that were raised during the experimental year of Job Appraisal Review in the Prison Department in 1971.

As a committed trainer and one particularly involved in JAR and ACR training over an extensive period, I firmly believe that the provisions of HO Notice 155/1975 embodying annual staff reports, job discussions and career interviews have laid a solid foundation for future personnel policy and practice. Without a commitment to further development of personnel techniques (particularly those inspired at local level and backed by top management), however, these procedures can become largely automatic, lacking the depth of feeling and care that measurement of precious human commodities requires.

GEOFFREY MORRALL
Deputy Governor
Preston Prison

How to Pass Examinations (Third Edition)

JOHN ERASMUS
Oriel Press, 1978, 75p.

This booklet gives good advice for students and parents, though it should have been entitled "How to Study" because it covers more than just examination techniques. The information, particularly related to examinations, could have been much shorter and more digestible. The book, however, should have contained at least a short section on multiple choice question papers. More and more examining bodies are including this type of question paper and students would benefit from guidance in this field. The book is well written, easy to read and is worth the money.

W. J. BROOKS
Education Officer
Wakefield Prison

Victorian Murderesses

MARY S. HARTMAN
Robson Books, 1977, £5.25.

I groaned at the thought of reviewing yet another book written from a "feminist" viewpoint, but I was to be pleasantly surprised. *Victorian Murderesses* is a well-researched study of thirteen nineteenth-century French and English women accused of sensational murders, or of being accomplices in murder. All were from 'respectable' middle-class backgrounds, yet all succumbed to pressures which resulted in death for their victims. Two of the deceased were suffocated, one died of a fractured skull, two were shot, another received knife wounds, and the remainder met their death by poison.

Most of the accused women were probably guilty as charged, although only six were convicted and none were made to suffer the death penalty. Furthermore, five of the six who went to prison were freed before their full sentences were served. Six of the seven others were acquitted and the thirteenth was never brought to trial. It is concluded that in the 1800's women were literally getting away with murder.

Two points relevant to the present are immediately obvious. For those in the Prison Service who have worked or are working with females convicted of murder, there are many analogies to be drawn from the backgrounds of these women to those of murderesses today. Secondly, the current judicial treatment of female murderers, in particular the length of time they serve in prison compared with their male counterparts, indicates that little has changed since the nineteenth century. The frightening fact is that, in many ways, Mary Hartman's subjects are quite unexceptional people.

This book, however, is more than a simple historical account of a number of cases. It is an attempt to look at these offences and offenders within the social context of the societies in which they lived and it is an exploration of the way reactions to those crimes changed during the period under study. The author looks beyond the immediately known facts about the cases and addresses herself to the question of how the accused were treated. There were favours shown, but this had more to do with society's attitudes to women than to judgements based purely on the alleged facts and evidence.

The feminist viewpoint is clearly in evidence but has not been communicated by irksome phraseology which is so often the hallmark of much current "feminist" writings. The author's researches clearly show grounds for taking the view she has about nineteenth century women.

The thirteen women were not "freaks" or active campaigners for changing chauvinism, but they each in their own way broke through by their homicidal actions, the legal and social inferiority in which they and their peers found themselves. They experienced the same problems as other women but, unlike the majority, they seemed incapable of adjusting to developments which

were taking place and could not cope with their immediate difficulties amidst a climate of changing female aspirations.

The first two cases illustrate the problem of middle-class society's expectations and the conflict engendered when a woman's aspirations were not in tune with their expectations. Marie Lafarge and Euphémie Lacoste both murdered their husbands. Marie's psychological problems are shown to be a result of the "repressed" female situation. Both women were expected to play roles which were frustrating their personal feminist hopes. The heavy parental influence in bourgeois marriages led both these women into personal disaster.

The limits of a review prevent the details of each case being discussed but they are fascinating and the book is very interesting. If, like me, you are easily bored and disenchanted by erudite psychological volumes and find many books too "mind-taxing" for leisure reading, then this book is refreshingly different. Historical matters have never been a favourite part of my personal reading, yet Mary Hartman's researches and style of writing make pleasurable reading. The book may be too expensive for individual purchase, but it is worth obtaining from a library and will not take too long to read.

