

If you have issues viewing or accessing this file contact us at NCJRS.gov.

4/7/75

A

→ CONTROL BY CONSENT -
towards a penal philosophy -

Howard League for Penal Reform -)

→ ANNUAL REPORT 1st JULY 1973 to 30th JUNE 1974 -

THE HOWARD LEAGUE FOR PENAL REFORM
125 KENNINGTON PARK ROAD, LONDON SE11 4JP

THE HOWARD LEAGUE FOR PENAL REFORM

OBJECTIVES: THE ADVANCEMENT OF EDUCATION IN CONSTRUCTIVE PENAL
& SOCIAL POLICIES

President: The Rt. Hon. the Lord Gardiner, PC.

Vice-Presidents: C.R. Hewitt Professor Nigel Walker
The Rt. Hon. Sir Kenneth Younger, KBE.

Chairman: Louis Blom-Cooper, QC

Vice-Chairman: Professor T.C.N. Gibbens, MBE

Honorary Treasurer: Sir Edward Howard, Bt, GBE

Council: Dr. D.I. Acres Dr. R.G. Andry
Michael Day Mrs Susanne Dell
A.A. Dumont Mrs Evelyn Gibson
Jimmy Gordon Miss D.E. Harvie, OBE
Nicholas Hinton Stanley Johnson
Dr. Roy King Jonathan Marshall
Robert Tollemache Dr. Keith Wardrop
Dr. Donald West Mrs Joyce Williams, MBE, JP
Graham Zellick

Director: Martin Wright

Office Staff: Mrs Anne Curtis

Honorary Director of Training: Dr. R.G. Andry

Charity No: 251926

Registered in London: 898514 as a company limited by guarantee

Registered Office: 125 Kennington Park Road,
London SE11 4JP
Telephone 01-735 3773

AFFILIATED HOWARD SOCIETIES

Australia Howard League for Penal Reform, Victoria
Howard Prison Reform Council
of New South Wales
John Howard Society of South Australia

Canada John Howard Society of Alberta
John Howard Society of Canada
John Howard Society of British Columbia
John Howard Society of Ontario
John Howard Society of Quebec

Jamaica Howard League for Penal Reform
The Reform Men and Women Welfare Association

New Zealand New Zealand Howard League for Penal Reform

CONTROL BY CONSENT: TOWARDS A PENAL PHILOSOPHY

This review might have been entitled "Towards a new penal philosophy", but that would imply that there was one already. In fact the British penal system embodies at present a mixture of ideas ranging from the most imaginative innovations, such as day training centres, community service orders and New Careers, to the crudest application of repression and deterrence. The use of the word "control" highlights the dilemma. At one end of the scale, some probation officers are anxious about the "new and stronger" measures for dealing with offenders in the community, called Supervision and Control Orders, proposed in the Advisory Council's report *Young adult offenders*: they do not see how one can control a person living in the community without either following him around or threatening him with sanctions. At the other extreme, the prison authorities have discovered that it is impossible to compel people to do something, for example work, and very difficult to forbid actions, such as insulting an officer, when the person has so little to lose that further sanctions are almost meaningless; they are trying to deal with those who seriously disrupt the life of the prison, by means of "control units". It is true that some prisoners create severe problems for the authorities and for their fellow inmates; but these prisons-within-prisons, apparently based on unsophisticated learning theory, raise many fundamental questions which need answers before the necessity for such potentially oppressive places can be accepted.

Despite these contradictions, the past year may prove to have been a turning point in British penal policy, with a serious effort to find new ways to induce people to obey the law, replacing imprisonment and even, to a limited extent, punishment. It is true that some relatively harmless actions are illegal, and some extremely obnoxious ones are still legal; but that is a matter for law reform rather than penal reform. In between there is a wide range of acts which it is right by almost anyone's standards to prohibit. What is objectionable is the reliance on harsh sanctions to try to control this behaviour while neither devoting adequate resources to removing known causes, nor even making proper assessments to discover whether severity is effective, despite a large body of evidence that it is not. Hardliners who ignore the evidence, and resist the introduction and evaluation of new measures, endanger the community which they seek to protect.

In the last resort authority cannot control other people's behaviour if they are determined to resist (like professional criminals) or unable to do what is demanded of them (like the average habitual offender). The best prospect of success lies in trying to secure their consent, first of all to measures which, though backed by compulsion, are of potential benefit to them, and then to

the general body of laws and controls to which most of us submit voluntarily most of the time in return for social acceptance.

Why can't you behave?

The reason for not behaving badly should not be that you will be punished if you are caught, but that your behaviour will harm others. The task of promoting pro-social behaviour therefore consists primarily in making potential wrongdoers (which means all of us) care whether other people are hurt. But we are unlikely to do so, unless the others give some indication that *they* care about *us*. This might be expressed in Christian terminology by saying that those who ask a person to be penitent for what he has done should themselves offer him forgiveness. What incentive have employees not to steal from an employer who offers no share in the prosperity of the business? Or an ex-prisoner (or for that matter a school leaver) to obey the rules of a society which will not offer him a job?

The old penal system, too much of which still survives, has little appearance of caring. Some transgressors are sent to prisons where, in addition to loss of liberty itself, they are also subjected to numerous other deprivations — of the right to communicate freely, even with their families, their lawyers or their MP's; of the right to decide when to get up in the morning, or to put the light out at night; of free choice of occupation or study (even within the limited range available in prison). This remains true despite many humane improvements in matters of detail over the years. The traditional message is: "when you have been caught breaking the law, you will be punished; when your punishment is over, we are quits. It is up to you whether you want to repeat the process, but if you do, we will punish you again and again." This allows us to push the responsibility on to the individual offender, regardless of the social pressures to which he may be subject. It also allows him to treat the whole process as a morally neutral chain of events: by spending the ordained time in prison, he "pays the price" and considers himself entitled to re-offend, if he is willing to take the risk, or to be given a job, if he chooses to apply for one.

The new message is more complex. For one thing, it ideally comes from a different "We": not the Justices of the Peace, the police, the controlling forces of society, but we, all the other people who are trying to live together in reasonable harmony. We tell the offender that he has broken the law and we must publicly show that we cannot ignore the fact — not because the law is perfectly just, but because it is the best approximation we have to a code for co-existence, and we all should normally obey it. It is true that the law, and its enforcement, in some ways favour particular sections of society, and this should be put right; but it is also true, as Stan Cohen has pointed out (*New Society*, 8 Nov. 1973), that "Despite the romantic ideas of some radical

criminologists, it is the poor, the minority groups and the old who are most likely to be victimized by those forms of crime which result in direct personal loss. For the middle class certain forms of crime might be, in Oscar Newman's phrase, a 'survivable nuisance'." If a fine or probation is not appropriate, we will mark our disapproval by temporarily restricting his right to spend time as he wishes, but he will be given the chance to use this period in a way which should not do him any harm (hence we will not put him in prison unless we believe him to be dangerous) and which may help him, if he needs help. This is because we recognise that it is unreasonable to expect him to abide by the rules unless, firstly, he has the necessary know-how to live within them (vocational skills, literacy, articulateness, ability to settle disputes without force, and so on), and, secondly, an opportunity to develop his talents legitimately, and recognition for his contribution. But this is a two-way contract: if he is given, even belatedly, the same opportunities as the rest of us, we will expect him to conform to the same minimum standards of behaviour.

