

YOUTH AND POLICY

**the journal of
critical analysis**

ISSN 0262 - 9798

No. 16 Spring 1986

YOUTH the journal of **critical analysis** **AND POLICY**

Youth and Policy
ISSN 0262-9798

'Burnbrae'
Black Lane
Blaydon Burn
Blaydon
Tyne and Wear NE21 6DS

Youth and Policy, a non-profit making journal, is devoted to the serious critical study of issues in Youth affairs and the analysis of policy concerning Youth in society. All of the Editorial Group work on a voluntary basis.

Editorial Group:

Maura Banim	Chris Parkin	Richard Jenks
John Carr	Muriel Sawbridge	Malcolm Jackson
Judith Cocker	Jean Spence	Tony Jeffs
Sarah Marshall	John Teasdale	Ross Cowan
		Barry Troyna

Thanks to Jackie Kelly and Sandra Leventon who assist the group.

Youth and Policy is published quarterly. Details concerning subscriptions and procedures for submission of material, including advertising copy, can be found on the inside back cover, and are available on separate leaflets by request.

Material from the journal may be extracted at any length for study and quotation. Please acknowledge the author and Youth and Policy.

The views expressed in Youth and Policy are those of the respective contributors and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the editorial group.

Whilst every effort is made to check factual material, the editorial group are not responsible for statistical errors in material accepted in good faith from reputable sources. Where possible information will be updated in future issues and any errors corrected.

Editor's address:

'Burnbrae', Black Lane, Blaydon Burn, Blaydon, Tyne and Wear NE21 6DS.

Typeset and Printed by: Mayfair Printers
Print House, William Street, Sunderland,
Tyne & Wear SR1 1UL. Telephone (0783) 79326

© Youth and Policy 1986

contents

NO. 16 SPRING 1986

	page
Ruth Levitas Tory Students and the New Right	1
Chris Crossley Police Involvement in Youth and Community Work	10
Bob Franklin The Youth and Policy Interview	14
Sue Lees A New Approach to the Study of Girls	20
Mike Nellis Death of an I.T. Programme	28
Harry Torrance Reforming the Secondary Examination System	34
Terry Thomas Juvenile Bureaux	39
Working Space	42
Reviews	43
Analysis	50
Monitor	51
Contributors	Inside back cover

tory students and the new right

RUTH LEVITAS

This article examines the emergence of the Federation of Conservative Students as an active political force over the last ten years in the context of the rise of the New Right as a whole, and the recent dominance of the libertarian 'sound faction' within the Federation. It stresses the centrality of anti-socialism to both FCS and New Right ideology, and examines the problematic relationship between the Federation and the Conservative Party. It argues that New Right dominance over the Conservative Party is such as to make a curbing of the Federation's activities very unlikely.

On 23 March 1985, Mrs. Thatcher made an impassioned speech to the Conservative Central Council in Newcastle.

Young people are impressionable. How we behave - whether as parents, teachers, sportsmen, politicians - is bound to influence how our children behave. When teachers strike and cause disruption - that's a bad example. When football idols play foul - that's a bad example. When local councils refuse to set a legal rate - that's a bad example. And when some Trade Union leaders, yes, and some politicians, scorn the law and the courts and the police - these are bad examples. So too is picket line violence. And who can help but worry about some of the violence we see on our television screens? The standards of society are set by what we tolerate, by the discipline and conventions we set.⁽¹⁾

In view of these sentiments and further condemnations of football hooliganism being widely publicised, it was something of an embarrassment to the Conservative Party when, ten days later, vandalism by Tory students made front page news. Delegates to the annual conference of the Federation of Conservative Students at Loughborough University were alleged to have caused thousands of pounds worth of damage to university property at a late-night party. John Gummer, then chairman of the Conservative Party, immediately suspended the Federation's £30,000 per annum funding and announced an inquiry into the incident, promising that those responsible for the damage would be expelled. When the inquiry reported on 12 June, it found that reports of damage were much exaggerated; indeed, since the University had made no inventory prior to the incident concerned, it was not possible to assess how much damage was actually caused by FCS members. Those responsible have not been identified, so no-one is to be expelled. The Federation's funding was immediately restored, with Gummer saying "they will get all the money they need to do their job".⁽²⁾

The main obvious result of all this has been a little more egg on Gummer's face, vindicating the Federation's angry assertions that little damage was actually caused, that Gummer acted unreasonably, and that he was unfit for his job. Exactly five months after suspending the Federation's funds, on 2 September 1985, Gummer was sacked and replaced by Norman Tebbit as Party Chairman. Few people will lose much sleep over Gummer's demotion (except indirectly, over Tebbit's succession). But what should keep us awake at night is that this is the third inquiry into the FCS in five years, and none of these has been successful in inhibiting the Federation's swing to the Right, the extremism of its policies, or the tactics adopted by some of its members. For Gummer's action in suspending the Federation's funding was not simply an over-reaction to press reports or a necessary step to demonstrate that privileged and supposedly educated hooligans were as unacceptable as any others. He had, in fact, announced an inquiry into the FCS before the Loughborough Conference opened, to investigate claims of excessive factionalism and political extremism within the Federation.⁽³⁾ It was indeed found guilty of factionalism, and rule changes are to be negotiated with the current FCS leadership to attempt to overcome this. The issue of political extremism has been quietly ignored; indeed, it was outside the terms of the inquiry's remit to investigate this.⁽⁴⁾

A more important issue than how badly some students behaved at Loughborough is the significance both of the undoubtedly extreme views of the Federation and some of its individual members, and of the failure of the Conservative Party to take any effective action to curb the Federation's less reputable activities. To evaluate this, one needs to examine three processes. Firstly, the emergence of the FCS over the last ten years as an active participant in student and non-student politics, and its capture by what is called the 'sound faction'. Secondly, the general rise over a similar period of time of the New Right, of which the Federation is a part. Thirdly, the relationship between the Federation, the New Right and Conservative Party, and the limits thereby set to the likelihood of action seriously restraining the FCS.

'Libertarianism' and the Federation of Conservative Students

Over the past few years, and particularly since 1980, the FCS has been dominated by the so-called 'sound faction', whose views are usually characterised as 'libertarian', and which has particular strength in Scotland. The Federation collec-

tively, and its members individually, espouse policies which apply Thatcherite rhetoric about freedom rigorously to the economic sphere, demanding deregulation and privatization; demands for freedom are also extended beyond the economy, leading to advocacy of, for example, the legalization of cannabis, and in some individual cases, the legalization of heroin. More recently, and especially since the defection of several members to the Social Democratic Party in 1981, support for extreme right-wing regimes and movements, such as South Africa, the South-African-backed UNITA forces in Angola, and the US-backed Contras in Nicaragua, has been much in evidence. The Federation is strongly antipathetic to anything which can be regarded as socialist or socialist-influenced (including the National Union of Students) and has been known to employ provocative tactics in pursuance of its aims.

All this is a relatively recent development. The Federation of Conservative Students was founded in 1931 by John Buchan, but it was not until 1973 that it began to be really active in students politics. It is the official student wing of the Party, organised separately from the Young Conservatives. It is supported out of Party funds, has an office at Conservative Central Office, the Party headquarters, and is affiliated to the Conservative National Union. Its membership consists of all members of affiliated Conservative student associations in individual colleges. In the early seventies, the Federation began to campaign actively for policies which diverged from those of the NUS, and indeed to campaign for the transformation or destruction of the NUS itself. From the outset, differences between those who espoused a 'moderate' conservatism characteristic of the post-war period, and those who espoused a 'libertarian' or right-wing position, are easily discernable.

Early signs of the growing activity of the libertarians include the tabling of a motion to the 1975 Welsh Conservative Party conference, regretting that there was little sign of the new positive conservatism on which Mrs. Thatcher was elected to the Party leadership, although this was swiftly followed by protestations of loyalty. (It is notable that Thatcher's reply was that Britain does not have a presidential system, and the leader should not be expected to do everything!)⁽⁵⁾ Earlier still, in April 1974, a motion to replace or supplement student grants by loans was proposed by Michael Forsyth (then an FCS delegate from St. Andrews, now MP for Stirling) and was defeated by the FCS conference.⁽⁶⁾ During this predominantly moderate period, in December 1975, a package of FCS proposals aimed at 'democratizing' the NUS, was decisively rejected by the NUS conference.⁽⁷⁾

The first major victory for the libertarians was the election of Forsyth as FCS chairman in April 1976. Early in 1977, Forsyth said that the Federation has "altered from being quite a docile organization into a campaigning one".⁽⁸⁾ Its aims were threefold. Firstly, to create a more responsible and representative NUS. Forsyth argued that FCS spent a great deal of time dissuading student unions from disaffiliating from NUS. It is however, striking that St. Andrews disaffiliated in

February 1976, immediately following the rejection of the Federation's proposals for reform.⁽⁹⁾ Secondly, to pursue a strongly pro-European policy, forging alliances with the European centre right. For this international trips were necessary. (In December 1976, FCS had been sharply criticized by NUS for planning a visit to South Africa at the expense of the South African government; the following month, Forsyth, David Wilks - who was to be the next chairman of the Federation - and another FCS member went to the USSR instead).⁽¹⁰⁾ Thirdly, to promote free-market principles in a debate on capitalism. Forsyth himself drew attention to the divisions between the libertarian 'right' and the paternalistic 'left' within the Federation, and to further divisions among libertarians on the subject of immigration controls.⁽¹¹⁾

At the FCS conference in 1977, Thatcher praised the FCS, which by then claimed 200 branches and over 16,000 members. There is no doubt that the Federation had grown in influence: in 1974, there was only one Tory Student President; in 1977 there were fifty! Thatcher argued that up to twenty parliamentary seats could depend upon the student vote in the next election. However, while she was singing the Federation's praises, the FCS was preparing to pass a series of resolutions marking the dominance of the libertarian faction, and causing considerable annoyance to some Conservatives. These policies included the legalization of cannabis, of abortion (though not free abortion) on demand, and wider rights for homosexuals. Responding to the subsequent furore in the press, Forsyth was quoted as saying:

The Federation is simply coming to terms with the dichotomy in some sections of the Conservative Party that says you should be free to do what you want with your private property but not with your private parts.⁽¹²⁾

Ronald Butt, criticizing the FCS in *The Times*, claimed that Forsyth had said that "he personally (and a lot of his members) would accept the legalizing of heroin - believing in any case that "openness" could reduce the number of people taking heroin".⁽¹³⁾ Butt's objections hinged upon the argument that conservatism is about order, not (just) about freedom, and provoked a defence of freedom from Norman Lamont MP.⁽¹⁴⁾

It is not, however, just the policies which emerged at the 1977 conference that are worthy of comment, but also the tactics. Press reports quoted leaflets giving advice on how to undermine the left, both within student unions, and more generally, through use of the local media.⁽¹⁵⁾ These reflected the Federation's objections to the NUS including that it was dominated by 'lefties', and, following the financial collapse of the NUS travel and insurance services at the end of 1976, the FCS had launched another campaign to reform the NUS. This campaign took the form of putting up candidates for NUS elections, and trying to influence it from within. Under the chairmanship of David Wilks, Forsyth's successor, the FCS concentrated on this campaign, and indeed claimed some success. Commentators clearly regarded the

Federation as having recovered from its recent lunacy, and as having had a thoroughly beneficial effect on the NUS. This policy did not, however, have universal backing, and the burning issue over the next few years was whether FCS should work within NUS to change it, or pursue a campaign to disrupt NUS and encourage individual unions to disaffiliate. A key element in this dispute was the objection to compulsory membership of student unions, seen as equivalent to the 'closed shop'. The conflict was not internal to FCS and NUS, but involved MPs and the National Association for Freedom (NAFF).