J. M. FOWLER
Assistant Governor
Styal Prison

The Rules of Disorder

PETER MARSH, ELIZABETH ROSSER, and ROM HARRÉ
Routledge and Kegan Paul
1978, £4.95.

In recent years there has been an increase in violence and disorder in the classroom and on the terraces of football grounds and there has been a need for an up-to-date book on the subject. This book attempts to fill that gap. It makes interesting reading; psychologists and sociologists, police and prison staff will find it a useful source of reference.

The authors challenge the old concepts of disorder and violence and offer a new interpretation directed towards the classroom and football terraces. The main theme is that violence associated with these places suggests that young people see their social life as a struggle for personal dignity. In the absence of any existing order to which they can adhere, young people construct their own forms, rituals and hierarchies to which they can relate and which give them status and dignity. It is essential to read and understand the first chapter, "Themes and Anticipations", which explains the various theories of behaviour. I found this chapter 'hard reading', but essential to grasp the theme of the work.

The second and third chapters explore disorder in the classroom and on the football terraces. Data is derived mainly from conversations at a local youth club and from participant observation study at Oxford United. Data from other grounds has been included to show

that Oxford United is not an untypical case.

Chapter four, "The Interpretation and Control of Action" examines the meaning of rules and their interpretation by football fans. This is an important chapter which explains the meanings of actions. Football fans have a clear idea of how they think police and other officials at football games should behave—they have rules for the actions of others as well as themselves—and interpret some actions on the part of officials as being breaches of propriety.

The authors have not sought to excuse the football fan or the classroom troublemaker. From the theoretical viewpoint, one can accept this statement, but I doubt that members of society who are on the receiving end of the misbehaviour—damage, violence and unnecessary destruction—will be convinced.

WILLIAM LINCOLN
Chief Officer
Lowdham Grange Borstal

Violence and Aggression

RONALD H. BAILEY
Time/Life Books, 1977.

This book is the tenth in a series described on the fly-sheet as, "... a penetrating study about people. Specifically written for the layman ...". This volume is rarely penetrating, however, and one is left with the impression of a readable, "coffee-table" book for the less than critical layman.

The book reviews a wide range of issues from the arguments of Freud and Lorenz who claim that aggression is "instinctive", to those social psychologists who claim that learning plays an important part in aggressive behaviour. The ways in which violence may be triggered and the effects on aggressive and violent behaviours of belonging to a group are also reviewed. In the final chapter, the book pays attention to ways in which aggression and violence could be controlled; concluding optimistically that "aggression is not beyond human control".

The author, Ronald Bailey, is a journalist and, although his approach to the subject is highly readable, his style is of the traditional "Life" magazine genre, with lavish illustrations and chapter headings which read like tabloid newspaper headlines (e.g. "Muzzling the Menace", and "The Urge to Hurt"). As an introduction to the rather complex problem of aggression and aggressive behaviour, the approach is often over-simplified.

As a consequence of writing such a book for the "layman", much of the research reviewed is dealt with only superficially and it is interspersed with "pseudo-scientific" analyses of violence in the forms of football hooliganism, Vietnam, Northern Ireland, TV and cinema violence. There is, therefore, no consistent thread of argument to this book which is merely a review of a wide range of examples of aggression and violence. What

little critical argument there is, is broken up by the illustrations which, although of high standard and often quite disturbing examples of "man's inhumanity to man", all too frequently add little to the text.

For the Prison Service reader, there is nothing new here although the last chapter does deal briefly with one attempt at rehabilitation of highly aggressive delinquents in Florida by "re-channelling" their aggression. However, there will be no answers for those seeking to understand the upsurge of aggressive behaviour in prisons in recent years.

I would recommend this book for those interested in light non-critical reading as it does cover quite a wide range of ideas in the field of human aggression and is likely to provoke some interest. For the more critical reader, however, I would recommend that he turns to the bibliography (which is not adequately referenced in the text) and starts with one of the books on that list.