Conforming is a suspect word these days: it should not mean that we, the majority, will force a minority to change its lifestyle, unless it is injurious to others. But those whose horizons have been restricted by their background, whether it was middle-class, working-class or simply marred by the classless blight of deprivation, may appreciate the opportunity to widen them by doing new things and meeting new people and new ideas. This does not oblige them to conform to anyone else's norms, or to undergo "treatment", whatever that means, but it may be a learning process which makes it easier for them to respect the legitimate rights of others and to contribute to society as well as deriving benefits from it.

Traditionally, courts were concerned (and many still are) largely with the proportionality of punishment to the harm done and to that inflicted on other offenders, and with the somewhat metaphysical concept of deterrence. They should continue, however, to act as a safeguard, by limiting the duration of compulsory intervention, however well-intentioned, in proportion to the harm done by the offender. If he accepts that the facilities are beneficial for him, he can continue to use them voluntarily after the end of the court order. American experience has shown that indeterminate sentences can become a tyranny. The new approach does not say that punishment will never be used; for one thing, it may be needed as a sanction for those who choose not to comply with a "re-educative" measure. Nor does it exclude custody, which will obviously be needed for the dangerous — but we must be very careful how they are defined. If the proportion of the sentence that is spent in custody can be shortened by executive discretion, the criteria should be made quite explicit and the reasons for every decision given.

There is, as Mr. Justice MacKenna demonstrated at last year's Howard

League Summer School increasing awareness that the results of different measures can be evaluated, and that the traditional institutions and deterrent methods often make a poor showing. New methods, though seldom measurably more effective, tend to require fewer financial resources, to offer more opportunities for community participation, and, as far as we can tell, to be less damaging for the offender. Some legislation, and some courts, are beginning to refrain from punishing at all, if a different plan can be worked out which seems more likely to bring the offender back into the fold. The deferred sentence can provide a useful framework for this approach. The danger is that inadequate social services may fail to make realistic and imaginative alternative arrangements; this is no help to the offender or the community, and undermines public confidence in would-be progressive innovation.

It is time to recognize that penal reform is not concerned merely with the punishment of a handful of miscreants. It is fundamental to our attempt to regulate our life together — all of us in our complex society — so as to persuade people to do as little harm to each other as possible. The processes of law enforcement should be scrutinized as carefully as other services — not out of a misguided desire for leniency, but to make them more realistic as regards the effect they actually produce on lawbreakers.

1. A programme for reform

For these ideals to be put into practice, they first need to be discussed and revised. We hope that the present attempt to formulate them will initiate some constructive debate.

Some of them can be, and are already being, introduced within existing legislation. Others may require legislation, probably accompanied by changes in the administrative framework. An appropriate task for the re-constituted Advisory Council on the Penal System would be a fundamental review of the moral, sociological and psychological basis for resolving the conflict between social control and individual freedom, between the prevention of crime and the denial of opportunity to the under-privileged.

More specifically, it could look at ways in which the penal system could be modified so as to base its practice on learning acceptable behaviour rather than on punishing past misconduct.

But there is no need to wait for this major socio-philosophical exercise before taking action. The following list is based on proposals handed by the Howard League to the Rt. Hon. Roy Jenkins in May 1974, shortly after he became Home Secretary. A few other proposals have been included which are the concern of other Ministers.

(a) Making criminal justice less heavy-handed

There are breaches of the law for which people should not, as a rule, be sent to prison at all: default on payment of maintenance, inability to pay fines (*Newsletter*, May 1974), vagrancy, prostitution. There should also be limitations applying to particular categories of offender. First prison sentences should normally be very short, because generally the initial period in prison has the most deterrent effect. Other sentences should be severely limited (as was suggested in *Ill-founded premisses*, para. 19).

Drunkenness should not be criminal, let alone imprisonable. The Howard League supports the Campaign for the Homeless and Rootless in its demand for action to provide more appropriate places than prisons for alcoholics. *Bail* In local prisons and remand centres, the prison population is augmented and the staff crisis aggravated by unnecessary use of remands in custody. Bail should be mandatory where the offence is not imprisonable, and should be the rule where a custodial sentence is unlikely. The delay in creating the machinery for establishing bail hostels has been disappointing. Current remands in custody should be surveyed to assess the numbers for which bail hostels or clinics would be appropriate, and plans made to provide the necessary places.

Social inquiry reports Before sending a person to prison, especially for the first time, a court should know enough about his background to assess whether any other sentence is likely to be effective. Even when the court considers, on the facts so far presented to it, that punishment is appropriate in a particular case, it should not decide the form or severity of the punishment in ignorance of the individual's circumstances. The Home Secretary should use his powers to make social inquiry reports mandatory before a prison sentence, especially a person's first.

Sentencing should aim at the protection of the public after, not merely during, the sentence. Information on penological experience and research should be made more widely available to judges and magistrates.

Deferred commencement of custodial sentence, the principle of which is supported by the Advisory Council on the Penal System's report on *Young adult offenders* (paras 235 — 238) should be introduced. This would allow people, in certain circumstances, a short period to deal with urgent commitments before starting their sentences.

(b) The community and its offenders

We would ask the Home Secretary and all concerned to stress the positive concept of dealing with offenders in their communities, rather than the negative one of keeping them out of prison.

Community Service Orders should be extended nationally, but not merely as a cheap alternative. It is important to evaluate not only their overall statis-

tical "success", but the effect produced on different types of offender by different schemes for community service. Regular conferences should be organized for the probation service, voluntary organizations and sentencers to clarify aims and formulate good practice.

Day Training Centres The same points apply, and go-ahead probation areas should be allowed to set up more centres. The concept is imaginative, it involves the community, and it does not isolate the offender. It also has potential as a preventive measure. Although these centres are more expensive than CSOs, their cost/benefit potential is still considerably better than that of prisons.

Hostels, for bail, probation and after-care: the provision of these should be speeded up. There is probably scope for more involvement of the voluntary movement in the time-consuming business of searching for premises and campaigning to secure planning permission. Capital grants (not loans or mortgages) should be available, and should not be restricted to hostels intended exclusively for offenders. But there are dangers in assuming that hostels are a panacea: we need to know more about which types of offender are helped by hostels run in various ways, by lodgings or other low-cost accommodation, as well as by opportunities for jobs, social contacts, and so on.

Help for victims It is no one's job to look after the victim of an offence. Ways should be found of remedying this (*Newsletter*, July 1974) both for the sake of the person who has suffered, and to lessen popular antagonism against the offender.

(c) Prisons

It is difficult to do much about prisons without improving the staff ratio. Since it is proving difficult to expand the system (and is in any case undesirable), this must depend on measures to reduce the prison population. But the process of modernizing the prison system should not wait.

Buildings No new prisons should be built in inaccessible places. The money allocated for building and running them should be concentrated on community measures and on bringing existing prisons up to acceptable standards, especially accommodation for unconvicted persons. The trend towards increasing the size of prisons (several new prisons for over 800 are planned) is storing up potential trouble for the sake of administrative convenience and short term economy.

Staff The situation is critical, but should not be used as an excuse for inaction. Plans should be made now for the greater involvement of prison officers in the more human side of the work, enabling them to acquire qualifications, and paying them correspondingly. The existence of such plans might in itself encourage disillusioned staff to stay, or even attract new recruits. The aim should be to raise entrance qualifications.