From this point until Easter 1980, the Federation was dominated by the 'moderates', and its official policy was to work within NUS and not to encourage disaffiliation. Despite this the FCS did badly in NUS elections early in 1978, and this increased pressure from the libertarians for disaffiliation. Their argument was that compulsory membership of student unions, being tantamount to a closed shop, was contrary to individual freedom; and that individual unions should disaffiliate from NUS, which was unnecessary, unrepresentative and Marxist-dominated. The dominance of the moderates did not prevent members of the FCS, perhaps influenced by NAFF, from encouraging individual unions to disaffiliate from NUS and several, including most of the Scottish universities, did so. It later transpired that this campaign was at least partially financed by business donations. In spite of the fact the NAFF subsequently denied any **direct** involvement in the campaign for disaffiliation, they were certainly campaigning for voluntary membership of student unions; and at the local level, NAFF and FCS were alleged to have supported at least one student claiming the right not to join a union.⁽¹⁶⁾

The campaign for voluntary membership was also supported by Nicholas Winterton MP, who sponsored an unsuccessful Private Member's Bill on the issue in the summer of 1978, and sent a message to the FCS April conference announcing his intentions to do this. In spite of Winterton's initiative, and the influence of NAFF among FCS members, the conference rejected moves to make voluntary membership of student unions part of FCS policy. It also threw out motions calling on a future Conservative government to ban the closed shop, take away state benefits from strikers' families and restrict the number of pickets at any one entrance to six; and passed a resolution regretting new Tory proposals to reduce the flow of black immigrants into Britain, arguing that the number of black people in Britain could not thus be significantly reduced, and that politicians had a duty to allay, not exacerbate public fears.⁽¹⁷⁾ (This led Thatcher to assure them that "numbers do play a part in racial harmony".)⁽¹⁸⁾ The dominant FCS position was so moderate that in October Winterton was quoted as describing the Federation as "trendy" and "pseudo-socialist", and their remaining within NUS as "appeasement". He was also said to have complained that the Federation supported legalising cannabis, abortion on demand, squatting and the closed shop.⁽¹⁹⁾

FCS was not only active in student politics. In the summer of 1978, they withdrew from a planned trip to the World Festival of Democratic Youth, to be held in Havana, because they failed to change the traditional structure of the Festival and place the issue of human rights on the agenda. Pressure was put on the British Youth Council to pull out as well, but this was unsuccessful. Press reports were favourable to FCS; the **Times Higher Education Supplement** suggested that had they succeeded in influencing the topics for discussion, their presence in Havana might have been as beneficial as it had been within NUS.⁽²⁰⁾

The real breakthrough for the libertarians occurred in 1980, with the election of Peter Young to the chairmanship, by a narrow majority. During Young's period of office, the Federation campaigned to stop the funding of a large number of groups deemed to be too left-wing, including the British Youth Council, Youth for Peace (a multi-lateralist organization sponsored by the United Nations, described by the FCS as a Soviet propaganda outfit) and the Woodcraft Folk; the Arts Council was attacked for funding left-wing drama groups. FCS also launched its own Campaign for Peace Through Strength, in favour of Cruise, Trident and the Neutron Bomb.⁽²¹⁾

Offensive tactics flourished. In January 1981, NUS took legal advice over a poster proclaiming "Support the Cuts", picturing two hands holding a woman's breasts, while another hand cut her bra-strap. Press reports claimed that an internal FCS newsletter said the poster was aimed at Marxists and feminists, and that the omission of the name of any publisher or printer was "in case your union has policy against sexist propaganda". Another poster read "NUS A million conscripts, one bowel movement". Distribution of a sexist leaflet caused a scuffle, involving 30 people, at the NUS conference in April 1981.⁽²²⁾

More importantly, a major rift developed within the Federation over the issue of student loans. FCS had a standing policy against loans. Without consulting a delegate conference, the committee, on a five to four vote issued a statement favouring a cut in the student grant to less than one third of its current level, the remainder to be made up by loans. Young is said to have asked three of the committee to resign for opposing the policy, and to have claimed that the only reason why most of the Federation's members within NUS were opposed to loans was because only the left wing of the Federation was active in the NUS. The dominance of the Right was however exacerbated by the defection of several prominent members of the Federation to the SDP.⁽²³⁾

In April 1981, Lord Thorneycroft, chairman of the Conservative Party, ordered an inquiry into the FCS. Not only were there the problems of factionalism (reflected in the loans issue) and provocative tactics, but there were allegations that delegates were illegitimately bussed in for the 1981 conference; in 1980 there were 250 delegates, in 1981, 500. Reporters claimed that behaviour at the conference was

“abusive, sectarian and aggressive”, that “racist songs were sung at a cabaret”, that paramilitary dress was in evidence, and that there was vandalism. Additionally, it was alleged that there were links between members of the FCS and the British Movement and National Front.⁽²⁴⁾

The only results of this inquiry were some constitutional changes which required that in future delegates should be registered at the institutions they represented, and some further tightening up of procedures. FCS continued its campaign against NUS which had been launched at the April 1981 conference. This campaign included sending no official delegates to NUS, and plans to disband it and substitute a new, cheaper organization. Although several institutions had disaffiliated as a result of the campaign discussed earlier, by now this process was declining, and indeed organizations began to disaffiliate from FCS itself; the allegations which led to Thorneycroft's inquiry also led to Aberdeen University Conservative Association leaving the Federation. Although the FCS thus had no official delegates at the NUS conference in December 1981, it did have a number of anti-NUS observers. Again, paramilitary uniforms and offensive badges were reportedly in evidence.⁽²⁵⁾

In April 1982, a second inquiry into the Federation was set up. Not only had allegations of financial malpractice led both Oxford and Cambridge Conservative Associations to threaten their resignation (involving 2,500 members) and to ask Cecil Parkinson, as Party chairman, to disown the FCS. More seriously, the NUS had called in the police to investigate claims that signatures on nominations forms for anti-NUS candidates in the recent executive elections had been forged. And it was revealed that a bank account had been opened in the false name of Mycroft Holmes. It was suggested that this fund had been used to finance bogus delegates to the 1981 conference to swell the right-wing vote. There were of course counter-claims by the FCS that employees at Conservative Central Office supported Heathite policies, and that a Central Office official had had secret meetings with the Communist president of NUS.⁽²⁶⁾

Although the inquiry did investigate the issues of forgery and of the slush fund, like its predecessor it did not investigate allegations of Far Right infiltration.⁽²⁷⁾ However, when it reported in July 1982, the inquiry found that Peter Young had opened a bank account in the name of Mycroft Holmes. In eighteen months, more than £4,000 passed through the account, to which Young was the sole signatory, the money being raised from business people between December 1979 and June 1981. The money was used to finance the disaffiliation campaign, which at Heriot-Watt alone had cost in excess of £1,000. The inquiry was unable to substantiate claims of electoral malpractice at the 1981 conference. Brian Monteith, newly-elected chairman of FCS, was found guilty of “grave errors of judgement”, but did not resign; another FCS official did resign after admitting to forging signatures.⁽²⁸⁾ Further constitutional changes were suggested, which would have resulted in most of the Federation's committee being elected regionally rather than at the annual

conference. Like the 1981 proposals, these were to be negotiated with, rather than imposed upon, the Federation. However, the proposals, drawn up by Donald Walters, the chairman of the Conservative National Union, who had headed the 1981 inquiry were rejected by an FCS conference in September, 1982.⁽²⁹⁾

In July 1982, shortly after the inquiry reported, Monteith wrote to the **Times Higher Education Supplement** declaring that the FCS was preparing itself for “a major assault on the bastions of socialism within the education system”. Keith Joseph had promised earlier in the year to examine any evidence the Federation could produce about “misuse” of Student Union funds. In September the *Times Higher Education Supplement* announced that the Freedom Association (formerly NAFF) was drawing up a dossier of **ultra vires** uses of Union funds. In October, the FCS sent Sir Keith a dossier detailing 29 cases of **ultra vires** payments, and Monteith demanded that all payments to Bradford University Students Union be suspended pending an inquiry.⁽³¹⁾

When the April 1983 conference took place, there were further suspicions (never substantiated) about the status of delegates. Monteith stood for election for a second year, but was defeated by the moderate candidate, Paul Goodman. What constituted moderation had changed somewhat; the general move to the right meant that Goodman, too, was in favour of student loans.⁽³²⁾ The Right, however, were only temporarily defeated. In September they again succeeded in blocking a key constitutional change. According to one reporter the voting credentials of a moderate delegate mysteriously disappeared and were later seen in the possession of a right-wing leader. Only one of ten motions was debated; intended to defend YTS against Labour criticism, it was opposed by the Right, who see YTS as an interference in the market and thus illegitimate. David Jobbins reported that shortage of time prevented the Right voicing their views on other motions relating to the “restoration of capital punishment, return of the birch, castration of child-molesters and an embargo on the FCS taking part in anti-racist campaigns”.⁽³³⁾

In January 1984, the BBC television programme **Panorama**, investigating allegations made by Young Conservatives about links between the Conservative Party and far Right racist groups, broadcast the claim by David Irving that he had bought the names of two thousand FCS members for “several hundred pounds” from a chairman of the Federation. They had subsequently been sent material including Irving's pro-repatriation **Focal Point**. (Both Goodman and Monteith denied having been involved in such a transaction; no date was ever specified).⁽³⁴⁾

At the April 1984 conference, Thatcher spoke in favour of the current (moderate) leadership of the Federation. Unfortunately, her speech was made after the elections had taken place. Before votes were cast, John Gummer had spoken, and his pro-NUS speech was jeered by delegates. They proceeded to elect Marc-Henri Glendening as Chairman for the

next year. Moderates did however manage to prevent Heath being sacked (on the grounds of disloyalty to the government) from the office of Life Patron of the Federation, and to prevent a commitment to destroy the NUS being written into the constitution. The Federation was, however, substantially back in libertarian hands.⁽³⁵⁾ Glendening is frequently said to be in favour of the legalization of heroin, he has said:

"I believe in the de-criminalisation of heroin, and all drugs... I believe that the individual should be responsible for what they do to themselves..."⁽³⁶⁾

Other supporters of FCS do share this view: Brian Micklethwait, writing in *The Cambridge Liberator*, praises Glendening for not disguising his views, and adds that "injecting harmful drugs into yourself is not, or ought not to be, a crime. Only you suffer".⁽³⁷⁾ However, a press release issued by the 1985-6 Chairman of FCS, Mark Macgregor, points out that Glendening's view that "liberalisation of the law relating to the possession of drugs might reduce the incidence of crime" does not constitute FCS policy, and was not shared by the newly-elected officers. Macgregor's press release points out that FCS policy consists only of resolutions passed or ratified in the previous three years, after which it lapses, and that any other views are merely personal opinions. But the Inquiry which reported in June 1985 observed that "FCS is not entitled to put a gloss or its own interpretation upon Conservative Party Principles or to invent new ones. Above all it does not have power to evolve a policy of its own, as has been its practice for some time".⁽³⁸⁾ There is of course a danger in attributing to FCS the views of individuals especially since the membership of FCS ensures that a wide range of views, including some which are extreme or eccentric will be present. It is arguable that the Inquiry's strictures make this more tempting, if the resolutions of FCS conference have so little status. But even accepting the Federation's own interpretation, the publicly expressed views of prominent FCS officials and activists, and their political allegiances and activities, cannot be regarded as completely irrelevant to the Federation's political complexion.

During Glendening's period of office, the Federation tabled five motions for the 1984 Conservative Party Conference. These included proposals to privatize the mining industry and break the National Union of Mineworkers, to further privatize the National Health Service, and to fully integrate Northern Ireland with the rest of the UK. They also included proposals to freeze student grants and to end the NUS "closed shop". The importance of the latter proposal is that it was seen as pre-empting a possible compromise solution over this issue being worked out for the Federation's own September conference, although this in the end turned out not to be the case.⁽³⁹⁾

In August 1984, *The Times* reported a plan by members of the Federation to "picket" London stations, collecting money for working miners whose homes had been damaged

by Scargill's "red fascist thugs", sticking "Smash Scargill" stickers on members of the public, and handing out leaflets demanding privatisation of the pits. *The Times* wondered whether Central Office condoned such "violence".⁽⁴⁰⁾

'Smash Scargill' badges created some problems at the September conference, as the Federation was sharing conference facilities with the Union of Construction and Allied Technical Trades (UCATT), who objected both to the badges and to the pro-UNITA leaflets which were distributed. An attempt by FCS officials to deny press credentials to *National Student*, on the grounds that they were "political enemies", was overruled by the Conservative Party. Conference supported resolutions in favour of privatizing universities (with Stirling proposed as a pilot study), abolishing the University Grants Committee, and introducing student loans. The so-called compromise solution, whereby contracting-in would replace contracting-out, which was seen as a move away from outright hostility to NUS, also became policy. So too did the restoration of sporting links with South Africa, while opponents of immigration managed to defeat a proposal that refugees from communism from Hong Kong should be allowed in. The proposal to abolish the office of Life Patron was passed, albeit subject to ratification the following April.⁽⁴¹⁾ Despite this decision, Glendening subsequently wrote to Heath suggesting that he should resign. At almost the same time, the FCS committee co-opted an MP as a demonstration of support in the face of "smears" by Young Conservatives. The MP in question had been named in the *Panorama* programme in February 1984, but denied the allegations made there.⁽⁴²⁾

Provocative tactics were again in evidence at the December 1984 NUS conference, not only because FCS opposed compulsory union membership, but because it deliberately sought opportunities for confrontation with the Left. Past tactics had included displaying material supporting apartheid and such badges as 'Hang Nelson Mandela'. This time the disruption was more extreme. A pamphlet was distributed reading:

Always be provocative. Remember, you are not here to persuade the closed-minded leftists. You are here to wind them up so much they lose control and disrupt the conference, e.g. 'You red, fascist scum'.⁽⁴³⁾

This advice was taken by one FCS member, with the intended effect. This particular document was not officially issued by the FCS. Another, which was, said:

Some will say that we are only here to disrupt. This is entirely correct. As long as the NUS forces students into membership the only avenue of protest available is disruption. When the closed shop is broken, and NUS no longer feeds off the taxpayer like a bloated parasite, then the disruption will cease.⁽⁴⁴⁾

Conservative Student Unionists sent a report to John Gummer on these events, suggesting that FCS should be called to account for discrediting the Conservative Party. Gummer's speech to the 1985 FCS conference made great play of the

importance of free speech, saying:

disruption, intimidation and abuse are wholly alien to Conservatives... I expect the Trots to say "smash Thatcher - but no Thatcherite - except in jest, says "smash the Trots".