C. J. DONEGAN
Senior Psychologist
Prison Service College, Wakefield

Web of Violence

JEAN RENVOIZE
Routledge and Kegan Paul
1978, £4.95.

In her book, Jean Renvoize considers many aspects of the physical violence inflicted by members of families upon each other. The violence is physical but the results illustrated are often emotional and psychological.

The opening of the book, an account of a girl who has experienced the results of four generations of family violence introduces the reader in a stark and vivid way to the aspects of violence which are discussed more fully later. Further chapters deal with battered wives, children, refugees, granny bashing, baby battering and incest. In each area, the problem is illustrated, available research and work currently being done is described, and the writer then indicates a way forward. Although such subjects make depressing reading, it is clear that much is being done.

I found the chapter on 'Refuge' of particular interest. Here are described ways in which different agencies have set about trying to alleviate the plight of those who for one reason or another have had to leave the family home in which violence has taken place; at present, these are normally battered wives and their children. While the emphasis is on the victim, the fate of the assailant also receives attention.

For those of us working in the custodial setting, there is little guidance or optimism. As Miss Renvoize indicates, in most instances of family violence, imprisonment has a totally negative effect. While the courts continue to sentence those involved, a wider understanding of the approaches available to us to minimise the damage would be beneficial.

In her final chapter, Miss Renvoize looks in detail at the relationship between the professionals in-

involved. She considers the lack of co-operation between the services to be one of the major problems in tackling family violence. Limited staff and finance are clearly significant but, above all, the links and channels of communication must be developed and utilized. The attitudes held by professionals and the members of the violent families must be modified, contends Miss Renvoize; the commonest cases are of those trapped by an inability to fulfil the image they have of what they ought to be or to feel.

J. M. KING
Assistant Governor
Moor Court Prison

Open Conditions

Gaynes Hall Borstal, 1978.

To produce a good "house journal" demands interest, enthusiasm, dedication and determination; the very qualities required of both good prison officers and good probation officers. The images of both services have suffered (often as a result of self-inflicted injuries) from adverse publicity in recent years and it is, therefore, refreshing to review a magazine which promotes the picture of institutional life which those who have close contact know to be a true reflection.

The basic aim of *Open Conditions* is to improve communications and understanding between borstal and probation staff. To this end, the magazine includes accounts of projects sponsored by the Probation Service; articles by borstal staff on how they see their job; reports of community service and other activities in which borstal trainees have become involved; and interviews with members of staff. A lively and interesting style has been maintained in the first two editions and the articles transmit the enthusiasm which fostered the schemes and characterized the people they describe.

R. M.

Prisoner Subcultures

LEE H. BOWKER
Lexington, 1978, £10.00

This slim volume might be better described as an expanded bibliography with commentary rather than a book in its own right. It provides an extensive and comprehensive review of all the available literature on the subject of institutional subcultures. There is inevitably some loss of flavour by compressing so much work into a brief review and there are many occasions when one might wish for more detail. For this reason, I found some of the central sections dry reading, for they become little more than a catalogue of one piece of research after another. Nonetheless, it is all there and well referenced. A further advantage is that much

of the material covered is not readily available in book form.

Students of the subject in our own service are always faced with the problem that the overwhelming bulk of the research has been done in America. It was, therefore, pleasing to see a number of references to more immediately relevant material and particularly the comparison between the Morris' *Pentonville* and Sykes' *Society of Captives* through the inmate roles described in each.

If there is a central theme, it is woven around consideration of Stanton Wheeler's work on the question of whether the inmate code derives from an external criminal subculture, and is thus imported into the institution, or whether it arises as a functional response to the pains of imprisonment. Bowker's conclusion after reviewing much research is that the answer is not as clear as Wheeler thought when he postulated a U-shaped curve theory. He concludes that the answer has much more to do with the type of prisoners and the type of institution.

Of interest in this country again is reference to Cohen and Taylor's work at Durham with criticism similar to that which appeared in this Journal that it was more literary than scientific.