Governors should be encouraged to put forward, and introduce, schemes for helping prisoners in particular ways, and to stay in post long enough to implement and evaluate them. If they thereby forewent an opportunity for promotion, they should receive a merit award or special responsibility allowance.

Prisoners The whole ethos of prison should be changed, to emphasise contact with the outside world and preparation for release; away from control by restrictions and towards learning. Progress towards abolishing censorship and introducing access to the telephone should be speeded up. All prisoners should be eligible for the pre-release employment scheme for the last six months of their sentence: in place of the remote screening process which excludes those with past records of violence, it should be the practice for someone known to the prisoners, such as the governor, to explain that the future of this form of graduated release depends on their conduct, and that abuse may lead to temporary curtailment of the scheme because of public reaction. In other words, the aim should be to secure not submission to authority but understanding of cause and effect.

Long term prisoners The aim, until the end of their sentence approaches, should be to provide sufficient variety of occupation to combat deterioration.

Work The work which prisoners are made to do, and the reasons for it, need to be re-examined. Is it likely to enable them to find rewarding employment outside, or to motivate them to do so? Should the aim be industrial efficiency, and a higher financial return to the Prison Department, or should human considerations have a higher priority? What should be the relationship between work, education and welfare? Prisoners should receive proper wages, and insurance stamps; if this cannot be introduced all at once, a start should be made in the last months of sentence.

Access to lawyers The present Prison Rules deny access to lawyers and the courts without the Home Secretary's permission. The rule is currently being challenged before the European Court of Human Rights. If prisoners are to come to respect the law, and quite apart from having their legal problems dealt with adequately, this rule should be abolished.

Home leave To preserve family ties, all prisoners should be eligible for home visits at an early stage in their sentence. Special leave should be granted more readily on compassionate grounds.

Parole After five years, the scheme needs re-appraisal. Although it is accepted that a cautious approach was wise at first, several aspects need review. Some long-term prisoners, though suitable for parole in other ways, are refused it for reasons, such as the deterrence of other potential offenders, which have already been taken into account in the original sentence. This, and other sources of misunderstanding and grievance, are aggravated by the fact that no reasons are given for decisions; the Parole Board has now accepted in principle the need to give reasons, and this should be implemented. The value of parole

should be better explained to the public to build up a fund of acceptance which would weigh against occasional publicized crimes committed by parolees.

(d) Increasing public understanding

The basis should be, firstly, to allow the public to become more aware of what is being done in their name, and of the effects it produces, and, secondly, to ask the public to enter into a partnership with the law enforcement agencies, who will work to promote law-abiding behaviour provided that the community makes it possible by re-accepting the ex-offender, employing him, helping hostels and day training centres to be established, and so on.

Research This will mean more research into the actual effects, and means of making the results widely known, especially among magistrates, probation officers, and voluntary helpers and others directly involved.

An *information centre* is therefore needed, not merely to answer enquiries but actively to collect and disseminate information.

The Official Secrets Act Recently television crews have been allowed in prisons, responsible journalists have been allowed to visit and members of the prison service have spoken at Howard League public meetings. All this is welcome; but it is still true that public understanding of offenders and of the way they are treated suffers from lack of adequate information about what goes on. The Act should be amended to allow the prison service to take part in public debate on penal issues as recommended by the Franks committee.

Prison Standing Orders should be available to prisoners and the public except where security would be endangered.

Prevention The key must always be to aim at prevention. Remedial services of the kind proposed for offenders should be available to non-offenders too: the Urban Aid programme, if expanded, could have a useful function in creating projects. Beyond that, preventive work merges into general social reform.

2. Review of the year

During 1973, the first Day Training Centres and Community Service Order projects came into being: the New Careers scheme to train offenders for the helping professions was introduced in Bristol, under the auspices of NACRO; and the Community Training Centre opened in Gloucester, to help both offenders and non-offenders to acquire skills. The prison population fell to 35,010 on 31 December, though it has risen again slightly, and on 5 December five institutions were cut from the prison building programme.

We hope that closures can be made in excess of those required by economic stringency, and a way found to transfer the resources to developing many more non-institutional programmes. But we hope too, that as expertise

develops in running them, proper arrangements will be made for communicating it to new staff: the new community measures need special skills and could be stillborn if they do not develop a clearly thought out philosophy.

Other measures from the Criminal Justice Act 1972 began to be used: deferred sentences, confiscation of motor vehicles used for crime and criminal bankruptcy.

After the previous year of disturbances, 1973/74 has been the year of control. Prison Department thinking appears to have been preoccupied with the maintenance of order and the prevention of escapes (is it significant that the title Controller has been selected for senior administrators?). Prison Rule 1, which stresses that prison should prepare people for their release, is being demoted in favour of containment.

This policy is dubious logically, and could be disastrous psychologically. What becomes of the prisoner after his release? The implied answer, that that is the responsibility of Probation and After-Care, is just not good enough. One of the main arguments, when the Home Office swallowed the Prison Commission in 1963, was that the two parts of the penal system could work more closely together; but ten years later they have separate heads, separate budgets, and, it seems, separate policies.

Yet there is in the Prison Department a humane understanding that many things which used to be regarded as privileges to be earned by good conduct (letters and visits, for example) are necessary to prevent distress and deterioration; we hope that this will become a growth point for positive policies based on the encouragement of co-operative attitude, rather than the enforcement of outwardly conforming behaviour.

A welcome development was the abolition of dietary punishment announced last year, and put into effect on 1st June 1974 together with other modifications of the sanctions used in prisons. The opportunity for restoration of lost remission is a humane innovation and we hope that the Boards of Visitors will use it.

Discharge grants were raised in June 1974 to £6.50, or £12 for the homeless: this is much less than the Howard League, NACRO and others asked for, but as an interim measure it may enable prisoners to survive provided it can be supplemented in cases of need. But the real answer is proper wages at least for the last months of the sentence, from which to save up for release.

In borstals, permission was given for ex-inmates to return voluntarily in times of crisis — a potentially valuable preventive step.

The Rehabilitation of Offenders Bill, based on proposals in the Justice/Howard League/NACRO pamphlet *Living it down*, passed both Houses of Parliament without opposition, but fell when the general election was called in February 1974. It was re-introduced by Mr. Piers Dixon, M.P., and Lord Gardiner, with the support of the new government, but attracted a sudden spate

of opposition. Despite this, it received the Royal Assent on 1st August.

Two other significant events during the year were publications, the Home Office report on *Bail in magistrates' courts* and the Advisory Council on the Penal System's *Young adult offenders*. The Director of the Howard League has expressed a welcome with qualifications, for the former, which endorsed several suggestions made by the Howard League in its evidence (*Criminal Law Review*, August 1974); regarding the latter, we have organized two conferences to assist in publicizing it, and the League will submit its detailed views to the Home Office in the autumn.

Issues raised during the year The Howard League has drawn attention to variety of penal issues in 1973/74. We hope to help to build up pressure to the point where action is taken; in doing so we shall be glad to collaborate with other organizations, including the relevant government departments.

The dominant issue has been reducing the prison population. It was the theme of our Summer School, at which a High Court Judge, Sir Brian MacKenna, argued the case for shorter sentences; our retiring Chairman, Sir Kenneth Younger, gave a critique of sentencing policy at the Annual General Meeting; the Director spelt out ways of reducing it in a University of London lecture on "The future use of prison", and it was the underlying theme of our pamphlet *Ill-founded premisses*, on the need to check the prison building programme.