He had no criticism, however, for the Federation elision of fascism and communism:

Of course the Left hates all this talk of freedom. The FCS characterised it brilliantly in a poster - I have it here - two of a kind - Lenin and Hitler - Two faces - one ideology.⁽⁴⁴⁾

A notable feature of the regaining of power by the libertarians in 1984 is that it was accompanied by a much higher profile being given to right-wing views in the area of foreign policy. In recent months, the activities of David Hoile, (research assistant to John Carlisle MP) have attracted considerable publicity. Hoile spent a week on armed patrol with the Contras in Nicaragua, having apparently made contact with them "through a secret network in Washington" where he "had been liaising with right-wing organisations on behalf of FCS".⁽⁴⁵⁾ FCS had pursued relationships not just with the Contras and with UNITA, but with groups in Chile, Kampuchea and South Africa; FCS members have accepted invitations to receptions at the South African embassy.⁽⁴⁶⁾

Libertarianism and support for extreme right-wing regimes are not easily compatible. The uneasy juxtaposition of these is apparent in *The Cambridge Liberator*, a publication of Cambridge's 'University Right', which contains "a combination of eclectic views covering a wide range of topical issues interspersing its fundamentalist anti-State libertarianism with, for instance, articles condoning South African apartheid.... The conflict between....support for right-wing states and their professed libertarianism is present in every issue".⁽⁴⁷⁾ It is indeed difficult to reconcile support for South Africa with the claim that libertarians are "internationalists supporting free migration across borders".⁽⁴⁸⁾

The logic behind support for these rather nasty causes is that even dictatorial right-wing regimes are preferable to anything that might be seen as part (or potentially part) of the Red Menace. A central theme of the libertarian position is a virulent anti-socialism, which leads easily into an obsequious support for US foreign policy interests. One journal of the student Right, *Campus*, suggests "experimental spraying of socialist demos and rallies with special sterilising liquid".⁽⁴⁹⁾ A songbook produced by Warwick University Conservative students which bears a picture of Margaret Thatcher and the words "Fuck the Trots" contains references to killing Greenham peace women. It also attacks miners and homosexuals, and rejoices over the deaths of Argentine sailors in the *General Belgrano*.⁽⁵⁰⁾ An FCS delegate to a recent NUS conference called for the public execution of Arthur Scargill as well as the hanging of Nelson Mandela.⁽⁵¹⁾ And the Left extends a long way: supporters of the moderate Conservative Students Union claim that at Loughborough in April 1985, the 'sound faction' rampaged through corridors kicking doors and shouting "Kill the Wets",⁽⁵²⁾ this behaviour being explicitly disapproved of in the Inquiry's report.

Support for South Africa raises the question of whether the FCS is racist. Again, it is important to distinguish between

the views of individuals and the policies of the organisation. Two students were recently expelled from their local Conservative Student association for daubing anti-semitic slogans on campus walls.⁽⁵²⁾ It may be the case that other individuals hold racist views and refrain from scrawling racist graffiti. This does not make FCS racist, although if it were shown that such views were widespread among FCS members, it would be cause for considerable concern. Nevertheless, connections between FCS and Far Right groups are as much a legitimate ground for concern as similar connections alleged to exist between the Tory Party and the racist Right. In the early 1980's, there were repeated allegations that both the National Front and the British Movement had infiltrated FCS. Although there has never been formal investigation into these links, the arch-libertarian Peter Young was among those concerned about Far Right infiltration, and discussed the issue with the Conservative Party Chairman.⁽⁵³⁾

Young's concern illustrates the point that libertarianism is not a racist philosophy, even in its extreme forms, although it can be made compatible with some forms of racism through the argument that it is the right of anyone to discriminate against blacks or Jews if they so wish. FCS policy, however, is to support the South African government, while rejecting apartheid:

"...we support constitutional reforms, not revolution, and support free market policies being introduced to undermine apartheid; we are totally opposed to both terrorist groups such as the ANC and all forms of apartheid...."⁽⁵⁴⁾

Historically, the Federation's policy has been better than one might expect on issues of racism. True, in 1978 the Federation left the Anti-Nazi League, ostensibly because the ANL was opposed to the Conservative Party.⁽⁵⁵⁾ True, also, that the Federation campaigned against the NUS policy of "no platform for racists and fascists", on the grounds of freedom of speech.⁽⁵⁶⁾ But they also, as we have seen, opposed Tory proposals for more restrictive immigration laws. And in 1978, they also launched a campaign against the National Front and in favour of multi-racial education which led William Whitelaw to qualify his support for the venture with the remark that people's genuine anxieties about black immigrants should be taken seriously.⁽⁵⁷⁾ These ventures, however, took place when the Federation was under moderate control, and whether more overtly racist policies might emerge under the new leadership remains to be seen.

In one sense, overt and direct racism is unnecessary to the Federation. Hatred of the Left can be seen to fulfil the same function for them as hatred of blacks and Jews does for the far Right, and leads to some extraordinary political judgments:

"Communist resistance fighters in France or Greece during the last war cannot be said to have been 'freedom fighters' for what they were seeking to replace Nazism with was very clearly not freedom as understood by individual liberty and limited government".⁽⁵⁸⁾

There is therefore no grounds for complacency, as the outcome of anti-Left assumptions may well be support for regimes with racist policies. But it is important for understanding the structure of FCS ideology to see that these views are derived from an 'anti-communist' position.

The FCS and the New Right

At the beginning of this article, it was argued that the Federation of Conservative Students should be seen as part of the New Right, which like the Federation, has been increasingly in evidence over the last ten years. The New Right is not confined to Britain. It can be found throughout the capitalist West, especially in France (where it is overtly racist) and in the USA (where it has a particularly strong religious element), and there are strong international connections. The New Right is, however, not a homogeneous entity. It consists of a range of groups and ideas, which, while themselves not necessarily new, have risen to prominence since the mid-seventies, and which can be separated into three main strands, neo-liberalism, neo-conservatism and neo-puritanism. A further important and contentious issue is whether, and how, these strands which initially appear contradictory have been stitched together into a new synthesis.⁽⁵⁹⁾

The strand most closely related to the FCS is that of neo-liberalism. This is the body of thought which stresses the virtues of the free market and which supports privatization on principle. Its general emphasis is on freedom although this masks both the very specific meaning given to freedom, and certain differences of emphasis within neo-liberalism. Thus while the work of Milton Friedman emphasises the benefits of the free market in promoting economic growth, and the control of the money supply to control inflation, Hayek is much more concerned with the negative political effects of state intervention, arguing that it necessarily leads to totalitarianism. The latter view was widely publicised as long ago as 1944 in *The Road to Serfdom*. Hayek's belief in deregulating the economy goes as far as denationalising money; a motion in favour of this failed by only two votes to become FCS policy in 1985.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Besides permitting all the abuses which gave rise to the (shortly to be abolished) Truck Acts of the 1830's, such a policy would presumably make control of the money supply impossible. The strand of Austrian economics of which Hayek's work is a part is important because anti-socialism is central to it, thus connecting with the outlook of the FCS. A third element in neo-liberalism is libertarianism. Since the right wing of the FCS is generally described as libertarian, it is worth looking a little more closely at what this means.

The essential feature of libertarianism is that it begins from the assertion of inalienable human rights. How those rights are defined alters the effective meaning of libertarianism. The main philosophical proponent of right-wing libertarianism is Robert Nozick, whose starting point is that individual rights importantly include the right to dispose of one's own property as one sees fit.⁽⁶¹⁾ From this starting point, even the minimal role for the state advocated by Adam Smith becomes illegitimate. All taxation is theft, and the state merely a protection racket.

Because libertarianism proceeds from individual rights, it is potentially in conflict with other neo-liberal positions; individuals have no rights against the workings of the free market, and the anti-socialist and anti-trade-unionist position adopted by Hayek necessitates legal sanctions to prevent individuals combining to interfere in the market. These conflicts only occur, however, if individual rights are defined in

other than economic terms. In practice, this is not usually a problem. On the New Right, the term libertarian generally describes an extreme commitment to economic deregulation. The resolutions passed by the FCS in 1977, however, were of a rather different kind, as Michael Forsyth so eloquently described. Legalising cannabis, abortion, homosexuality and pornography are traditional liberal demands connecting up with the kind of libertarianism that might concern itself with civil liberties. The FCS have not been vociferous in defending civil liberties. Nor have those libertarians now in parliament. Limiting freedom to the economic sphere does present some problems for them, however, and these are illustrated in a libertarian MP's defence of the Video Recordings Act, in Parliamentary debate. He was only able to justify supporting the Act, while still defending freedom and claiming that a "limited right to hurt and be hurt" should remain, by invoking the protection of children.⁽⁶²⁾ The scare campaign about the exposure of children to 'video nasties' was clearly crucial in de-fusing potential libertarian opposition.⁽⁶³⁾

One can detect in the New Right then vestiges of liberal libertarianism, economic libertarianism which pursues deregulation, and 'libertarianism' which is no more than anti-socialism. It would seem that over the years, the FCS has moved from the first, through the second, to the third position (which includes the second, but which is antipathetic to the first).

Neo-liberalism is only one strand in the New Right. A very different strand of neo-conservatism also began its resurgence in the mid-seventies, and this strand is explicitly antipathetic to individual freedom. Its key concepts are tradition, authority, allegiance and nation, which are combined in an ideology embodying what some authors describe as cultural racism. The neo-conservative New Right blames the problems of society on the permissive sixties, which sapped the moral fibre of a generation who, as parents and teachers are depriving today's children of moral health, and who, as the 'new class' of public employees, are parasitically draining the economy of wealth. As Thatcher put it:

We are reaping what was sown in the sixties. The fashionable theories and permissive claptrap set the scene for a society in which the old virtues of discipline and self-restraint were denigrated.⁽⁶⁴⁾

The solution is a return to Victorian values, with the patriarchal family and the subordination of women at the centre of a society in which traditional 'British' culture is elevated and multi-culturalism scorned. Linked to neo-conservatism is a kind of neo-puritanism, particularly prominent in the USA in the formation of the Moral Majority. This element in New Right thought has been widely underestimated, despite Miriam David's insistence on its importance.⁽⁶⁵⁾ It underpins anti-abortion groups; Mary Whitehouse's National Viewers and Listeners Association; the video nasties campaign; Victoria Gillick's campaign to prevent contraceptive advice being given to girls under 16 without parental consent; and Enoch Powell's Unborn Children (Protection) Bill, which was concerned to prevent experiments on human embryos, but by its very title, moves towards more restrictive legislation on abortion.

Neo-conservatism and neo-puritanism are alike in their

obvious opposition to prioritizing individual rights, and thus their opposition to libertarianism. What is less immediately obvious is that neo-conservatism and neo-liberalism are not necessarily in opposition with respect to the free market. The free market, far from being antithetical to the strong state, actually requires it in order for the market to remain free (or, rather, what passes for free, for as several commentators have observed, there is no such thing as a free market in the modern world). And Andrew Belsey has cogently argued that both in practice and in theory, in the work of Hayek, the market operates as a mechanism of discipline rather than of freedom, so that those who espouse the strong state need not fear it.⁽⁶⁷⁾ That neo-conservative opposition to freedom does not entail opposition to the free market is quite clear. In the seminal neo-conservative statement, *Conservative Essays*, T. E. Utley wrote:

In short, to the question 'Should the Tory party now be emphasising authority or freedom?' Mrs Thatcher has given the right answer, the more effectively because she has done so in concrete rather than abstract terms: the antithesis between liberty and authority is false. The State must be strong in defending itself against foreign attack, enforcing the rule of law and recovering and strengthening a sense of national identity. It must however, forswear the pretention to meddle incessantly in the economic and commercial activities of its subjects.⁽⁶⁷⁾

In similar vein, Peregrine Worsthorne wrote:

The urgent need today is for the State to regain control over 'the people', to re-exert its authority, and it is useless to imagine that this will be helped by some libertarian mish-mash drawn from the writings of Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill and the warmed-up milk of nineteenth-century liberalism. This does not mean that there are not crucial areas, where some people do need to be set free, notably the wealth producers.⁽⁶⁸⁾

Yet another point of congruence between neo-conservative and neo-liberal strands of the New Right is that they share a similarly aggressive foreign policy. While one would expect the neo-conservatives, with their emphasis on nationalism and the strong state, to place heavy emphasis also upon matters of 'defence', it is less immediately to be expected from the Adam Smith Institute, a key organisation in the neo-liberal New Right, which has had a profound influence both upon government policies and upon the FCS. In 1983-4, the ASI published a series of reports called the *Omega File*, including two reports on defence policy and foreign policy.⁽⁶⁹⁾ Adam Smith himself cited national security as the first of three legitimate functions of the state, so it is no inconsistency that the ASI should place great emphasis on this while being primarily advocates of deregulation of the economy. What is striking about these reports is their obsessive belief in the Soviet threat as a force operating on a global scale, and their explicit support of pursuit of US interests particularly in Central America. Further, economic and security interests are treated as virtually synonymous. A virulent anti-socialism is clearly visible here; as similar anti-socialism is central to neo-conservative writing, especially in their journal *The Salisbury Review*. Grovelling capitulation to US military interests is evident in the policy decisions, revealed recently in the *New Statesman*, to hand over control of civilian installations including ports, airports and hospitals, in

the build-up to a future war.⁽⁷⁰⁾

It has been said that the return to power of the 'libertarians' in FCS in 1984 involved the resolution of difference between the de-regulationist neo-liberal element, and the old conservative Right of Monday Club supporters. This is entirely consistent with the ideological meshing of neo-conservatism and neo-liberalism in the New Right as a whole, and increases the possibility of overt racism becoming a significant part of FCS ideology. However, while parts of the new Right are demonstrably racist, it is true of the whole of the New Right, not just the FCS, that loathing is primarily directed at the Left.