There are separate chapters on young offenders institutions, with a conclusion that boys' institutions are more violent, anti-staff and manipulative than adult ones, which seems to be borne out by the experience of those who work in closed borstals, and on women's institutions with, typically, some evidence to show that family visits are worthwhile and helpful in improving general behaviour in the institution.

Finally—for me, the most rewarding and accurate piece—Chapter 7 on policy recommendations. Here the threads are well brought together with concrete examples and perceptive suggestions.

R. R. TILT
Deputy Governor
Ranby Prison

Criminological Theory Foundations and Perceptions

Edited by STEPHEN SCHAFER and RICHARD D. KNUDTEN
Lexington, 1978, £11.90.

The main purpose of this book appears to be to provide a platform from which Knudten can launch his own ideas of the importance of having a "middle range theory of relativity" in any future criminological studies that are undertaken. He does this with his co-editor (now deceased) by attempting to bring the historical panorama of criminological theorising into contemporary focus.

The book is mainly a catalogue of excerpts from the works of the major theorists of this century and each excerpt tries to focus on, and encapsulate, the central ideas of each of them. Sections of the book look respectively at the studies that have been done on the concept of

crime, biological factors in crime, psychological factors in crime and sociocultural causes of crime. Each section of the book is prefaced with an introduction by the editors and the historical contributions are from the works of notable lawyers, anthropologists, geneticists, psychiatrists, psychologists and sociologists.

These sections are then followed by two articles by Knudten on the present and future of criminological theory and an explanation of his own theory of relativity. In a passage on contemporary explanations of criminal conduct, he points out that most theoretical development since the turn of the century derives more closely from the work of Lombroso (crime being a product of environment and heredity) rather than that of Beccaria (crime being a product of free-will). He goes on to present a comprehensive summary of the physical, psychological, cultural, social and environmental explanations of crime by the major criminologists of recent years. From this he argues that, "for too long, criminological theorists have theorised in limited terms that are not applicable to all forms of criminal conduct or even to every culture in which a given violation occurs". He stresses that in the future there is an urgent need for criminologists to define "middle-range" theories of causation which are consistent with the known facts about criminal conduct and crime control.

This leads him neatly on to his own theory that "causation theorising should not be applicable merely to one crime, one society or one culture". He argues that no crime takes place within a social vacuum but rather that it is a product of all elements involved in human association, growth and interaction. In future, he says, "theorising should speak to these complex issues and not merely add more fragments to an already fragmented field of theory. What is needed now are theories that bring order out of diversity and multiplicity".

Who would argue with him on that score except to doubt the practicality of any such undertakings? As the book reveals, analysts have struggled over the last two hundred years to expound a scientific understanding of the cause of crime. This goal, if it ever can be attained, is still a long way off. This book, however, has merit in that it provides an excellent source of reference for students of the development of criminological theory.

D. G. LONGLEY
Deputy Governor
Shrewsbury Prison

Luke Street: Housing Policy, Conflict and the Creation of the Delinquent Area

OWEN GILL
Macmillan, 1977, £10.00 (hard back)
£3.50 (paper back).

My initial reaction to this well-researched book was to compare it with another, called *View from the Boys*, by Howard Parker, as the similarity in environment and

methods used by the authors appear quite close. The similarity, however, ends there.

Owen Gill has provided an excellent study of the cultural problems experienced by residents of an area of Liverpool which could be in any of the major cities of Great Britain. The creation of the delinquent area and the rather depressing attitudes of the inhabitants of Luke Street, are clearly illustrated. His views on the "Superstructure of Delinquency" I found of great interest as Gill has highlighted certain ways in which negative assessments are made by officials: "The definitions and actions of these 'trouble workers' may, if not actually initiate delinquent behaviour, then certainly exacerbate it. In doing so they play a Key Role in creating the delinquent area". But how can the system be changed to a fairer one? Mr. Gill presents a very thorough description of the Luke Street inhabitants and their histories. The tables used in the allocation system by the housing officials are excellent and provide a clear picture of the system in operation. The pressures that families suffer in this type of environment and system of allocation can only be described as undesirable, although clearly there are cases where there is no alternative. The lack of communication between the residents of Luke Street and the housing authorities seems to have caused problems. As Owen Gill states: "perhaps the residents felt that it was necessary for 'all the rubbish' to be put together".