Several of these have received a fair amount of publicity, and so have some of the other topics raised in Newsletters, lectures and articles. Those mentioned in the Newsletter, for example, have included:

- Imprisonment of first-offender shoplifters as a "deterrent" to others (October 1973)
- Convicted prisoners who do not know until the very end of their sentence whether they are to be deported (October 1973)
- Segregation of prisoners for their own protection under Prison Rule 43 (February and May 1974)
- Prisoners' right to vote (May 1974)
- The Official Secrets Act, and particularly its application to prison chaplains (May 1974; see also article in *The Times*, 12 June 1974)
- The problem of violence in institutions, including hospitals for the mentally subnormal and old people's homes (May 1974)
- Imprisonment of maintenance defaulters (which has also been condemned by the Finer Committee on One-parent Families) and of indigent fine defaulters (May 1974)

In addition, the Chairman and Director went to see Mr. Roy Jenkins after his appointment as Home Secretary, as mentioned above.

3. Prisons: to build, to rebuild or not to build?

The Council of the Howard League examined the old problem of prison buildings. Even the revised, reduced estimates of the prison population in five years' time are still over 40,000: should the persistent over-crowding and primitive conditions be met by building new prisons? The League published a pamphlet, *Ill-founded premisses*, questioning the logic of this approach, and warning against the danger that if new prisons are built in remote places, and the prison population continues to fall, it is the relatively accessible city prisons that would be sold off, because of the high commercial value of their sites. Other points made in the pamphlet include:

We cannot accept the logic of building more prisons, when the overcrowding is largely due to the imprisonment of people for whom provision could and should be made in the community, often at a lower cost.

The total number of prison places should be progressively reduced. We support a programme of renovation of prisons, accompanied by the demolition of outmoded premises: but the key to avoiding unnecessary overcrowding should be the reduction of the prison population, with the provision of alternatives in the community wherever necessary. We accept that the Home Office has a duty to provide up-to-date accommodation for those sentenced to imprisonment, but only those who constitute a real danger should receive such sentences.

We advocate a substantial transfer of resources of finance and manpower from the custodial penal system to non-custodial measures, combined with steps to persuade courts to take advantage of the new facilities in the community.

The provision of more community resources should be accompanied by parliamentary restrictions on the courts' powers to impose imprisonment and more training of members of the judiciary in the effects of penal measures.

Only exceptionally should people be held in custody awaiting trial, or be remanded in custody for social or medical inquiries. Where custodial remands are unavoidable they should be in local institutions, suitable for the purpose and accessible to the prisoner's family and legal representative.

New prison projects in the outback should be cancelled. Rebuilding should take place on the central sites, but only to the extent necessary for a much reduced prison population, in smaller units, with adequate facilities for work and other activities.

4. Working parties

One of the main ways in which the Howard League works is by convening working parties to formulate policy on particular issues, either on our own initiative, or in response to invitations from Government Committees of Enquiry. During 1973/74 the following subjects were studied:

(a) Boards of Visitors

The Home Secretary had announced in June 1973 that he was setting up an internal working party to consider the adjudicatory functions of Boards of Visitors; but the Howard League has long felt that not only this, but the role as a safeguard to persons detained in prison, needs re-examination, and in particular the question whether the two functions can be satisfactorily combined in one group of people.

Accordingly we joined Justice and NACRO, which both felt similarly, in setting up a committee to consider the matter. Lord Jellicoe agreed to serve as Chairman.

(b) Prison and community

One of the effects of imprisonment is isolation, both from ordinary work, from the community, and from families. A working party was formed under Dr. Roy King of Southampton University to study this, including the complex question of unsupervised visits and home leave.

(c) Custody of defendants during trial

A group under the chairmanship of Lady James of Rusholme is examining such questions as bail during trial and whether the layout of the court room is disadvantageous to the accused.

Both this project and the preceding one are based outside London, in Southampton and Leeds respectively.

(d) Compensation for criminal injuries

The Home Office Working Party to review the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme invited the Howard League to submit evidence on the operation of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board, and the proposal that its awards should be entitlement rather than *ex gratia* payments. A working party was convened to study this; the Chairman is Anthony Evans, Q.C.

(e) Imprisonment of Prostitutes

Prostitutes are a category of lawbreakers whom many people would like to keep out of prison. Towards the end of the year under review Mrs. Marna Sedgwick, J.P., offered to consider ways of doing so and hopes to form a group to submit comments on the Home Office study of the law of vagrancy, expected in the autumn.

(f) Children and Young Persons

This subject is being approached in a slightly different way.

Recognising that the Howard League has perhaps paid too little attention to it in the past, the Council has decided to set up a permanent group to keep it under review. Miss Elizabeth Harvie has agreed to convene it and its first

task will be to submit evidence to the House of Commons Expenditure Committee.

5. Prisoners' letters to the Howard League

What emerges most clearly from the League's correspondence is that many prisoners, and especially their families, experience sheer bewilderment when they first come up against the prison system. When it appears that the system is acting arbitrarily or unfairly, this can easily turn into antagonism — a feeling which imprisonment is just as capable of producing as the deterrence and rehabilitation which are its ostensible aims. Yet the refusal to give reasons for administrative decisions, let alone discuss them with the people they affect, gives just this impression of arbitrariness — however justifiable the decisions themselves may be.

One of our correspondents says "I am not very good at letter writing", and several are apprehensive about taking up the cause of their imprisoned relative for fear that he will thereby be treated as a troublemaker. How many merely resentfully acquiesce? During the past year we have been asked, for example, how a remand prisoner can have his spectacles returned to him, how a prisoner may be moved to a lower security category, how he may apply to be transferred (or allowed to remain where he is), and how one man could persuade the prison to allow him to continue working on a document urgently required by his employers so that an export order could be fulfilled.

But to judge by the letters we receive, one of the biggest single causes for frustration is the refusal, without reasons, of parole, pre-release employment scheme, home leave and compassionate leave. Even accepting that the facts as presented do not necessarily give the whole story, or even a wholly accurate one, we are persuaded that the prison system is too often guided by caution and fear of creating a precedent.

Of course, people seldom write to the Howard League about the cases where prison governors or Prison Department officials take a risk and show trust in prisoners; we hope the Department will be less reticent about these, not only for the sake of its own image, but also to build up public acceptance for the use of discretion, and compassion, in promoting the re-integration of prisoners into the community.

6. Activities and Administration.

(a) Lectures and conferences

How to keep more people out of prison was the theme of the Summer School held at the University of York from 10th to 14th September 1973. Lord

Gardiner opened the conference on the Monday evening. Dr. Charlotte Banks of the Home Office Research Unit gave the first lecture on Tuesday entitled "Who are the prisoners?" in which she described a survey of the prison population. Dr Cyril S. Smith followed with a talk on preventive youth work, based on the Wincroft Youth Project. David Aitken of the Day Training Centre at Sheffield and John Harding, Senior Probation Officer at Nottingham responsible for the Community Service Order scheme, talked about progress so far and possibilities for the future. During the evening Sir Brian MacKenna, a High Court Judge, spoke on "Sentencing and penal policy": his lecture, advocating a reduction in the sentencing tariff, will be published in *Progress in penal reform*, edited by Louis Blom-Cooper (O.U.P., December 1974). On Wednesday Robert Tollemache, a former probation officer and now a lecturer at Bedford College, London, considered "What does the probation and after-care service need?" Chris Nuttall, Senior Research Officer, Home Office Research Unit, made us aware of "The importance of evaluating alternatives", and later Dr. Richard Smith of No Fixed Abode spoke on "Escape from the revolving door: the homeless single person". Two speakers considered the institutional aspects: Paul Clairmonte, an Assistant Governor at Ford open prison, discussed "Day to day constraints in the running of institutions", and Arthur de Frisching of P2 Division at the Home Office gave a ten-year perspective on "Rehabilitation, release and the prevention of recidivism". After lunch Dr. Pauline Morris, of Legal Advice Research Unit spoke on "The role of parole", and the final lecture was given by Peter Nokes, Lecturer in Social Administration, University of Leeds, "New perspectives on the assessment of institutional change". Plenary sessions and discussion groups were held between the lectures and the conference was closed by the Chairman, Sir Kenneth Younger, drawing together the reports of the different groups. We are grateful to the Home Office and the Governors concerned for making it possible for conference members to visit institutions in the area.