The Federation of Conservative Students and the Conservative Party

How, then, is the relationship between the FCS and the Conservative Party best understood? Are the policies so extreme as to be incompatible with those of the Conservative Party itself? And why is it so difficult for the Federation to be controlled?

The FCS has been described by political commentators as the equivalent of the Militant Tendency in the Labour Party - although *The Guardian* suggests that the FCS has penetrated less deeply into the Conservative Party.⁽⁷¹⁾ Although this may be true in institutional terms, the ideas which the FCS represents may well have at least as much support within the Parliamentary Conservative Party as Militant's have in the Parliamentary Labour Party. One reason why it is difficult for the Conservative Party to discipline its student wing is precisely that there is much sympathy for its general policy orientation within the parliamentary Party, as well as in other influential quarters. Not only did Alfred Sherman finance a press conference to enable the FCS to put its case after the suspension of its funding;⁽⁷²⁾ several leading members of the FCS work as research assistants to members of Parliament; and the wider links between the Federation of Conservative Students and the Adam Smith Institute, and the ASI and the Conservative Party have been documented elsewhere as have FCS connections with the American New Right.⁽⁷³⁾ The New Right, indeed, has been described as the "seed-bed of Thatcherism".⁽⁷⁴⁾

On the one hand, the policies of the Federation reflect the rightward drift of the Conservative Party, and indeed of contemporary politics as a whole. On the other, the ambivalence between the Party and the Federation represents a necessary renegotiation of the boundaries of the range of acceptable political opinion. These boundaries are always in need of renegotiation and confirmation, but particularly so, when there are, as now, marked shifts in the dominant ideological climate. In this sense, there are important parallels between the FCS and Militant, in that both involve a similar process.

A further similarity is that in both cases, what is at issue is not solely (or perhaps even primarily) the policies of the 'dubious groups', but their political tactics. The main reason why the FCS is an embarrassment to the Conservative Party is that its mode of political expression is, to say the least, ungentelemanly. To say this is not to make the kind of elitist judgement that neo-conservatives would intend, although it

is interesting that the social class base both of the 'sound faction' in FCS, and of the libertarian back benchers elected in 1983, is reputedly different from that of traditional Tory students and Members of Parliament.⁽⁷⁵⁾ The new MP's are markedly less likely to have public school and Oxbridge education, and to have farming connections; the libertarian FCS is said to be largely working class or lower middle class in origin (and thus state-educated) and to include a substantial proportion of first-generation students. The relevance of this is debatable, since students frequently behave in an ungentlemanly manner, and the most privileged are sometimes the worst. Its importance however, lies not just in the behaviour manifestations, such as the Loughborough party, but in the fact that in traditional Toryism, a gentlemanly mode of expression is a crucially important device in masking the unpleasant social implications of ideologies and policies. One of the functions of an elite education is to produce a facility in this mode of discourse. In the FCS, for whatever reason, this is noticeably absent. The effect of this is to lay bare the implications of New Right ideology, in a way that, for example, the Adam Smith Institute does not. Most, though perhaps not all, FCS policies could find support with at least some Conservative MP's; and it is difficult to see how action could be taken over individual views which are not Federation policy, however disturbing some of these views may be.

The failure of the Conservative Party to take effective action thus derives essentially from the fact that the New Right ideology which informs the FCS's politics is now deeply embedded in the Conservative Party itself. Although there are those who find the Federation's policies objectionable, there being a conflict within the party over what constitutes conservatism, and still more who find their tone and behaviour embarrassing, it is unlikely that any action will be taken, or that the problem will disappear by itself, unless and until the New Right as a whole, including the present government, is decisively politically defeated.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- Quoted in D. Edgar, 'The Free and the Good', in R. Levitas, (ed) *The Ideology of the New Right*, Polity Press, 1985.
- The Guardian*, 14.6.85.
- Sunday Times*, 31.3.85.
- D. Jobbins, 'Right-wingers face Tory inquiry', *Times Higher Education Supplement* (THES) 19.4.85. However, Jobbins also reported that a further inquiry, internal to Conservative Central Office, would be conducted into the influence of the libertarian right within FCS.
- The Times*, 3.6.75, 10.6.75, 11.6.75.
- THES, 5.4.74.
- Times Education Supplement* (TES), 2.4.76.
- THES, 4.3.77.
- TES, 6.2.76.
- THES, 21.1.77.
- THES, 4.3.77.
- Quoted in *The Times*, 6.4.77.
- R. Butt, 'What will the new Tories of Ashfield think of this dogma gone mad?' *The Times*, 5.5.77.
- The Times*, 1.8.77.
- The Times*, 5.4.77 and *The Times*, 9.4.77.
- THES, 14.4.78; letter from Mike Jackson, chairman of National Organisation of Labour Students, THES, 10.3.78; *The Times*, 6.4.78; THES, 7.3.80.
- The Times*, 12.4.78.
- The Times*, 13.4.78.
- Quoted in THES, 20.10.78.
- THES, 21.7.78.
- THES, 26.9.80, 7.11.80, 21.11.80.
- THES, 23.1.81 & 10.4.81.
- The Times*, 25.10.80; THES, 31.10.80, 12.12.80; THES, 21.8.81.
- 'A rift on the right', THES, 28.8.81.
- THES, 8.5.81, 11.12.81.
- THES, 16.4.82, 30.4.82, 7.5.82: *The Times*, 5.5.82.
- The Times*, 5.5.82.
- National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations. *Report of the Committee of Inquiry concerning the Federation of Conservative Students* pp. 3-5.
- THES, 10.9.82, 17.9.82.
- THES, 30.7.82.
- THES, 16.4.82; THES, 3.9.82, 1.10.82.
- THES, 18.3.83, 1.4.83.
- THES, 16.9.83.
- 'Maggie's Militant Tendency', *Panorama*, BBC1, 30.1.84; THES, 3.2.84.
- THES, 13.4.84.
- Interview with *National Student*.
- The Cambridge Liberator* 1, p.8.
- National Union of Conservative and Unionist Associations. *Report of the Committee of Inquiry concerning the Federation of Conservative Students* 1985 p.2.
- THES, 3.8.84; *The Times*, 30.7.84 (Diary).
- The Times*, 17.8.84 (Diary).
- THES, 14.9.84, 7.9.84.
- THES, 7.12.84, 21.12.84.
- The Guardian*, 10.12.84, *The Gordon Liddy Guide to Disrupting NUS Conferences*.
- J. Gummer, Speech to FLS Annual Conference, University of Loughborough 2.4.85.
- Searchlight*, May, 1985, pp. 10-11 and June 1985, p. 11; *The Guardian*, 4.4.85, 6.7.85; see also a letter from Hoile, *The Guardian*, 26.8.85, and correspondence 28.8.85, 31.8.85.
- Searchlight*, May, 1985, pp. 10-11.
- R. Furlong and M. Gillies, 'Might of Student Right', *New Statesman*, 1.2.85, pp. 10-12.
- Quoted in *New Statesman*, *ibid*.
- ibid*.
- Warwick Monsters Songbook, Federation of Conservative Students.
- Sunday Times*, 31.3.85.
- Searchlight*, Feb. 1986, p.7.
- Searchlight*, July 1982, p.4.
- FCS press release 1985.
- The Times* 8.9.78.
- THES, 11.11.77, 28.4.78.
- THES, 25.11.77.
- Hoile, D. *A Liberation Reader* Conservative Students Foreign Affairs Group Jan. 85.
- For an extended discussion of the rise of the New Right, and the various strands within it see D. Edgar 'Bitter Harvest' in J. Curran (ed) *The Future of the Left*, Polity Press, 1984; R. Levitas (ed) *The Ideology of the New Right*, Polity Press, 1985.
- Searchlight*, May 1985, pp. 10-11.
- See R. Nozick, *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, Blackwell, 1974.
- Hansard*, 6th series, vol. 48, pp. 574-7.
- See M. Barker (ed), *The Video Nasties*, Pluto, 1984.
- Quoted in D. Edgar, "The Free or the Good", in Levitas (ed.) *op.cit*.
- See, for example, M. David, 'Moral and Maternal: The Family in the Right' in Levitas (ed.), *op.cit*.
- A. Belsey. 'The New Right, Social Order and Civil Liberties', in Levitas, (ed.), *op.cit*.
- T.E. Utley, 'The Significance of Mrs. Thatcher', in M. Cowlin (ed) *Conservative Essays*, Cassell, 1978, p.51.
- P. Worsthorne, 'Too Much Freedom', in Cowling (ed), *op.cit.*, p.149.
- The reports were published separately in 1983-4, and collectively as *The Omega File* in 1985. For discussion of these see R. Levitas, 'New Right Utopias', *Radical Philosophy*, 39, Spring 1985, pp. 2-9, and R. Levitas, 'Competition and Compliance: The Utopias of the New Right' in Levitas (ed), *op.cit*.
- D. Campbell & P. Forbes, 'Secret Laws for Wartime Britain', *New Statesman*, 6.9.85 and 'If war came close we would have new masters', *New Statesman*, 13.9.85.
- The Guardian*, (Leader), 2.4.85.
- Searchlight*, May 1985, *The Guardian*, 10.4.85.
- Searchlight*, May 1985, pp. 10-11; *Labour Research*, February, 1984 and February 1985; *National Student*, March 1986 pp. 6-10.
- A. Gamble, 'Thatcherism and Conservative Politics', in S. Hall & M. Jacques (eds), *The Politics of Thatcherism*, Lawrence & Wishart, 1983.
- 'Tory M.P.s: The new breed', *Labour Research*, August 1983; D. Rose, 'Is the party over for the Tory fringe?' *The Guardian*, 4.4.85.

police involvement in youth and community work

CHRIS CROSSLEY

The riots in the Summer of 1981 brought many issues to the foreground of British social and political debate. They exhibited the isolation and frustration of young people in inner city areas suffering from the ravages of chronic unemployment, bad housing and extreme poverty. Of equal importance, they showed that there was a growing crisis in the relationship between young people and the police.

This crisis has been exhibited in two surveys. The first, carried out for the Thompson Report on the Youth Service,⁽¹⁾ found that two-thirds of all young people thought that the police suspected them of criminal activities. It is even worse among young black people. The Policy Studies Institute (PSI) investigation into the Metropolitan Police⁽²⁾ found that 41% of all young blacks felt that the police fabricated evidence.

In his enquiry into the Brixton riots,⁽³⁾ Lord Scarman looked at why this crisis had come about. He criticised the random use of 'stop and search' which far from being effective in detecting crime (PSI found that only 8% of such stops led to an arrest), had only served to increase hostility between young people and the police. He also attacked saturation police operations like the much publicised 'Swamp 81'. He said that the police should take a long, hard look at their methods, with particular reference to:

"the pattern of policing, especially the mix of foot and mobile patrols ... the role of home beat officers ... the provision of opportunities for operational officers to get to know the community they are policing."⁽⁴⁾

The above description of policing conforms very much to the idea of community policing which has been advocated by several police officers such as John Alderson.⁽⁵⁾ They argue like Scarman, that the police have become isolated from the community, particularly young people, by employing high speed technology like the Panda car, to respond quickly to crime. Some forces, such as the Metropolitan Police, have begun to move towards community policing in practice. This new style of policing is in some ways, a return to the old, traditional style, where beat officers patrol on foot a particular area and get to know the residents. They become involved in all facets of community life, and therefore an accepted part of it.

Willie McCarney, in an earlier article in Youth and Policy,⁽⁶⁾ feels that this development is much more than a reversal to

traditional policing methods. He sees two perspectives on policing, the reactive and pro-active approach. On the one hand is the idea that policing is for the police and solutions to crime lie in more resources and more purposeful police policies. The other as described above, argues that since the main resources for control lie within society, the police must work with society as effectively and fully as possible linking their policies with those of other agencies. Indeed McCarney argues that police officers advocating this policy view good community relations as the life blood, the very essence of effective policing.

It is but one facet of this policy that I intend to look at in this article - how the police are developing relationships with young people through one part of the community structure, the youth and community centre.

Police involvement in youth and community work is traditional and widespread. According to a report from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools in July 1982:

"About 20% of Local Education Authorities have police representation on Youth Advisory Committees and/or on the Management Committees of Youth Clubs. In about 40% of LEAS, the police run at least one Youth Club and this involves them in co-operation with youth workers and teachers. The Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme, which involves boys and girls, is an area in which there is extensive police involvement, often in co-operation with teachers and youth groups."⁽⁷⁾

Involvement is a vague term and needs to be defined. There is obviously no standard form of police involvement in youth and community work, but several. These I believe, conform to five levels, the first three being more traditional while the last two are relatively new developments.