The life in and around the local public house is explained in great detail. I don't wish to dwell on this area, as readers of the book will find it refreshing to say the least, and very well told. The humorous side of Luke Street is hilarious and one wonders if the people would survive without it. Since the author was accepted by a group of youths aged between 16 and 20 years, he provides some valuable information into their subculture. The group attitudes and individual records are examined and the author goes to great lengths to provide some valid discussion points.

To conclude, Owen Gill has produced an interesting book that has certainly highlighted some of the many problems encountered in an environment like Luke Street. I would recommend this book to all those who are genuinely interested in such areas. It is clear that Mr. Gill has researched very thoroughly and the end product is excellent.

WM. MCGINLEY
Assistant Governor
Rochester Borstal

key photograph of the view of the inner gate of Dartmoor Prison must have made many hard men weaken, at least momentarily. The faint overprinted pale pink bars are a subtle piece of psychology and, in no small way, sets one up for David Ball's message.

This book is an anthology of prose, drama, verse and picture. The stated intention is to provide some answers, and some starting points for thought, discussion and activity. Ball also says the writers in this collection speak for themselves; they state what prison has meant to them. In the main the writers are well known and include Dostoevsky, Behan, Koestler, George Jackson and Billie Holiday. No such collection would be complete without an Oscar Wilde contribution and his devotees can conclude with "The Soldier's Execution" from *The Ballad of Reading Gaol*.

Following the introduction, one comes face to face with Alcatraz. If one had to find a picture with greater impact than Dartmoor, then this must be it. It was said that 'Big Al' quaked at the sight; lesser mortals must surely have abandoned hope. The pictures throughout the book are of excellent quality. I also enjoyed Rudolf Sauter's drawings, which conveyed almost as much of an impression as real life.

After the initial reading of the book I felt that it was disjointed and very one-sided in its presentation, and to itemize each article in this collection would require more space than I am allowed. Perhaps the best method is to mention specific items. The first item of interest, to me at any rate, came in "The Police and the Magistrates". This article contains useful information for the young student. I feel that I must also say that the enthusiastic, untrained social worker would benefit from its content. Under normal circumstances I do not like statistics but I make exception here as the concluding paragraphs are most enlightening.

Looking at the more factual articles, I would recommend "East End Gang" by S. Daniel and P. McGuire and also James Patrick's "Tim". For those who live and work in the large cities, here is a message. What do we do with the Tims of this life? If one believes environment is a contributory factor to delinquency, then change the environment.

Overall, this is an interesting publication. It sets out to provoke thought, discussion and activity. It is light reading and will be a good travelling companion—put it in your pocket and read it on the train.

DON RUTHERFORD
Principal Officer
Durham Prison

Local Jails: The New Correctional Dilemma

B. WAYSON, G. FUNKE,
S. FAMILTON & P. MEYER
Lexington Books, 1978, £9.50.

There are thousands of local jails in America, most of them accom-

modating fewer than 20 prisoners. Controlled by the local sheriff, they hold people for trial and those with short sentences as well as longer-term convicts awaiting transfer to State prisons. For centuries, local jails have been regarded as the sores on the body of the American penal system. The number of attempts to publicise and improve conditions is so large that the authors of this book, in a short account of the history and functions of local jails, cannot be other than sombre and even cynical about reform. They know there are no votes in "welfare and social problem cases" and that local jails will always have a low political priority.

Given this history, what can be done? The policy is to set national standards for local jails, introduce a system of inspections, and encourage compliance to the standards by granting or withholding subsidies. For this, definitions, budgets, cost analyses, forecasts and explicit priorities are needed. And this, of course, is a job for economists.