Sir Kenneth Younger, as retiring Chairman of the Howard League, addressed the public meeting held at Caxton Hall after the Annual General Meeting on 18th October 1973, on *Sentencing*. The text of this address, which attracted much attention, is available.

The family, the social structure and the victim of crime, by Professor W.H. Nagel of Leiden University (21st February 1974).

Getting people out of borstal: The Taylor House experiment, by Michael Whitlam, formerly Assistant Governor in charge, (30th May 1974).

Can prison reform? by Miss Jessica Mitford, author of *Cons and rebels* (Allen and Unwin, 1974) (27th June 1974).

A new deal for Young Offenders was the title of the first of two day conferences to discuss the Advisory Council Report. This one was held in the Ethel Williams Hall at the University of Newcastle (19th June 1974) and we are

grateful to Mr. David Harte of the Faculty of Law for making the arrangements. The Chairman was Professor D.W. Elliott, Professor of Law and Pro-Vice Chancellor of the University of Newcastle, and the speakers were, the Lady James of Rusholme, a member of the Advisory Council of the Penal System, Miss Helen Paling, a Barrister and Recorder, Mr. Haydn Davies Jones, Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of Newcastle, and Professor Laurie Taylor, Professor of Sociology at the University of York.

A second conference was held in Southampton, just after the end of the year under review.

(b) Local Branches

Wales. Since its inauguration, announced in last year's annual report, the branch has been active, under the Chairmanship of Dr. W.J. Bolt, in organizing meetings, and has formed a study group. A report on the year's activities was included in our *Newsletter* for July 1974.

Middle Thames. A group was formed in the Reading-Windsor-Maidenhead area. It has held a number of meetings, organized visits to penal institutions, and started a newsletter. Its plans for the future are currently under discussion.

Sussex. A well-attended inaugural meeting was addressed by the President of the Howard League, Lord Gardiner, on Monday, 18th March, 1974. At a follow-up meeting addressed by the Director a steering committee was formed, to plan activities for the coming year and arrange for the selection of a full committee. The chairman is a solicitor, Mr. Michael Bailey.

It is hoped to follow up the Day conferences in Newcastle and Southampton by promoting local branches there too: and enquiries have been received from other parts of the country.

(c) New forms of membership

After receiving suggestions from members and potential members, the Council decided to introduce new forms of membership, for couples, groups, and organizations, and to re-introduce life membership. Couples can now join for £6, a group of four or more people for £3, each (with further reduced rates for larger groups), and the head of an organization can join as its representative.

We hope that members will encourage their colleagues and associates to take advantage of these arrangements.

(d) Howard Journal of Penology

The 1974 Journal unfortunately suffered multiple delays, first editorially, then through industrial troubles; it was sent to members in June, just in time to beat a rise in postal charges, and officially published in July. It contained

two articles based on Howard League lectures: one by Gunnar Marnell, a senior Swedish prison administrator, giving a detailed account of Swedish prisoners' negotiations for reforms, and one by Professor John Flackett, of Boston College Law School, Brighton, Massachusetts, describing how institutions for under-17s in Massachusetts were not reformed but abolished. Street robbing caused concern during the year, after the newspapers took to calling it "mugging", and Tony Jefferson and John Clarke of Birmingham put forward a suggestion of the factors underlying it. Colin Palfrey, who is also secretary of the Howard League in Wales, has written a critique of remedial education in penal institutions. Another American contribution, by Professor R.K. Brautigam, describes a pilot study aimed at elucidating the attitudes of various participants in the court-room process. Finally Michael Clarke analyses some sources of institutional malaise.

John Corden, of the Department of Social Administration and Social Work, University of York, took over as Review Editor.

It was necessary to raise the price to non-members to £2, but this could be regarded as enhancing the value of the membership subscription, since members receive it free (or for 80p if they subscribe at the reduced rate for students and retirement pensioners).

The Newsletter was published in October 1973, February and May 1974.

(e) John Howard Library

At last it has been possible to start cataloguing and classifying the Library, thanks to a generous grant from the Noel Buxton Trust. The grant also made it possible to acquire the books and pamphlets left by the late R.L. Morrison. The Library overflowed into the Director's office, in two bookcases commissioned from the workshops at Broadmoor.

The many enquiries received emphasised the need for a more comprehensive information centre on crime problems.

(f) Howard Centre Study Groups

Two groups have met in three terms of ten weeks. They were conducted by Dr. Mary J.L. Ellis, M.B., B.S., M.R.C.Psych., D.P.M., Senior Medical Officer, Feltham Borstal, who reports:

One group was a continuation of the first-year group of 1972/73, with the same composition except for one member who was unable to attend. The work consisted of on-going training for group members who have groups of their own, with group analysis of situations that arise. Although the train strikes in early 1974 made travelling difficult for one out-of-town member, attendance was very regular and mutual support and interaction is expected to continue now that the group has terminated.

The second group formed Year I of a new training course and has been pursued throughout the year with some vicissitudes due to movement both

within and without the group. Because of two members leaving and two going into full-time training in the autumn, the numbers may not be sufficient for a viable second year. This matter is being investigated; it is hoped to continue, but this depends on (a) numbers and (b) finance from the employing authorities.

(g) Enquiries from members and the public

The League has continued to receive requests for information at all levels, from schoolchildren working on projects to members of the House of Lords preparing for a debate.

In conjunction with NACRO we started work on a series of fact sheets which we hope will be useful.

(h) Speakers' panel 1973/74

Members of our speakers' group, and others who are not, took part in forty meetings last year. Some addressed groups, others led discussions and a few took part in formal debates. The meetings were arranged by a wide range of organizations including schools, colleges and universities, women's associations, political and secular groups. Among other engagements the Director spoke twice to prisoners' social studies group at HMP Coldingley; once to a staff group at HMP Pentonville; and gave a lecture on "The future use of prison" in a series organized by the University of London Extra-Mural Studies Department. He was also invited to speak on "Treatment" at the conference in Bromsgrove organized by the Margery Fry Memorial Trust to mark the centenary of Margery Fry's birth. Our thanks go to I. Abelson, Mrs D. Allen, A. Arnold, C. Barker, D. Bickmore, A. Bishop, R. Bogg, Mrs Y. Craig, D. Curtis, A. Daniels, B. Estlea, Miss M. Freeman, R. Griffiths, Miss. E. Harvie, D. Howard, Rev. A. Hoyles, R. Jackson, Mrs T. Joll, R. Parsons, Mrs V. Valentine, Mrs J. Yeo-Marsh and G. Zellick for undertaking engagements on our behalf.