The first level I see as an **information** giving role, where the police give talks in Youth Clubs on subjects such as crime prevention and road safety. Here the officer will be uniformed and it will be part of his/her normal duties.

The second level is **observation**, which has become a mainstay of community policing. It involves visiting Youth Clubs while they are in operation. This is again carried out during working hours, where the officer will usually be in uniform.

The third level is **assistance**, where the police as sponsors run or support certain activities, e.g. provide football pitches or prizes or help in the training of members in different sports. This role can be carried out during or after working hours and the police will **not** usually wear uniforms.

The fourth level, which is in many ways a new development, is **partnership**. This basically means what it says. The police play an equal part in the provision of activities in the Youth Centre. This can occur in several ways. For example Police Officers may be seconded to a Youth Centre or police cadets may work in youth centres as part of their training. On a higher level, there may be police representation on the Management Committee of the Club. As before, the police will not wear uniforms during these activities.

The fifth level is the highest level of involvement, which I define as **control**. This is where the police have taken over the running of a Youth Club which as the HMI Report points out, occurs in 40% of all Local Education Authorities. A case in point here is Ancoats Youth Club in Manchester, which is totally staffed by the police on a rota basis. The police here are actually undertaking a youth work role.

The justification for police involvement in youth and community work is varied but one major factor must be its role in crime prevention. As the Chief Constable of Northumbria says "it is crime prevention in its broadest sense combined with the promotion of mutual understanding between the police and young people."⁽⁸⁾ Indeed this involvement is seen by many police officers as an ideal way to break down barriers between young people and the police by fostering communication and good relations in the informal non-threatening atmosphere of a youth centre. However, is this involvement purely a by-product of the police's determination to reduce crime, and if it is, what context does that put police youth work in?

It is interesting to note that the police seem to have recognised that crime is a social problem and not based purely on moral issues. This is in itself a great step forward. But should the police have a role in trying to alleviate social problems through youth and community work? It is important to distinguish between analysis of the problem and what the police do about it. One must ask if there is something specific about the skills individuals need before they can be considered to belong to that body of people we call youth workers. What is youth work all about and what role should other organisations particularly in this context the police, play within it?

However one looks at this issue, there are obviously wide differences between the style of youth work we know and the police style. The former stresses the informal aspects of young peoples' lives. It extols a commitment to an open and sensitive relationship with young people. However, the latter is very much more in keeping with the style and guidelines for training which the MSC insists on within its schemes. This is a process of 'straightening out' young people, inculcating respect for the status quo and an unchallenging acceptance of their condition as young, unemployed, pushed around and powerless.

The police officer and the youth worker stand for two quite different types of listening. The former is listening for information in the pursuit of his/her duties. The latter in contrast, is listening for a sense of awareness of a complex and growing person in a difficult time. The police officer is geared to suspect criminal intent in the informalities of the club members. He/she may spy and detect, turning the Centre into a circle of informers and in time 'criminalise' all young people in the area. As a result, the youth group may suspect the trust they have placed in the youth worker. Even by the simplest act of allowing the police officer into the Centre, the members may see the youth worker as siding with the police, who they feel already harass and discriminate against them.

Police involvement in youth and community work can easily lead to a crisis of identification among young people, i.e. who the real youth worker is. This is particularly so when officers don't wear uniforms when working in youth clubs. Officers working voluntarily in Centres confuse the situation even more. Even when off-duty police officers still hold certain responsibilities and this could have dire consequences for an unaware club member.

Community policing in itself can confuse young people when put alongside the heavy hand of ordinary policing. The community liaison police are the friendly face, diverting attention from an often insensitive force, many of whose personnel are lacking in appropriate skills and judgement.

The practice of youth work and the assumptions that are made regarding the relationship between youth workers and young people are in many ways fundamentally at odds with the law enforcement functions of the police. These are not set aside whatever postures the police may adopt. While they might be tempered by individual discretion, police officers are programmed to respond to certain events in certain ways. To illustrate this, I recount a story told to me by a youth worker in Manchester. A police officer had been seconded to her club to get to know the local young people. He seemed to relate well to the members. After he left the club he was seen patrolling the area in a Panda car. One night he arrested one of the members for non-payment of a fine (her DHSS cheque hadn't come through) and she was subsequently sentenced to youth custody.

One would have expected the officer to have gained some awareness of the particular problems facing the club members and thus acted with more sensitivity outside the club but patently not. The police officer however much he or she strikes the informal pose and style of the youth worker, will be duty bound to be a police officer first and youth worker second.

Training the police for this new branch of work is an important issue. Many officers assume that because of their experience of dealing with all sectors of the community they don't require training. However many forces are sending their cadets to youth centres as an introduction to community policing. There is a conflict of views among youth workers on this issue. Some talk about sensitising the police in youth work methods while others criticise this as it implies a contract. They believe that no amount of training could turn

the police into youth workers.

Is this involvement a proper use of local and national funds? Whilst well established and valuable youth work projects are being starved of funds, there seems to be an easy supply of money for police youth work. Ancoats Youth Club in Manchester is a good example of this. Manchester Education Authority had no money to revitalise this ageing club. The police stepped in, applied for inner city funding and now run it themselves. This is of course, a dilemma for the Youth Service. Already starved of cash, if it doesn't fill the gaps in provision then other organisations such as the police (and increasingly the MSC) will. What is even more foreboding for the Youth Service, is that the police are in a position to use their financial strength to influence the work of youth organisations. Youth workers need to be aware of the implications of grabbing at police hand-outs.

One wonders if this involvement is an appropriate allocation of police resources. Could they be better spent on training in racism awareness for example? Is it in fact, part of a diversion from more serious deficiencies in the operation of the law? Some would argue that much community policing practice is only a token gesture to those who support its implementation. Certainly one should consider this possibility when one hears stories such as that of the young community beat officer who when asked why he visited a particular Youth Centre replied that he didn't know. However, given the large amount of money that is being spent on community policing in areas like London and Manchester, I would question this theory.

A group set up in Manchester to monitor police involvement in youth and community work⁽⁹⁾ argues that the police are not just another part of the repertoire of social and educational professions. Their privileged role in relation to the law and powers of arrest stress the care with which they should serve the community. The police they believe, should not have a hand in everyone's business. They should not turn their **specific** authority in relation to crime prevention and detection into a **general** authority as the guardians of society.

They argue further that there is no interchangeability of roles where youth and community workers are concerned. Youth workers can't suddenly decide to move around the community performing the roles of the police. Society does not expect that of them and they would most likely be arrested for impersonating the police if they tried. Likewise, the police can't be expected to do everyone's business. Do we expect them to step in as teachers, nurses or councillors?

Police involvement in youth work has been criticised in terms of being a one-way relationship from which only the police can gain. Such involvement fits far too easily into a shift towards neighbourhood surveillance and information gathering. Crime prevention, then, would seem to be the principal reason for police involvement in youth and community work. Bearing this philosophy in mind, should the Youth Service co-operate? Some radical critics of the Youth Service, even dare I say some disillusioned Youth Service personnel, would say that it is already an agent of social control. Thus it has nothing to lose by working with the police.

Birmingham: A Case Study

As part of my special study at Westhill College, I decided to find out what involvement (if any) the police had in youth and community work in Birmingham. To do this, I first interviewed the Head of West Midlands Police Public Liaison Department and then by means of a questionnaire, I asked eight youth workers from Clubs across Birmingham whether the police were involved in their Club, in what ways and how they felt about it.

West Midlands Police do have a community policing policy which is described as the police working both in a voluntary capacity and as part of their normal duties, together with the local community. It does extend to involvement in youth and community work, the reason being that the police need to meet all parts of the community if they are going to get their co-operation, particularly of the young people who will be the citizens of the future.

There is a 'rich variety of involvement' in youth and community work. Several officers are seconded to various Youth Centres; much voluntary police youth work is undertaken and there is a lot of work with voluntary youth groups.

West Midlands Police doesn't feel there is a particular need for training in this new area of work for two reasons. Firstly, police officers already have various qualifications and talents which they can use in their youth work. Secondly, they don't want to turn police officers into youth workers as the Youth Service is already well served by its existing staff. They consider it very important to liaise with the Youth Service and meet regularly with senior youth officers, to discuss matters of common interest. In the field, police officers liaise with youth officers and workers. In one Birmingham sub-division this led to a joint weekend involving youth workers and police officers which aimed to forge relationships and create a better understanding between the two services. On the whole, they felt that relations between the police and the Youth Service, both voluntary and statutory, are very good.

The Head of West Midlands Police Public Liaison Department did sound a note of caution in that there are some personalities who don't get on together, obviously pointing to youth workers who don't agree with this involvement.

West Midlands police feels this involvement has been successful, pointing to the minimal riots experienced by that area during the Summer of 1981. It has now become an accepted part of police policy and is seen as a very effective way of fighting juvenile crime. Indeed, it is described as a kind of corporate approach involving many agencies in crime prevention.

The eight youth clubs I surveyed were spread geographically across Birmingham and were divided between five statutory clubs and three voluntary clubs.

Out of the eight clubs studied, seven had been visited by the police, although two of these only once and this was through problems at the club. The other five were visited once a month usually by the Permanent Beat Officer in their community policing roles. In two clubs the Beat Officer was on

the Management Committee. Almost all of the youth workers whose clubs had been visited by Beat Officers were pleased as they felt it improved the relationship between the police and their members. The two workers whose clubs had been visited because of problems had objected to the way the police had entered the club, (obviously not doing much for their public relations) and didn't want the police to visit again because of their offensive nature and their lack of sensitivity in dealing with young people.

Only three out of the eight clubs had been offered help by the police. This ranged from police cadets in one, to voluntary youth work at another. All three had received visits from the police which they supported. Thus it could be said that one followed on from the other.

The fact that one immediately notices from the above results is that the clubs visited by the police were in the majority (7:1). But how do the results conform to the table of involvement I drew up at the beginning of this article?

Of the seven clubs visited by the police two because of problems at the club and five by the Beat Officer, all conform to the **observation** role, the second lowest form of involvement. This is probably the norm for many clubs in Britain, who are visited by the police from time to time. One club had police help in the form of lectures and slide shows which conforms to the lowest level, an **information** role. All the other clubs though, which had police help, conformed to **partnership**, the second highest level. In two the Beat Officer was on the Management Committee, thus taking an active role in the running of the clubs. The others had police cadets and voluntary police youth work, both working in partnership with the youth worker at the club.

One of the reasons the police put forward for involvement in youth and community work was that it breaks down barriers and improves relations between young people and themselves. According to the results of the questionnaire, this does not seem to have happened. None of the clubs with police involvement had good member-police relations according to questionnaire responses. Two of them were bad, two satisfactory and one unsure. Overall, out of the clubs visited or receiving police help, the majority (four) had bad relations. This obviously does not bode well for the good relations reason for police involvement in youth work, particularly when one considers that when the police entered two clubs because of problems, relations between them and the club members worsened.

One of the most surprising results of the survey was the difference between the voluntary and statutory clubs. All three voluntary clubs had police involvement while only three of

the five statutory clubs did. The reasons for greater police involvement in the voluntary sector in Birmingham (which may or may not be so in the rest of the country), are that voluntary clubs tend to be under-resourced and under-staffed compared to statutory clubs, thus they are grateful for any assistance the police provide.

One wonders why police officers in the West Midlands and possibly throughout the rest of the country, appear to be so ready to volunteer for youth work. There are undoubtedly many possible reasons. Perhaps they felt it is an easy option, i.e. they would rather prop up the walls of a warm youth club rather than freeze outside on the beat. Some may see it as an opportunity to impress their superiors in order to improve their prospects for promotion. Some may have a selfless desire to improve their relations with young people or to improve the lot of club members. Yet ultimately, the reason in many cases must be that of crime prevention - whether the officers are pushed into the clubs by their superiors or by their own desire to make their job easier by knowing what is happening and/or what 'mischievous deeds' are being planned by the club members.

At the time of writing this article, a lot of money, labour and resources was being ploughed into youth work by the West Midlands police, although no figures for expenditure were available. Much of the effort was concentrated in large cities like Birmingham and Coventry, where high crime rates exist, where there are large concentrations of young black people and where the police feel there is most need. However, as a result of the cutbacks in police funding in the West Midlands, many areas of police involvement were under threat and the future was unsure.

In this article I have tried to look at some of the issues surrounding police involvement in youth and community work. It is a crucially important issue for the service - one that should not be set aside but discussed at every available opportunity. The consequences of this involvement for the service are so immense that no-one should ignore them, whatever their opinion.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Young People in the Eighties - A Survey, H.M.S.O., 1983.
2. P.S.I. Report.
3. Rt. Hon. Lord Scarman, The Brixton Disorders, 10th to 12th April 1981, H.M.S.O., 1981.
4. Ibid.
5. See Alderson J., The Youth and Policy Interview, and Bibliography, Youth and Policy No. 11, Winter 1984/5.
6. McCarney W., Policing: Reactive and Pro-active? The Northern Ireland Experience, Youth and Policy Vol. 2 (2) Autumn 1983.
7. H.M. Inspectorate of Schools, Police Liaison with the Education Service, DES., London 1983.
8. Guide for Permanent Beat Officers, Northumbria Police, 1982.
9. Youth and Allied Workers - A report by Youth and Community Workers in the Greater Manchester Area, August 1983.