Most of this book is a treatise in economics by members of the Correctional Economics Center. Their job was to study 45 jails in the State of Washington and estimate the cost of implementing the operational standards recommended by a State Commission. The book displays their economic wizardry. By chapter five, the figures and formulae are flying so fast that one can forget this is about real institutions. So crisp is the language of economics, that it is hard to believe that the theme really is what should be done about the squalor of the local jail. The language, however, will not seduce the English purists who can smell an "Americanism" at 50 pages: they will not forgive phrases like "variegated standards had to be prioritized".

Hardly a page goes by without a numerical table. The appendices, in particular, are stuffed with figures—although the first appendix is unexpectedly interesting because it sets out the more than 200 specified standards on which the project was based. These will be more useful than the mass of economic analyses in that they provide comparisons for those readers who operate British remand centres and local prisons.

The climax of the book can be revealed, without in any way spoiling the plot, by quoting the final formula: "Share 2(i) = (Ratio) (Share 1 (i) = (0.5) (Sindex (i)) (Ratio)". In all fairness, this is an attempt to solve the most difficult administrative problem of all: how best to share out the State's expenditure amongst the necessary additional staff, supplies and constructions. It is something of a relief, nevertheless, to reach the chapter of "conclusions". This is in English (or at least in American) and confirms that the project really was about trying to improve conditions in local jails. There is no indication as to whether such a project will actually work or if it was an entirely academic exercise, but it does show the possibilities of this type of approach in changing institutions and in providing information for rational decisions. This can only be an improvement over the previ-

ous approaches: expediency and piecemeal reform.

RICK EVANS
Senior Psychologist
Bristol Prison

Killing Time

BRUCE JACKSON
Cornell University Press
1978, £10.50.

This book sets out to give a pictorial view of life in a penitentiary in Arkansas. To attempt to cover a subject as vast and so full of excellent subject matter as a penal establishment, is a formidable task. To do the same in photographs requires the touch of an artist. The author has obviously taken great care in his selection of shots for this book. His technical skills have made an excellent photographic record.

I would like to refer to several outstanding studies in this book. Photos 49, 88, 89 illustrate in no uncertain manner the problems of overcrowding in the establishment. 49 shows the inmates crowded into their barracks, probably during the evening. One can well imagine the pressures there must be, given this situation. Plates 45 and 46 depict inmates posing with models they have made. These are very good studies indeed. The expressions on the faces of the inmates give some indication of how distorted one's sense of values becomes in the institutional setting. Plates 61, 63 and 64 are studies of elderly (or are they so old?) institutionalized inmates. If I were on the other side of the fence these photos would frighten the life out of me. They say it all. Finally, a reference to plate 67. Here we have a middle aged trustee. This man has found his place in life. Whilst it is not ideal, he appears thankful for it.

In conclusion, Bruce Jackson has chosen for himself what could only be described as a Herculean task and completed it well. This book is well worth looking at.

RON MARTIN
Principal Officer
Liverpool Prison

Directory of Projects 1978/79

BARRY ROSE 1978, £3.50.

This directory is co-produced by CHAR, CYRENIANS, FARE, MIND, NACRO & SCODA, a group of organisations which work with socially-disadvantaged people and which, through a variety of residential projects, provide supportive accommodation for people leaving prisons, hospitals etc. It is easy to use, being well indexed and conveniently divided by geographical location and nature of problem. There is also a useful section on national agencies. This book is essential equipment for all who are involved in the rehabilitation of people leaving institutions; by combining all the information in one directory, a considerable amount of the case-worker's time can be saved.

F. HAYNES
Senior Probation Officer
Bristol Prison

The Experience of Prison

Edited by DAVID BALL
Longman, 1978, £1.00

This is a well-presented book with an impressive cover which conveys the immediate impression of the dark, sinister happenings to be disclosed inside. The diffused, low-

Report of the Inter-Regional Working Party on the Provision of Secure Accommodation for the Long-Term Treatment of Children and Young Persons as a Regional Facility

Regional Areas 9 & 10, 1978.

I embarked on my reading of the report with great enthusiasm and interest, hoping that I would find a rigorous and new approach to the provision of secure accommodation for children. I did not find this and have to admit a feeling of some disappointment in that the approach held nothing new. On the whole, however, there is little to quarrel with in any of the report.