A member who teaches public speaking, Miss Ione Hoskins, kindly offered hospitality to a meeting to discuss ways of putting penal reform across to different audiences. It is hoped to convene further meetings of this kind; this is something which perhaps local groups could do.

(i) Staff

After a very uncomfortable transitional period, we were fortunate in finding Mrs Anne Curtis, who came in October originally as Martin Wright's secretary; but she has now taken over the administration of the office, with special reference to membership subscriptions. She has worked hard to bring the records up to date; Mrs Betty Voller was extremely kind in coming back in the autumn of 1973 to deal with problems left behind by her successor who

has proved unsuitable. We are grateful to those who have helped by renewing their subscriptions at the first reminder, and apologise for not always succeeding in replying promptly to correspondents.

Finding a new secretary proved very difficult, and more than once our advertisements brought no response. We were therefore forced to the expensive expedient of using temporary staff. A consultant, Mr. David Sladen, advised us on office procedures.

We continue to owe a great debt to Mrs Irene Kaspers, who in addition to helping in the office and Library did a great deal of work in organizing the Brighton meetings, and to Mrs Thalia Joll; who has helped with information and the compilation of fact sheets.

(j) Council

In August 1973 the death occurred of Sir George Benson, Chairman of the Howard League from 1936 to 1960, and thereafter Vice-President. A warm tribute was paid to him by Mr. Tom Lodge at the Annual General Meeting in October, and Hugh Klare contributed an appreciation in the Newsletter. The League welcomes an Assistant Honorary Treasurer, Mr. Brian Twyman, FCA, of the chartered accountants' firm of Ross, Edwards; and six other new members of the enlarged Council, Mrs Evelyn Gibson, and Messrs. Jimmy Gordon, Nicholas Hinton, Jonathan Marshall, Robert Tollemache, and Graham Zellick.

Miss Elizabeth Harvie, OBE, who has served on the Council since 1969, has decided to resign as from the 1974 Annual General Meeting, but she will continue to help with the working party on Children and Young Persons until it is well established. Council members retiring by rotation are: Mr. Michael Day, Mrs Susanne Dell, Mr. Tony Dumont, Dr. Roy King and Dr. Keith Wardrop. Of these, Mr. Day and Dr. Wardrop are not standing for re-election this year, in accordance with a Council decision to limit the normal term of service to six years (*Annual Report 1971/72*, p.21). The remainder offer their services again.

We congratulate our Vice-President, Dr. Nigel Walker, on his appointment to the chair of criminology at the University of Cambridge, and Mrs Joyce Williams on the award of an MBE in the New Year's Honours.

7. Finance.

The accounts show that the work of the Howard League has been achieved with a general budget of just over £10,000, an increase of less than ten per cent on the previous year.

Our deficit has been kept as low as £359 only because of two generous grants. One is £3,000 per year from the Barrow and Geraldine S. Cadbury Trust; but this will last for only three years, and we are half way through the period. The other is £1,000 a year for five years, from the Sutton Trust. We are very grateful to these, and to all our other donors.

We must look to increasing income from subscriptions. It may, unfortunately, be necessary to raise subscriptions again. The only ways to check this increase are, firstly and above all, to recruit more members; secondly for members to raise funds through selling publications or in other ways; thirdly, for those whose income has increased to raise their contribution accordingly. We are particularly grateful to those who already send us more than the basic subscription, and those who have enlisted new members.

One method of enabling us to extend our activities in the present financial situation is to secure grants for specific projects. We express our thanks to the Wates Foundation for supporting the Boards of Visitors Committee, the Noel Buxton Trust for help towards reorganizing the library, and the Hilden Trust for supplying copies of Dr. Kellmer Pringle's pamphlet "The roots of violence and vandalism". In addition, since the end of the financial year, the Allen Lane Foundation has made a grant to cover the working party on Custody during trial, and the Sembal Trust has made a donation which has been allocated to the initial expenses of the working parties on Prison and community and Compensation for criminal injuries.

Of the other items in the accounts, the relentlessly increasing cost of stationery, postage, telephone and many other items is too familiar to need repetition. Mention should be made of the regrettable item for defalcations: these have come to light since the dismissal of an unsatisfactory book-keeper who was employed briefly last summer. It is hoped that at least some of the amount will be recoverable. It remains to thank our auditors, Messrs. Brewer & Co., for their patience and expedition in preparing the accounts.

The Howard League in Scotland 1972-73

Starting with Mrs Renee Short M.P. on 16th October 1973 our public meetings in the Hume Tower have once again been uniformly successful and thought-provoking. Mrs Short (that "combination of Boadicea and Elizabeth Fry" as Ethel Houston put it in her words of thanks at the end of the meeting) concentrated on the two main deficiencies of the prison system, as she saw it, namely, the lack of truly rewarding work and the lack of facilities for maintaining family and marital relationships. It was a bleak picture; and, because of the overcrowded state of our prisons, it seems almost impossible to make a move in the right direction.

Speaking at the beginning of November, on the "Treatment of Offenders in Prison and Rehabilitation - Some Experiments in the Netherlands", Dr. Van Der Grient, Deputy director of the Dutch Prison Service, gave a lively and witty exposition of the organization and treatment aspects of the penal system in Holland. There, because of the relatively low level of prison sentences, they show us how many opportunities seem to exist for change and improvement.

On 30th November, John Harding, Senior Probation Officer responsible for Community Service, Nottingham City and County Probation and After-Care Service, spoke in optimistic terms about community service orders in England. The meeting was followed up by a leader page article in *The Scotsman* which may have led to the subsequent discussion in Parliament about the situation in Scotland. In any event, the next move here would seem to be a seminar-type discussion involving both voluntary bodies and law enforcing agencies, with a view to seeing if any steps can be taken in the direction of community service north of the border, where no change in the law is required. The committee have in mind the possibility of holding such a seminar in the spring.

Our last speaker for the year was Dr. Norman Tutt, who spoke in the Hume Tower on 8th May. Dr. Tutt, whose book *Care and Custody* has now been published by Darton, Longman and Todd and who works in the intermediate treatment area, took the view that approved schools functioned in terms of four dimensions, namely, treatment, punishment, custody and rehabilitation. On all four counts they were failing miserably, and the main consideration now must be to break out of the vicious circle and develop new forms of treatment based on radically different premises.

Among other activities, the Committee has submitted recommendations to Lord Dunpark's Committee on Reparation by the Offender. It seems to us that such reparation, which could reduce or even take the place of punishment, would represent a sensible measure of decriminalization. The Committee is also proposing to make representations in respect of the failure of a model court-house, which has been on exhibition in Scotland, to depart from traditional ideas. Research is at present under way so that we can bring to the attention of the authorities possible alternative designs.

There have been some Committee changes during the year. In January Drummond Hunter resigned as Honorary Secretary, following on his appointment as Secretary of the Scottish Health Service Planning Council. Eric Walker has resigned as Honorary Treasurer, and Karen Bruce Lockhart, 60 Frederick Street, Edinburgh, is acting as Honorary Secretary and Treasurer until the next Annual General Meeting. Sir Gerald Reece has retired as Chairman of the Howard League in Scotland, although he still serves on the Executive Committee. Dr. Bruce Ritson, DPM, MD, MRCPsych., has

agreed to act as Chairman until the next Annual General Meeting. Niell Campbell, we are glad to say, has been able to rejoin the Committee.