ALTERNATIVE MONOPOLY

Is a variation of the standard game and is intended to illustrate more faithfully the real workings of our economy. For example, not everybody starts out with

the same assets. Not everybody starts out with the same likelihood of success. Some players are more prone to exploitation than others.

Other features include railways which can be travelled upon (if you can afford it), factories which can be built to provide employment, and elected council with its own funds, and a facility

for linking up several games being played concurrently.

The
ALTERNATIVE MONOPOLY RULES
are available for £1 (p & p inc.)
from
**DPE, Rivermill House, St. Ives,
Huntingdon, CAMBS, PE17 4EW.**

yyy: tokenism or a real opportunity for a change?

BOB FRANKLIN

1985 was United Nations International Youth Year (IYY); it came and went almost unnoticed. Ironically, only with its demise will it probably receive the media attention deserved at the outset. 1985 was a devastatingly bad year for young people. UNICEF estimate that globally 10.3 million children die each year before their first birthday but in 1985, the famines in Africa increased those figures. More parochially and less dramatically, in Britain unemployment figures for those under 18 topped 170,000 with an additional 320,000 people conscripted onto what are euphemistically described as training schemes. The abolition of wages councils, cuts in education facilities and the Fowler regulations each caused considerable hardship to young people.

Given these difficulties it is not surprising that there is a growing tendency to public cynicism about the effectiveness of these United Nations 'Years' as good cause succeeds good cause in a now annual ritual. Like drunken resolutions made on New Years Eve, they evoke a fierce enthusiasm and commitment which dissipates rapidly as the year unfolds. If Oscar Wilde was correct and the cynic is someone who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing, then cynicism is an appropriate response to IYY. The price of IYY or, expressed differently, the costs incurred by government in financing it, have been miserably low. Its value for young people, judged by the Years impact on the problems which confront them, has arguably been less. This is not too harsh a judgement if considered in the context of the question, in what ways if at all, has the position of young people been improved as a consequence of the campaigns and activities of IYY?

Advocates of international years usually defend them on three grounds. First, they create the possibility for raising and highlighting issues of concern and serve to focus attention on them; in brief they have an agitprop value. Second, while there is no doubt that they are under resourced any sum of money is better than none. No matter how limited, IYY has involved young people, some for the first time, in new structures like youth councils at the local level and travel exchanges at the international level. Finally, the benefits of international years are sometimes expressed in the negative formulation that if they don't do any good at least they don't do any harm. On this logic there is everything to gain and nothing to lose. The experience of IYY shows that none of these arguments can be sustained.

IYY has failed completely to appeal to the media and has thereby proved unable to focus attention on the relevant issues. Indeed it is a failing of United Nations' years in general that they lack, while the mass media possess, the power to decide precisely which issues will be highlighted. My trawl through the Guardian, Times and Telegraph on the days after the Youth Parliament and the lobby of Parliament produced no results although young people continued to appear in the press cast in their traditionally designated roles of rioter, criminal, glue sniffer, heroin addict and hooligan. The media create images for different groups in society, including young people, and when the behaviour of those groups does not conform to that expectation, it will fail to be reported. This means that the possibility of publicising issues and generating discussion is limited by the constraint of these media created public perceptions.

Another possible strand to this argument is that it is the raising of issues with political parties, rather than the general public, which is important. Parties then take up the issues, draft appropriate policy and, hopefully, Parliament enacts legislation. This has not been the outcome of party activity in IYY.

There is general agreement that the Liberals have been the most consistent supporters of IYY by proposing 13 bills under the 'ten minute rule'. These inevitably had little chance of success but did promote discussion in Parliament; regrettably few people subscribe to Hansard so subsequent publicity has been limited. A similar agreement suggests that the Conservatives have ignored the year's activities and worse have implemented policies damaging to young peoples' interests. The commitment of the Labour party to IYY has been more contentious. The interview below acknowledges that the party "haven't been bad" and that Labour Listens To Youth - a day of events organised by the party "was successful". However accounts of the day differ. An LPYS delegate who attended claims that Kinnock and others on the Platform were heckled (maybe it was a success?) and that the day went with "more of a whimper than a bang". When questioned from the floor about guaranteed jobs for school leavers, Kinnock asked delegates to be reasonable. "We don't give impossible promises", he explained. "We should speak of the realities of Socialism and mobilise the optimism and confidence of youth rather than exploiting their depression and misery". (Labour Briefing no 23 Dec '85 p.20) The political parties,

with the exception of the Liberals, have done little to champion and advertise the cause of young people in IYY; indeed the Conservatives have tried to bury it.

The second defence of international years is equally untenable since IYY has not succeeded in involving young people in its activities on any substantial scale. English IYY claims a maximum of 180 local groups working with projects but concedes that the size of groups varies between five and 25 members. Even if the larger figure is accepted as typical it means that there has never been more than an 'elite' groups mobilised in local activities. The best hope here is that the 60 groups which will survive the year form an embryo which will develop at a future date into a radical network campaigning on youth related issues. At the level of international exchanges, only a handful of people have participated in travel and projects abroad.

The final defence argues that international years have the potential to advance the interests of the group concerned but cannot possibly prejudice them and therefore there is little to be lost. United Nations' years offer the possibility for change which should be grasped, but if that potential is not realised than at worst the status quo is restored. I would suggest that international years can harm their cause in at least three ways and consequently there is much to be lost.

First, they offer cynical governments and cynical politicians (and there are plenty of them about) a cheap cop out when challenged about their indifference to the special needs of groups such as the disabled or young people. Future accusations of this government's lack of concern about the difficulties facing young people will undoubtedly be met with the assertion that, 'we supported IYY'. These years are an easy substitute for effective action and we shouldn't provide governments with ready excuses no matter how implausible the excuses may be.

Second, international years misrepresent the nature of the problems facing the target group, by suggesting that the difficulties can be resolved by one hard, determined effort. Particularly tricky problems and injustices will require a little longer and on this reasoning the United Nations recently devoted a whole decade to women. The point here is an obvious one and it is this. What is required is a sustained, long term engagement with social problems rather than this 'one off; now we've solved it; let's move on; who's next?' style so typical of United Nations' years. This leads directly to a third objection.

By designating a year, 'youth year' or 'year of the disabled' or of 'the child' there is the suggestion that the problems of this particular group can be resolved in isolation from the wider society. However it is often the case that the whole must be restructured to effect the desired change in the constituent parts. The problems of young people must be located in a broader context which includes the circumstances of Britain's declining position in an international economic regime, with the consequent contraction of manufacturing and employment possibilities. Equally important are society's changing requirements in education and training as well as the emergence of the ideology of the New

Right, with its strictures on the expression of sexuality and its flabby tolerance of racist views under the guise of freedom of speech. The difficulties facing young people cannot be properly analysed, much less resolved, if they are considered in isolation from their social context. Young people are positioned in a set of power relationships which means they can win some battles but are likely to lose others. To imagine that young people's needs can be met by promoting the themes of 'peace', 'participation' and 'development', is to risk reducing young people to an abstraction.

One final but important point. The arguments set out here are meant to prompt doubt about the value of international years as effective vehicles for changing the circumstances of the designated group. I am not trying to discredit the industry and integrity of those individuals who have worked hard, against all the odds to make IYY a success. For those interested in youth affairs the neglect, deliberate or unconscious, by the media has been regrettable resulting in only muted discussion of important issues. It therefore seemed appropriate at the end of IYY to discuss the year's activities with the people who have worked at IYY head quarters - Michael Cowcher, Annajoy David, Julie Donachie, Adam LeBor, and Bob Stroulger. The shortage of resources so typical of IYY was probably nowhere more apparent than in the cramped office accommodation at Charlton Street, when I spent a day there in December 1985; equally apparent was the enthusiasm of the workers as well as their frustrations. 1986 is to be Energy Year as well as Industry Year, while the United Nations has designated 1986 International Peace Year (although the British government has refused to acknowledge it). Let's hope it proves more successful than IYY or there may be little opportunity to review its achievements.

How is IYY organised at the national level?

The government decided against United Kingdom structure, so in each of the four countries: England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales there is a national co-ordinating committee. This has proved difficult for English IYY, which has 90% of the U.K. population and is sited in London, because it creates the impression that events at English IYY are the whole of IYY. It's been difficult to counteract that feeling but we've tried hard to make it clear that we're just England. In Scotland they have a national committee which is made up completely of young people with only one or two adult advisors, who serve as observers offering advice when asked. They're based at Scottish Community Education Council and funded by the Scottish Office and financially they are much better off than us. They've sponsored a lot of activities at district council and regional council level. In England however we have paid more attention to addressing the political issues facing young people and provided a forum for that without being prescriptive about what those issues are or what the answers should be. The English Committee has about twenty five members with about half being young people and the other half being people drawn from organisations like National Youth Bureau, Council for Local Education Authorities, the churches, CBI and TUC.

Who do the young people on the committee represent?

The young people are drawn from youth organisations such as Union of Jewish Students, Gay Youth Movement, National Youth Assembly, Student Christian Movement, etc., but they only represent themselves and in fact they were specifically meant not to be representatives of organisations. They are just drawn from those organisations to provide a good balance.

Isn't there a problem here because in speaking for no one and representing no one, they are accountable to no one? They are representatives without a constituency.

They are not accountable because they were not elected. There is no structure established to make them accountable and it was impossible to make it like that.

I've read some reports of a division on the national committee, can you comment on them?

There have been some problems because young people on the Committee want action now. It's a gut reaction to all that is happening to young people based on frustration and anger. The organisational representatives around the table are perhaps more cynical, if that's the right word, they actually know how long it takes to do anything and they also know about 'real politik'. We are funded by the government and they have probably been aware throughout how close to the wind you can sail without actually getting closed down. If you are government funded and you are set up as an all party cross interest group, there are constraints that derive from members' own positions and what they perceive to be the funder's position.

Is that a constraint you've felt, because the national committee sets the agenda for what you do here at IYY?

We're here quite simply as a secretariat to carry out what the national committee decides.

Let me come back on this, because the article I read in the Times Educational Supplement suggested that young people felt the older group had been preventing IYY from addressing the sort of issues which it should; which were unemployment, training, education, housing.

We've addressed the issues pretty clearly all through the year. The way we've addressed them is through *Spark*, and we've had some quite controversial articles in there; one on YTS, which provoked a response from an MP, an interview with Lord Young and an article on young gays and lesbians which provoked several letters in response, so it wouldn't be fair to say we've avoided issues. We've taken a pretty forthright stand on youth unemployment and homelessness, 'board and lodging', welfare cuts, and so on. What perhaps we could have done would have been more actual campaigning work, but we've always lacked resources. We haven't got a campaigns officer, in fact we haven't even got a press officer; Adam does those jobs because he's the only one with journalistic skills.

What has been the contribution of your joint Presidents - Paul Weller and Julie Walters?

Julie Walters hasn't been able to help that much because she's been so busy; she's very rarely been in London. Paul Weller's really done a lot. He got a leaflet printed to hand out at his concerts - that was done out of his own money - about IYY and allied issues, the arms race and unemployment. He helped to get people along to our video which we had made to advertise IYY. He's set up the President's Support Group of like-minded people in the media and music industry to promote IYY. He's put IYY on his LP covers; we've had a lot of letters from him; he's been very good. He's got us a lot of publicity in the music press and youth press, so he's been a very good President.

How has IYY been financed?

The major finance has been from the DES. In the first year we received £25,000 and £107,500 in the second which was an odd figure because the DES had originally given us £85,000 but had to top it up because of additional projects and the basement conversion downstairs to give more office space. This year they've given us £115,000, but we've also received small sums of money from advertising in *Spark* and from sales of posters. We've also had money in kind because two of us here are on secondment, one from National Westminster Bank and one from Prudential Assurance. The bulk of that funding has been eaten up by salaries and costs of office administration so we tried fund raising but without much success. We hired someone to look at this but we took the whole idea of fund raising on so late that budgets were fixed for '85 and all monies were spoken for.

There seems to be a general consensus that the year has been under financed, would you agree?

Not only the financial backing hasn't been there, but also the political backing. I think if we'd been given a higher priority as in some other countries like Canada where they have established a ministry for youth which is not the solution but is actually a statement to everyone which says look we see this as a priority and we're going to do something about it. The Canadian government has also contributed something like £8 million. In this country IYY has been a missed opportunity. Who knows why the government has refused us funds except perhaps, given its philosophy, of not throwing money at things, we are in the same position as the health service and education. A lot could have been done if it had been seen to be politically important. Governments, of course, will always say they're short of money but that is obviously a political decision in as much as they decide where to put the money. From our position here in the office it's been frustrating at times especially when people have rung and said can you help us with this, that or the other and we have had to say I'm sorry we don't have the resources. This has meant that for much of the time we've been on the receiving end of a lot of criticism.