The report itself is a well structured document outlining the basic areas covered by the inter-regional working parties, past and present. The list of recommendations summarises the report and suggests initially that the Regional Planning Committees concerned should review their decision to build a secure unit. Secondly, irrespective of the prospect of a secure unit, the inter-regional working parties recommend that a range of community-based measures be developed. Both are admirable points. The main bulk of the recommendations centre around the building of a secure facility which, it is suggested, should be an independent purpose-built unit catering for a maximum of forty children, both boys and girls, between the ages of twelve and sixteen, in conditions of security appropriate to the children's needs.

The most important part of the report is contained in section five, objectives and methods. Although defined somewhat loosely, an attempt is made to specify the task of the secure unit. "The unit's primary task is to treat the child". A detailed assessment is to be provided prior to a child's admission to the unit. The unit, taking the assessment as a base, will then "provide experiences which may enable the child, according to individual need, to fill in the gaps, to understand both the conscious and unconscious aspects of his own behaviour, to find, where appropriate a new sense of his own worth and identity and to modify his behaviour to a point at which he may be able to exercise self control and become socially more acceptable". I posed the question to myself, "How are they hoping to achieve this objective?". Their answer, I feel, is inadequately presented in the report. It lists education, group living and leisure as vehicles for "the treatment". However, the language describing the method to be used is lacking in detail. Phrases such as "the healing process", "personal fulfilment", "human relationships" and "good experiences" suggest an approach which, in my view, presents great problems for accurate measurement and assessment of the process. I may, of course, be jumping to conclusions here, but as there is no detailed reference to continuous assessment of the treatment offered, I can only assume that this is not envisaged. However, it is stated that "It is equally vital to consider targets, however rudimentary, so that movement, however slight, can be measured". Sadly, there is no reference as to how the measurement will be effected.

The report records the need for a high-calibre suitably talented staff for the unit which is obviously crucial to the success of any venture such as this. It is suggested that staff be recruited from a variety of professional backgrounds including social work, teaching, medicine, psychology and nursing. The working party did not appear to think that staff with previous experience in secure conditions were worth listing as being of value to a unit such as this.

Two other important areas are of particular note. First, the working party suggests that salary scales for such a unit be specially determined to take note of the particular skills and aptitudes of staff working in the unit, above those normally found in staff in residential work. It is pleasing that at last an authoritative body has recognised the value of staff who work with such abnormally difficult children in secure conditions and are prepared to go so far as to suggest appropriate remuneration. Secondly, one of the conditions for admission to the proposed unit should be that the Local Authority concerned should satisfy the admission team of the unit that it will provide the appropriate social work and other support for each child and his family. Again, it is encouraging to read such a statement since it confirms the view that the involvement of the Local Authority social worker and the family in any kind of treatment is vital for successful rehabilitation. It is too easy to place a child in a community school or the like, or to watch an individual receive a custodial sentence and then forget him.

Appendix 3 describes the design brief produced for the former working party. This is a very basic statement of requirements for the secure unit. The report expects that a final brief will be prepared for the architect but unless this focuses on the real problems of treating disturbed and disordered children in secure conditions the result may be much the same.

Is the report recommended reading? Only in so far as it demonstrates an accepted view of the thinking behind the provision of secure accommodation for children.

J. KOZUBSKA
Head of Special Unit
Aycliffe School

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Alibi

RICHARD GOODERSON
Heinemann, 1977, £9.50.

Introduction of alibi evidence is one of many well known weapons in the armoury of the defending counsel/solicitor. Regrettably, it is one

abused by the more unscrupulous accused and his representative when the question of identification arises in a personal confrontation crime, and a defendant alleges, "I was elsewhere at the time".

This book, one of a series of Cambridge studies in criminology, is an excellent, comprehensive study of the subject of alibi which will interest investigators, prosecutors, legal representatives and students of law. There are ample comparisons of English, Scottish and American law and it is also an up-to-date study with reference to the cases of Alfie Hinds, Hanratty, George Davis, George Ince, Peter Hain and others.