In the autumn we are particularly pleased that Professor McClintock, the new Professor of Criminology at Edinburgh University, has agreed to address us on "Has Penal Reform Failed?".

THE HOWARD LEAGUE FOR PENAL REFORM
(Company Limited by Guarantee and not having a share Capital)
BALANCE SHEET AS AT 31ST MAY 1974

| | 1974 | 1973 |
|--|----------------|---------------|
| | £ | £ |
| CAPITAL ACCOUNT – Note 4 | 7,736 | 8,331 |
| THE HOWARD CENTRE FOR PENOLOGY – Note 5 | 532 | 200 |
| THE ROY CALVERT MEMORIAL FUND | 461 | 461 |
| THE LIBRARY FUND – Note 6 | 390 | – |
| THE BOARDS OF VISITORS FUND -- Note 7 | 1,584 | – |
| | <u>£10,703</u> | <u>£8,992</u> |
| <i>Represented by:</i> | | |
| CURRENT ASSETS | | |
| Stock – Stationery and Publications | 263 | 313 |
| Debtors and Prepayments | 3,099 | 1,295 |
| Cash at Bank and in Hand | 3,640 | 3,625 |
| Loan: Social Services Ltd | 186 | 174 |
| | <u>£7,188</u> | <u>£5,407</u> |
| <i>Less:</i> | | |
| CURRENT LIABILITIES | | |
| Creditors and Accrued Charges | 3,016 | 2,135 |
| | <u>£4,172</u> | <u>£3,272</u> |
| FORMATION EXPENSES | | |
| INVESTMENTS – Note 3 | – | 236 |
| Market Value £4,804, 1973 £4,732 | 5,580 | 4,560 |
| FIXED ASSETS – Note 2 | 951 | 924 |
| | <u>£10,703</u> | <u>£8,992</u> |

Sir Edward Howard, Bt.
Martin Wright

Hon. Treasurer
Secretary

Notes on Accounts
31st May 1974

1. ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Depreciation of fixed assets is calculated as follows:

(1) Leasehold Property – on a straight line basis over the period of the lease.

(2) Furniture and Equipment – on a reducing balance basis at a rate of 10 per cent per annum.

2. FIXED ASSETS

(1) Leasehold Property

Cost at 1st June 1973

Less: Amortisation to date

Book Value at 31st May 1974

(2) Furniture and Equipment

As at 1st June 1973

Additions during year at cost

Less: Depreciation for the year

Book Value at 31st May 1974

(3) Library Books

Valuation as at 31st May 1974

3. INVESTMENTS

As at 1st June 1973

£485.00 British Insulated Callender's Cables

7% Debenture Stock 1985/90

£190.00 7% British Savings Bonds (First Issue)

£487.20 British Transport 3% Guaranteed Stk. 1978/88

£335.50 City of Salford 5½% Redemable Stk. 1986/88

900 Equities Investment Fund for Charities Units

1,500 Save and Prosper Group Units

(including £26 re-invested during the year)

2,000 Scot-yield Units

3,000 Target Income Fund Trust Units

£200.00 9% Treasury Loan 1994

Add: Purchased during year

1,600 Williams Hudson Group Ltd. Ordinary 20p Shares

As at 31st May 1974 per Balance Sheet

| | |
|--|---------------|
| | £ |
| | |
| | 472 |
| | 174 |
| | <u>£298</u> |
| | |
| | 352 |
| | 95 |
| | 447 |
| | 44 |
| | <u>£403</u> |
| | |
| | <u>£250</u> |
| | |
| | <u>Cost £</u> |
| | 478 |
| | 190 |
| | 280 |
| | 285 |
| | 1,390 |
| | 501 |
| | 525 |
| | 737 |
| | 200 |
| | <u>£4,586</u> |
| | |
| | 994 |
| | <u>£5,580</u> |

| | 1974 | 1973 |
|--|------------|---------------|
| | £ | £ |
| 4. CAPITAL ACCOUNT | | |
| Balance as at 1st June 1973 | | 8,331 |
| Less: Formation Expenses written off | 236 | |
| Excess of Expenditure over Income for year | <u>359</u> | 595 |
| Balance as at 31st May 1974 | | <u>£7,736</u> |
| 5. HOWARD CENTRE FOR PENOLOGY | | |
| Balance as at 1st June 1973 | | 200 |
| Add: Fees receivable for courses | | 985 |
| | | <u>£1,185</u> |
| Less: Fees not recovered | 50 | |
| Staff Fees | 553 | |
| Administration Expenses contribution | <u>50</u> | 653 |
| Balance as at 31st May 1974 | | <u>£532</u> |
| 6. LIBRARY FUND | | |
| Donation – Noel Buxton Trust | | 500 |
| Less: Books purchased therefrom | | 110 |
| Balance as at 31st May 1974 | | <u>£390</u> |
| 7. BOARDS OF VISITORS FUND | | |
| Donation – Wates Foundation | | 2,000 |
| Less: Expenses of the working party | 400 | |
| Administration Expenses | <u>16</u> | 416 |
| Balance as at 31st May 1974 | | <u>£1,584</u> |

Note: This Fund is held in trust for the Committee on Boards of Visitors

Report of the auditors to the members of The Howard League for Penal Reform

In our opinion, the accounts and notes set out on pages 22 to 27 give, so far as concerns the members, a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Company at 31st May 1974 and of the excess of expenditure over income for the year ended on that date and comply with the Companies Acts 1948 and 1967.

11 Southampton Row, London.

August 1974

BREWER & COMPANY
Chartered Accountants

THE HOWARD LEAGUE FOR PENAL REFORM INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT For the year ended 31st May 1974

| | 1974 | 1973 |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| | £ | £ |
| Subscriptions | 4,880 | 4,462 |
| Proceeds of Appeal | — | 1,576 |
| Donations | 4,570 | 2,222 |
| Howard Journal | 671 | 683 |
| Dividends and Interest (Gross) | 600 | 446 |
| Sundry Receipts | <u>561</u> | 827 |
| GROSS INCOME | 11,282 | 10,216 |
| Less: Establishment Expenses | 1,493 | 1,415 |
| Administration Expenses | <u>10,148</u> | 8,772 |
| | 11,641 | 10,187 |
| EXCESS OF EXPENDITURE OVER INCOME | <u>£359</u> | <u>£(29)</u> |
| transferred to Capital Account | | |

Income Details: Year Ended 31st May 1974

| | 1974 | 1973 |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| | £ | £ |
| SUBSCRIPTIONS | | |
| Net income from subscriptions | 3,964 | 3,511 |
| Income Tax recoverable under Subscribers' Covenants | 979 | 1,038 |
| | <u>4,943</u> | <u>4,549</u> |
| <i>Less: Transferred to Scottish Branch</i> | 63 | 87 |
| | <u>£4,880</u> | <u>£4,462</u> |
| | | |
| DONATIONS | | |
| Barrow & Geraldine S. Cadbury Trust | 3,000 | 1,650 |
| Sutton Trust | 1,000 | - |
| Others | 570 | 572 |
| | <u>£4,570</u> | <u>£2,222</u> |
| | | |
| DIVIDENDS AND INTEREST | | |
| Net income from Dividends | 152 | 152 |
| Income Tax recoverable thereon | 67 | 89 |
| Interest received gross | 381 | 205 |
| | <u>£600</u> | <u>£446</u> |
| | | |
| SUNDRY RECEIPTS | | |
| Royalties | 31 | 27 |
| Sales of Literature | 224 | 334 |
| Meetings | 25 | 218 |
| Fees | 5 | 234 |
| Summer School | 259 | - |
| Miscellaneous | 17 | 14 |
| | <u>£561</u> | <u>£827</u> |