The Labour spokesperson Barry Sheerman said that the themes of IYY were an embarrassment to the Government, do you think they are?

You'd have to ask the Government really. We can't speak for them. The themes themselves are very broad and can mean anything or nothing. Take participation for example,

everybody's in favour of more participation which may mean more young people taking an active role in schools and trades unions and colleges. Now that's one area where the government's not been too bad because its just funded another staff member to help the local committees carry on and turn themselves into some sort of permanent forum so there will be another 60 or so new youth forums or youth councils next year. As for development or peace, you can see the government's response to the famine in Africa where young people have been dying in large numbers in IYY, but they haven't given an extra penny for aid apart from the air lifts from the Ministry of Defence. Any money they've given has come from existing Aid budgets.

I think the message that we've been putting out is that whatever party is in government we are still looking to all political parties to come up with serious and thorough going solutions to the problems of youth.

Why do governments ignore young people?

Groups in society which don't have clout, which don't have access to power, people who are at the bottom within society, (young people or ethnic minorities or the elderly) find it hard to make their voices heard. There is a worry of pushing people outside the system and politicians are aware of that danger. One of the themes of the year was peace which we defined to include peace in the community as well as international peace. The irony is that in IYY community peace broke down in certain areas and there was a feeling that young people were being pushed outside of the system. There's been the argument that the disorders were an expression of criminality and young people jumping on the bandwagon, but what sparked the violence was that frustration and anger, that feeling of alienation that is common among young people who consider they have nothing and face a bleak future.

What has been the response of individual political parties to IYY? Have they supported the year?

Well they've all supported it in name because its an easy thing to say we all support IYY. However, in one way, the Tories have done the most for young people in IYY. Unfortunately almost everything they've done has made the position of young people worse. In 1985 we've seen the abolition of wages councils, introductions of board and lodgings controls, record levels of youth unemployment, cuts in benefit to young people, a general worsening of the economic situation, education cuts, a failure to bring the grant up to a realistic level. It just goes on and on, so although they've done the most for young people, they've done all the wrong things.

On a more positive note?

On a more positive note the Liberals have done the most for young people. They've put together a pack for IYY. They've sponsored five bills through parliament including a youth charter although obviously these bills had no chance of becoming legislation but they did generate publicity and raise the issues of young people in the House of Commons. The Bills they introduced sought age of majority at sixteen,

better provision for the young homeless, more participation for young people and a better Youth Service. They circulated model resolutions to their councillors to put to the council and they had a Liberal Youth Day when young people came to Parliament. A lot of young people were influenced by it because they met their MPs in an atmosphere where people were sitting around eating pizzas, going to seminars and listening to jazz. It broke down the mystique of Parliament which was a good thing.

What about the Labour Party?

They haven't been bad. The main thing they did was to organise a day called Labour Listens To Youth which unfortunately got a press release two days after the event. Nevertheless it was a successful day with MPs talking to young people. The party also launched their youth policy, the Charter for Young People, which isn't bad but needs to go much further in some directions; paying YTS trainees £36 a week is hardly a rise at all if you take inflation into account but it is moving in the right direction. The SDP haven't been bad. They've got involved in various campaigns, talked about it in speeches, they've supported the Liberals and their activities.

Earlier you mentioned the three themes, participation, peace and development. These are fine words but what have they meant in practice? How have you implemented them?

The first thing we did was print twenty thousand starter packs which amongst other things contained posters and information on each theme. We thought the most we could do given our resources was to publicise the themes and suggest how other people might like to implement them. We printed a leaflet outlining roughly how we interpreted each theme plus a list of suggestions on the back 'ideas for action', and a list of useful people to contact in the local area. There is clearly no way we could take on board all those themes and set them in operation ourselves. All we could do was make suggestions and hope that young people would contact the organisation themselves. So what we tried to do was to channel their enthusiasms.

Can I pick up on some of the events of the year? There was a lobby of Parliament, the Youth Parliament as well as the Declaration For Youth. Were they successful?

The Declaration For Youth was launched quite successfully. We got Kinnock, Owen and Steele together at the same time, which is quite rare. We distributed 100,000 declaration forms through **Spark** but because we didn't have a network of local full-timers working on IYY in the different regions, the response wasn't all that we'd hoped for. The lobby on the 13th November went very well. There were about two hundred young people from throughout the country, a good number of MP's, a meeting with Kinnock, Owen, Steele and Hall Miller who is vice chair of the Conservatives. It was a most successful day.

Everyone seems agreed that the successes of the year have been at the local level. Whats been going on?

There's been a range of things, but our major objective has

been to try to attract young people, who weren't involved in the established organisations like the Youth Service, the so-called unattached youth.

Have new structures been established?

Yes. Young people have established Youth Committees and Youth Forums, some working with sympathetic councils to campaign on a range of local issues such as unemployment and homelessness.

How successful have they been?

It depends on what you mean by success. If success is taken to mean that young people have the issues before them and the skills to organise themselves around those issues, then those groups have been successful. It's certainly not enough just to celebrate IYY like its some sort of festival although this has happened in some areas where very traditional sectors of the Youth Service have taken it over.

The main issues facing people are unemployment, YTS, housing and education cuts but it seems to me that what IYY has been doing at the local level doesn't attack those issues. For example what use is a Youth Bus, other than a gimmick? I can see the purpose of a drop in centre for unemployed people, but how does painting a bus help to resolve these important issues?

Well there are a range of projects that are worthwhile and which will continue after IYY. In Gateshead a Youth Advisory Service is being established to put young people in touch with organisations which they as young people feel are important. In Leigh they have set up the Leigh Co-Operative Centre for young people which will be the focus for a music co-op with recording studios. There will be keep fit classes, women's self defence classes and a forum for young people to get involved in political debates. In Norwich young people have launched the Norwich venue campaign which IYY activists left the traditional IYY group to form. It is a venue-based campaign around music, which is co-operatively run. London are doing a feasibility study to set up a centre, to be run co-operatively as an educational and campaigning forum for young people. So far as buses are concerned it depends upon the remit of the bus. In Dunstable they are setting up a bus that will travel round the rural areas - and let's not forget how difficult it is if the last bus to the city leaves at 6.50 in the evening, - so the role of a bus travelling round rural areas can be as important as a drop in centre in the inner city. What the bus contains is then another issue. In Dunstable the bus will be a resource centre giving young people a chance to find out about their rights on particular issues, such as board and lodging, the Fowler review, the NHS, benefit while unemployed, a range of educational issues as well as the peace campaign. So a bus on that sort of basis can be very productive and we would challenge anyone who said otherwise.

Jumping from the local to the global, to what extent has IYY been International?

Some people from Gateshead, Nottingham and other groups have been doing twinning and exchanges with coun-

tries such as America, Germany, Holland, France, which have been quite a success although limited by the number of people involved. But it will develop into longer term contacts for campaigning purposes. Nationally there hasn't been a central international perspective and on two occasions there simply wasn't money in the budget and project proposals had to be dropped.

Can we move on to the magazine Spark which was a title Lenin used for the Bolshevik paper? Is Spark meant to be political?

Its political in the sense that it raises political issues but it is also an educational and informative magazine. If it were a youth magazine in a conventional sense it would have a lot more about pop and fashion which would be really nice but we've got limited resources. We were very much concerned with getting over the issues and virtually every page has information for people to help them learn about political issues.

Can I offer some praise and criticism of Spark? In professional terms it is a very well produced paper, if a bit 'glossy', but I have two misgivings about it. First, is it not possible to widen the range of contributors to get young people involved and second does the paper's format appeal to young people?

As for getting young people involved, there are real difficulties. We tried hard from day one and made it clear that contributions were always welcome but unfortunately we haven't received many. One guy sent some poems which we published and we published an article on gay rights which received two letters from evangelical Christian groups and another from a gay young man who was supportive. The problem is that people will often only get inspired to write something if its a professional magazine like Ms or The Face. Also if people pay for a magazine it arouses stonger feeling in them when they read something that outrages them. Because **Spark** is read by different people, isn't paid for and is published irregularly, you don't get that critical response.

What about the format which looks very expensive?

Well we have a very good printer who gives quality results quite cheaply. We spend £2,500 on each issue which is not that much when we spend about £1,200 on distribution. Also we wanted a paper that looked reasonably professional, because **Spark** is the only way a lot of people come into contact with IYY and if they picked up something scrappy, that would be their impression for IYY. If you look at most youth magazines like Smash Hits, its layout and presentation is much more elaborate with graphics and the use of colour. We don't think that a glossy look puts people off.

What sort of readership does Spark get?

We have a 24,000 print run but the readership is probably higher because its passed on from hand to hand and left lying around in unemployment centres and things.

You mentioned that Spark is perhaps the only contact some people have with IYY and I certainly don't think they would

have read about it anywhere else because IYY seems to have had very little press coverage. What's gone wrong?

You'd have to ask the news editors. The media on the whole have never picked up on IYY. Partly its a fault of the way its been organised and funded. Something as important as IYY should have had a media campaign going for at least six months before it started, with a press officer appointed to build up contacts, take people out and explain what its all about to make them more receptive to a press release. However that never happened. We were refused funding for a press officer, and you can speculate as to the reasons for that, so basically its been down to Adam to hand out press releases.

But you've given out quite a lot?

Oh yes tons and tons and whole loads of magazines. We've sent them everywhere. There is no way they haven't got through to the sorts of people who could have given us media coverage but very little has been printed. A good example of media attitude is the Today programme. When we were launched in October 1984 we had someone on the Today programme for five minutes to talk about IYY but we've sent press releases to the Today programme about every single thing we've done since then and all they say is 'OH IYY we've done it'. That's media mentality. The story comes, the story goes and thats the end of the story. There is another reasons. The committee took a deliberate decision that the year wasn't going to portray images of young people jumping up and down, letting off balloons and having a wild time. The sort of image that suggests young people are happy, doing nice things and every thing is wonderful. However the experience we've had with the media throughout is that these are the sorts of things they like to publicise. The sort of message we wanted to get across was that there are very real problems which young people face, which people haven't faced in the past and we failed to do that. Sensationalism is what's got across; young people are football hooligans or heroin addicts.

With the benefit of hindsight what were the successes and the failures of IYY? What's its legacy for the future?

One of the its successes paradoxically is to demonstrate this government's lack of concern over the position of young people. If this is what they do for young people in IYY, then we should be grateful that next year isn't IYY. Its been one of the worst years ever for young people so in the sense of its political effect its been an absolute zilch. The big successes have been the local groups which reached young people not traditionally involved in youth clubs or any sort of youth organisation. Those young people who've got involved, perhaps for the first time, have actually discovered that they can organise things for themselves, that they can do it for themselves and that it can be exciting and a success. There were 180 but some have collapsed now. There's still about 60 which will become permanent forums to campaign around issues such as homelessness, unemployment, education and they will carry on after IYY and that will be IYY's legacy.

But will there by any way to co-ordinate them because that's

potentially a very powerful and useful network?

Yes strangely enough the ability to coordinate them will come from the DES who have funded a new worker, to start in March '86, to work with those local groups. So although the Government has been bad nationally, thats been its contribution locally and that's quite a big contribution. That will be the legacy.

But how effective do you think these 'years' are whether for women, the disabled or youth?

I think there is a big question mark over international years. People are cynical and say, 'Oh its another international year, its IYY'. Its always the year of something and next year its the year of three things. There's the United Nations International Year of Peace, but there's also the Government backed Energy Year while the CBI are promoting Industry Year. Obviously we thought there was a point in having it or we wouldn't be here. There were important things to say and we have said them and we have been addressing ourselves to those kind of issues. It's wrong to become totally fatalistic. All the United Nations can do is declare the year and the way its taken up depends on the individual people concerned. Its easy to say 'another year what a bore'. It's up to individual and organisations to make it a success or not.

But the issues facing young people are obvious and you've listed them better than I can. What this Government has given IYY amounts to no more than the proverbial drop in the ocean if its meant to resolve there problems?

Yes. In financial terms there is no doubt about that whatever. We've had a quarter of a million pounds over three years for 60 million people. Not much is it?

Many thanks to Elaine Conway for her helpful ideas and the copious notes and written material she gave me.



WORKING WITH GIRLS

* The magazine that makes the links between activities and issues, attitudes and action, theory and practice.

* The initiatives taken by girls' workers today will be on all youth workers' agendas tomorrow.

* So make the connection and stay ahead of the times,
Subscribe to WORKING WITH GIRLS today!

Please send me _____ copies of each issue of **Working With Girls** starting with issue
I am subscribing as an individual ☐

I am subscribing as a statutory/grant aided club/project; training institution; library;
youth office; social services dept. etc. ☐

I enclose a cheque/PO for £ _____
(rates £5.50 per annum - individual £12 per annum - institutional)

Name _____
Address _____

Agency _____
Tel No: _____
Date _____

No: 14701118

SEND TO: NAYC Girls' Work Unit, 30 Peacock Lane, Leicester (0533) 29514

a new approach to the study of girls

SUE LEES

Most analyses of young people have derived from studies based on the experiences of young men. This article offers an alternative perspective based upon research of language use as it effects young women and applies the findings to education.