Public outcry, following isolated incidents of 'conviction of the innocent' on mistaken evidence of identification, led to strong recommendations by the Devlin Committee on improving identification procedures, and the Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) later issued guidelines to judges where the prosecution depends wholly or substantially on visual identification.

In England and Wales, there was—until 1967—a common law privilege for the accused not to disclose a defence of alibi until the moment of introduction of such evidence at the trial. This placed a severe, if not unfair, burden on the prosecution, because such evidences were often fabricated. Advance notice of alibi allows such evidence to be examined by the prosecution before the trial but, as the book explains, there are still loopholes.

Fabricated evidence is readily available amongst the criminal fraternity and close relatives of the accused, though evidence of alibi exposes the witness to examination under oath. The threat of a perjury charge is always there, if seldom used. Furthermore, if a jury doubts the credibility of a defence of alibi there is a danger it will lead to a presumption of guilt.

The requirement of advance notice gives the prosecution the opportunity to check the alibi evidence before trial. If such investigation discloses that the witnesses are credible and the evidence probably true, the prosecution will no doubt be dropped. In America, however, some districts allow the trial to proceed on the grounds that the credibility of a witness is a question for the jury.

On the subject of identification, the various methods—voice, fingerprints, walk, smells, hair, exceptional personality, clothing etc., are explored. There is also an interesting comparison of the merits of photographic identification and the various methods of identification by confrontation and the implications of possible "irregularities" on parades. The Devlin Committee recommendations come to the fore in this connection.

All forms of alibi are discussed at length in this creditable book which is supported with a mass of case law.

DENNIS H. HUMPLEBY
Detective Chief Inspector
West Yorkshire Metropolitan Police

○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Justice and Punishment

Edited by J. B. CEDERBLOM and W. L. BLIZEK

Wiley, 1977, £11.00.

This group of eight papers was produced for a symposium on criminal justice and punishment run by the philosophy department of Nebraska University in 1976. Having accepted that we are in the business of punishment, the editors highlight the theories of just desserts and retribution. Kant's principle that a wrongdoer must be punished in order to retain his respect as a man is re-affirmed. We find ourselves again on the penological see-saw: on the one side are punishment, retribution, personal responsibility and Jessica Mitford, and on the other side, treatment, rehabilitation, social pathology and Baroness Wootton. In these papers, the see-saw is heavily weighted on the side of punishment. Treatment is left up in the air, masquerading as punishment in sheep's clothing.

In the midst of this philosophical cloud, there are two papers which seem to be rooted firmly in the ground. James Q. Wilson, in "The Political Feasibility of Punishment", shows how the re-acceptance of the concept of punishment as the principle that ought to guide the sentencing of convicted offenders could pull together the liberal and conservative (the suspect-centred and the victim-centred) attitudes to criminal justice. He describes the disenchantment with rehabilitation as growing out of an awareness that planned social change is a non-starter, and the disenchantment of the hardliners as an appreciation of the fact that more police does not equal less crime.

David Fogel's "Pursuing Justice in Corrections" looks specifically at imprisonment and decides that its rationale should be fairness in all things. He also recommends a return to flat-time sentences, the elimination of parole, the division of a large prison into small groups, due process of law for complaints and adjudications and inmate/staff consultative groups. "Prison administrators", he warns, "should not further confuse their staff with a mission claiming moral or psychological redemption". It is suggested that, if no kind of inmate organisation is legitimized by the authorities, inmate power will emerge in unacceptable forms. Similarly, if there is little dialogue between staff and inmate, "honest communication with prisoner groups in efforts to quell violence already underway is doomed".

Here is a group of contemporary thinkers about American criminal justice saying that perhaps we have been punishing our inmates all along while calling it many other things; that this is a perfectly valid thing to have been doing and it should continue. There is a tendency to spend too much time in linguistic somersaults attempting to re-define terminology. I find it refreshing and heartening to see an attempt to look at the moral and philosophical base upon which we do our work. In an era of 'humane containment' we need to be doing rather more of that.

C. J. WILLIAMS
Assistant Governor
Long Lartin Prison