Expenditure Details: Year Ended 31st May 1974

| | 1974 | 1973 |
|---|----------------|---------------|
| | £ | £ |
| ESTABLISHMENT EXPENSES | | |
| Rent | 1,408 | 1,343 |
| Insurance | 16 | 7 |
| Amortisation of Lease | 25 | 25 |
| Depreciation of Furniture etc. | 44 | 40 |
| | <u>£1,493</u> | <u>£1,415</u> |
| | | |
| ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES | | |
| Salaries and Related Contributions | 6,406 | 6,026 |
| Printing and Stationery | 917 | 737 |
| Postage and Telephone | 590 | 469 |
| Repairs | - | 7 |
| Advertising | 80 | 345 |
| Provision for Howard Journal 1974 issue publication costs | 611 | 447 |
| Literature and Publications | 201 | 161 |
| Library Books | 47 | 19 |
| Meetings | 89 | 336 |
| Appeal Expenses | - | 30 |
| Travelling Expenses | 152 | 124 |
| General Expenses | 341 | 111 |
| Defalcations | 277 | - |
| Bank Charges | 15 | 33 |
| Legal and Consultancy Charges | 402 | - |
| Accountancy and Audit Fees | 70 | 61 |
| | <u>£10,198</u> | <u>£8,906</u> |
| | | |
| <i>Less: Contribution to Administration Costs by The Howard Centre for Penology</i> | 50 | 134 |
| | <u>£10,148</u> | <u>£8,772</u> |

PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE HOWARD LEAGUE

(all prices post-free if cash with order)

- Granting bail in magistrates' courts: proposals for reform.** Report submitted by the Howard League to the Home Office/Magistrates' Association Working Party, 1972. It lists some weaknesses in the present system, and proposes that bail should be based on the probability that the accused will attend his trial, rather than on monetary or other criteria. Ways of achieving this are described. 40p (30p members)
- Living it down: the problem of old convictions.** Report of a Committee set up by the Howard League, Justice and the National Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders, 1972. The report describes the difficulties encountered by people who have a conviction dating from long ago, but have since led a blameless life: at any moment something may happen which allows this past to be brought up again, often with disastrous consequences. There may be a million people in this position; the report suggests a way of overcoming the problem. 65p (50p members).
- New careers for ex-offenders: a transition therapeutic community for young violent offenders,** by Dennie Briggs, and **The new careers project at Vacaville, California,** by Nancy Hodgkin. Reprint from Howard Journal, 1972. 25p
- Crisis agencies and the treatment of offenders in the Netherlands,** by Robert Tollemache. Reprint from Howard Journal, 1973. 25p.
- The future use of prison,** by Martin Wright. Text of lecture given in series Aspects of Punishment for University of London Extra Mural Studies Department, November 1973. 15p.
- Ill-founded premises: the logic of penal policy and the prison building programme.** The Howard League for Penal Reform 1974. 15p
- Sentencing.** The Rt. Hon. Sir Kenneth Younger, KBE. His address to the Annual General Meeting of the Howard League for Penal Reform, 18 October 1973, on his retirement from the chairmanship. 20p
- Murder and capital punishment in England and Wales,** published jointly by the National Campaign for the Abolition of Capital Punishment and the Howard League for Penal Reform, 1974. 40p
- Juvenile offenders in the community: some recent experiences in the United States,** by John M. Flackett (Reprint from Howard Journal, 1974) 40p
- The Church and the offender,** by Martin Wright. Article from Saint Margaret the Queen Parish Magazine, February 1974. 5p
- The purpose of punishment,** by Martin Wright. Text of sermon preached at Great St. Mary's, Cambridge, 25th November 1973. 5p

Howard League Booklists

| | |
|-----------------------|----|
| Prisons and Prisoners | 3p |
| Women in Prison | 3p |
| New Careers | 3p |
| Education in Prisons | 3p |

REGULAR HOWARD LEAGUE PUBLICATIONS

- Howard Journal,** published annually in March (£1.00 to members not paying full subscription; £2.00 to non-members)
- Annual Report of the Howard League** 30p (free to members)
- Newsletter** 5p (free to members)

ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THIS OFFICE

| | |
|--|-------|
| A filmstrip on prisons with accompanying notes, for hire | £1 |
| Who is the criminal? by Richard Oerton, 1968 | 25p |
| Prisons: time and punishment, by Tom Tickell, 1969. Illustrated factual account of life in prison by a prison visitor. | 15p |
| The hanging question: essays on the death penalty, edited by Louis Blom-Cooper. | 25p |
| Prisons under sentence, by H.W. Chatfield, 1973. A paperback by a prison visitor, with historical outline and summary of arguments against prisons in their present form. | 90p |
| People in prison, by Hugh J. Klare. The former secretary of the Howard League examines the nature of prison and prisoners and suggests reforms in the penal system and its administrative structure. Pitmans, 1973. | £2.00 |
| John Howard and Elizabeth Fry, by J. Gibson. Illustrated account of their lives in the Brief Lives series by Methuen Educational, 1971. | 25p |
| Newcareers for the disadvantaged, by Nancy Hodgkin, 1971. NACRO reprint No. 8 | 40p |
| Declienting Social Work, by Dennie Briggs | } 15p |
| Offenders as social workers, by Nicholas Hinton | |
| A workshop to promote change, by Jacqueline Castles Social Work Today, January 1973. | |
| The Bedford Gaol that John Howard knew, by Judge E. Stockdale | 5p |

WHAT THE HOWARD LEAGUE DOES...

The Howard League works for the prevention of crime by constructive penal and social policies, to encourage and enable offenders to make better use of their lives, instead of relying on the present largely punitive and unsuccessful methods. What is crime? Why is it increasing in our society? Why is the existing system so ineffective in prevention and treatment? These are the problems of which the Howard League tries to promote a wider knowledge and understanding, with the aim of developing more informed methods and thus reducing the number of people who suffer as a result of crime.

This is how the Howard League works—

— by factfinding

The Howard League acts as a watchdog on the operation of the existing penal system. When the system is not working as fairly, effectively and humanely as possible, or is not attaining the standards claimed in its public statements, we propose improvements.

— by encouraging reform

Study groups of the Howard League put forward improvements and new methods of preventing crime and treating offenders, and comment of draft legislation where necessary. The League presents evidence to Royal Commissions, Departmental Inquiries and the Advisory Council on the Penal System. It offers background information to members of both Houses of Parliament. It consults with, and makes informal recommendations to, Government officials, which often lead to improvements. When necessary, it raises issues in public by publishing the facts and showing up the need for reform.

— by supplying information

Information is available to members of the League, journalists, radio and television producers, students, and schoolchildren. We issue pamphlets, organize meetings and conferences, and publish the *Howard Journal*. A small *Library* is available to members.

— by providing training

The Howard Centre of Penology, set up by the League in 1967, is concerned with the training in new techniques of those engaged in treatment of offenders and in the prevention of crime.

END