Much of the work that has recently been carried out by feminists in the field of cultural studies has drawn attention to the almost total omission of girls from the subcultural literature and has attempted to fill the gap. In this article I wish to raise as problematic the insertion of girls into a subcultural framework and to question the consequent attempt to produce a specifically female subculture. The tendency in subcultural theory is to argue that subcultural groups: 1) exist in a space that marks a temporary escape from the pressures, and demands of society and 2) that youth's response to its situation where it takes a distinctive form marks a kind of resolution or resistance to that situation. This cannot be applied to girls precisely because subcultural theory is fundamentally based on class analysis. There is no female subculture or 'different space' that is not always the product of gender relations. Nor can the 'bedroom culture' postulated by McRobbie & Garber⁽¹⁾ be regarded as a form of resistance. If girls do not participate in boys' groups and their public activities and stay listening to records with a close group of friends, this is not a form of resistance but is, if anything, an adjustment to their expected feminine role, which by and large is centred on the home. Moreover, the terms on which girls participate in social life and social relationships are significantly different and to a girl much of her social behaviour seems to be determined by her sex rather than her class. By avoiding the analysis of gender relations in the subcultural literature of boys and girls, only a partial picture emerges of girls' social world.

When we⁽²⁾ set out in the early 1980's to talk to about one hundred 15 and 16 year old girls from different social classes and ethnic groups about their views of school, friendship, marriage and the future we did not intend to focus particularly on sexuality and gender relations. However the double standard of sexual morality and the concern that girls expressed about their sexual reputation which was frequently a target of potential abuse from boys and other girls led to a focus on the neglected area of how sexual relations were socially structured. The emphasis in youth culture studies on class has deflected attention away from the power imbalance between boys and girls so that few studies have

questioned the taken-for-granted subordination of girls by the structuring of gender relations.

The structure of sexual relations and the concept of reputation

Boys and girls talk about sexuality in quite different ways. It is possible to delineate three main differences. Firstly, while a boy's sexual reputation is enhanced by varied experience, a girl's is negated. Boys will brag to others about how many girls they have 'made', but a girl's reputation is under threat not merely if she is known to have had sex with anyone other than her steady boyfriend but for a whole range of other behaviour that has little to do with actual sex. Secondly, a boy's reputation and standing in the world is not predominantly determined by his sexual status or conquests. More important is his sporting prowess, or ability to 'take the mickey' or make people laugh. For a girl, the defence of her sexual reputation is crucial to her standing both with boys and girls - certainly around the age of fifteen or so. The emphasis on the importance of sex to a girl's reputation is shown up by a whole battery of insults which are in everyday use among young people. Finally, for boys sexism appears to be very important in male bonding in as much as denigration of girls and women is a crucial ingredient of camaraderie in male circles. The masculine tradition that focuses on drinking and coarse jokes usually focusses on the 'dumb sex object', the 'nagging wife' or the 'filthy whore'. This is not the case for girls. As one girl told me:

One thing I noticed is that there are not many names you can call a boy. But if you call a girl a name, there's a load of them. You might make a dictionary out of the names you can call a girl.

The vocabulary of abuse

This lack of symmetry between the variety of names to call a girl and the lack of names to call boys is the starting point for an understanding of the role of verbal abuse focussing on sexuality in reproducing, among girls, an orientation towards the existing structures of patriarchal sex-gender relationships. The word which illustrates this asymmetry more clearly than any other term is 'slag'. There is no equivalent to 'slag' in the vocabulary of terms available to be directed at boys. Derogatory words for boys such as 'prick' or 'wally' are much milder than 'slag' in that they do not refer to the boy's social identity. To call a boy a 'pooff' is derogatory but this term is not used as a term of abuse by girls of boys. As a term used between boys, it implies a lack of guts

or femininity: which of itself connotes, in our culture, weakness, softness and inferiority. There is no derogatory word for active male sexuality. The promiscuous Don Juan or the rake may be rebuffed as in Mozart's opera but his reputation is enhanced.

The potency of 'slag' lies in the wide range of circumstances in which it can be used. It is this characteristic that illustrates its functioning as a form of generalised social control, along the lines of gender rather than class, steering girls, in terms of both their actions and their aspirations, into the existing structures of gender relations.

The first thing that is striking about the use of the term 'slag' is the difficulty of getting any clear definition of what it implies from those who use it. This is true both for girls and boys. Take this girl's description of what she calls a 'proper slag':

I do know one or two slags. I must admit they're not proper slags.

Q. Can you describe what a proper slag is?

Available aren't they? Just like Jenny, always on the look out for boys, non-stop. You may not know her but you always see her and everytime you see her she's got a different fella with her, you get to think she's a slag, don't you. She's got a different fella every minute of the day.

Q. So it is just talking to different boys?

You see them, some of them, they look as innocent as anything, but I know what they're like.

The implication here is that the girl who is called a 'slag' sleeps around but this is by no means clear, and the insult often bears **no relation** at all to a girl's sexual behaviour. Boys are no clearer when it comes to defining what the characteristics used to define a girl as a 'slag' are, which is why they disagree as to who is or is not a slag. In their book about boys, **Knuckle Sandwich**, Dave Robbins and Phil Cohen wrote:

The boys classified all the girls into two categories: the slags who'd go with anyone and everyone (they were alright for a quick screw, but you'd never get serious about it) and the drags who didn't but whom you might one day think about going steady with. Different cliques of boys put different girls in each of the two categories.⁽³⁾

So whilst everyone apparently knows a slag and stereotypes her as someone who sleeps around, this stereotype bears no relation to the girls to whom the term is applied.

An alternative to asking those who use a term to define it, is to carefully observe the rules whereby the term is used. A look at the actual usage of 'slag' reveals a wide variety of situations or aspects of behaviour to which the term can be applied, many of which are not related to a girl's actual sexual behaviour or to any clearly defined notion of 'sleeping around'. A constant sliding occurs between 'slag' as a term of joking, as bitchy abuse, as a threat, or as a label. At one moment a girl can be fanciable and the next 'a bit of a slag' or even - the other side of the coin - written off as 'too tight'. The girls tread a very narrow line. They musn't end up being

called a 'slag'. But equally, they don't want to be thought unapproachable, sexually cold - a 'tight bitch'.

Ways 'slag' can be used

This constant sliding means that any girl is always available to the designation 'slag' in any number of ways. Appearance is crucial: by wearing too much make-up, by having your slit skirt too slit, by not combing your hair, wearing jeans to dances or high heels to school, having your trousers too tight or your tops too low. As one girl said, 'sexual clothes'. Is it any wonder when girls have to learn to make fine discriminations about appearances that they spend so much time deciding what to wear? Whom you mix with also counts:

I prefer to hang around with someone who's a bit decent. 'cos I mean if you walk down the the street with someone who dresses weird you get a bad reputation yourself. Also if you looked a right state, you'd get a bad reputation. Look at her y'know.

Looking weird often means dressing differently from your own group.

Behaviour towards boys is, of course, the riskiest terrain. You musn't hand around too much waiting for boys to come out (but all girls must hang around sufficiently), talk or be friendly with too many boys, or too many boys too quickly, or even more than one boy in a group, or just find yourself ditched.

Almost everything plays a part in the constant assessment of reputation - including the way you speak:

If we got a loud mouth, when we do the same they (the boys) do, they call us a slag, or 'got a mouth like the Blackwall tunnel'. But the boys don't get called that, when they go and talk. They think they're cool and hard and all the rest of it 'cos they can slag a teacher off.

Q. Who would be calling you a slag then?

The boys. They think, oh you got a mouth like an oar, you're all right down the fish market... They think you've come from a slum sort of area.

Thus 'slag' can just as easily be applied to a girl who dresses or talks in a certain way, or is seen talking to two boys or with someone else's boyfriend. The point is that irrespective of whether, in a particular case, the use of the term 'slag' is applied explicitly to sexual behaviour, since a girl's reputation is defined in terms of her sexuality, all kinds of social behaviour by girls have a potential sexual significance.

Perhaps the key to an understanding of 'slag' is its functioning as a mechanism whereby boys exercise control over the activity and social reputation of girls. What might happen after a boy dropped a girl seemed to be a constant preoccupation and was mentioned over and over again in the interviews. Girls described how a boy could drop you after you'd slept with him.

Then the next thing he'll be going around saying 'I've had her, you want to try her, go and ask her out, she's bound to say Yeah'.

or another girl said:

Some boys are like that they go round saying 'I've had

her'. And then they pack you in and their mate will go out with you. And you're thinking that they're going out with you 'cos they like you. But they're not. They're going out to use you. The next you know you're being called names - like writing on the wall 'I've had it with so and so. I did her in 3 days. And I've done her 12 times in a week'.

It may not be a question of the girl actually having slept with a boy, she may land herself with a reputation as a result of going out with one boy, then being dropped and going out with one of his friends. The consequences for a girl are quite different from those for a boy:

When there're boys talking and you've been out with more than two you're known as the crisp that they're passing around.... The boy's alright but the girl's a bit of scum.

If a boy takes you out or boasts that he has slept with more than one girl he is more than alright, his reputation is enhanced:

If a boy tells his mates that he's been with three different girls, his mates would all say 'Oh lucky you' or 'Well done my son, you're a man'.

The pressure is on boys to boast about their sexual conquests. They have to act big in front of their friends. As one girl explained:

They might say 'Oh I've had her'. Then it starts spreading round. She might be really quiet or something and they'll say 'Oh she's not quiet when you get outside the school'. Someone else will take it in the wrong way and it'll carry on from there.

No wonder that girls have always got fears about boys going behind their backs and saying 'Oh you know, had it with her'. It is the girl's morality that is always under the microscope whereas anything the boy does is alright. A number of girls described girls who had not slept around but had been out with a number of different boys in a short period of time "because they were unlucky enough to be dropped by a number of boys". This led people to start saying "Oh god who is she with tonight?"

The crucial point, then, about the label 'slag' is that it is used by both girls and boys as a threat. No girl wants to be labelled bad and 'slag' is something to frighten any girl with. The effect of the term is to force girls to submit voluntarily to a very unfair set of gender relations. A few girls did reject the implications of the label and the double standard implicit within it, but even they said they used the term to abuse other girls. What becomes important is not the identification of certain girls but how the term is used. A useful way to understand how terms like slag are used is provided by Sumner in a study of the functioning of **categories of deviance**.

Their general function is to denounce and control not to explain.... They mark off the deviant, the pathological, the dangerous and the criminal from the normal and the good.... (they) are not just labels.... (but).... They are loaded with implied interpretations of real phenomena, models of human nature and the weight of political self interest.

To call a girl a slag is to use a term that as we have seen appears at first sight to be a label describing an actual form of behaviour but which no girl incontrovertibly fits into. It is even difficult to identify what actual behaviour is specified. Take Helen's description of how appearance can define girls, not in terms of their attributes as human beings, but in terms of sexual reputation:

I mean they might not mean any harm. I mean they might not be as bad as they look. But their appearance makes them stand out and that's what makes them look weird and you think 'God I can imagine her y'know?'.... She straight way gets a bad reputation even though the girl might be decent inside. She might be good. She might still be living at home. She might just want to look different but might still act normal.

You cannot imagine a boy's appearance being described in this way. How she dresses determines how a girl is viewed and how she is viewed is in terms of her assumed sexual behaviour. Whether she is 'good' or not is determined by how she is assumed to conduct her sexual life; that sexuality is relative to male sexual needs.

Rather than attempt to specify what particular behaviour differentiates a 'slag' it is more useful to see 'slag' as what Sumner terms a category of 'moral censure': as part of a discourse about behaviour as a departure, or potential departure from - in this case - male conceptions of female sexuality which run deep in the culture, so deep that the majority of men and women cannot formulate them except by reference to these terms of censure that signal a threatened violation. This violation can occur for no reason other than a rebuff from a girl:

What I hate is when a boy tries, you go somewhere and a boy tries to sort of get in with you and if you dislike him as a person, then (he says) 'Slag'. That's what really annoys me.

A girl should be flattered by a boy's interest, should be a passive and compliant recipient rather than an active agent in her own right. She can be deemed a slag both when she approaches him or rebuffs him. He must always be master. The term connotes being promiscuous and 'sleeping around' but its actual usage is such that any **unattached** girl is vulnerable to being categorised as a 'slag'. This is the way in which the term functions as a form of control by boys over girls, a form of control which steers girls into 'acceptable' forms of sexuality and social behaviour. This is reflected in the fact that there is no way the legitimacy of 'slag' can be contested. If someone starts to get a reputation the only thing they can do to redeem themselves is to 'get a steady boyfriend':

Then that way you seem to be more respectable like you're married or something.

Going steady establishes the location of a sexuality appropriate for 'nice girls', and that sexuality is distinguished from the essentially dirty/promiscuous sexuality of the slag by the presence of LOVE:

The fundamental rule governing sexual behaviour was the existence of affection in the form of romantic love before any sexual commitment. For most of the girls, love existed before sex and it was never a consequence of sexual involvement.

Wilson, who studied a group of 13 - 16 year old delinquent girls goes on to comment:

Given this threat of rejection (for sex without love) it was difficult to discover just how many girls actually believed in the primacy of love, and how many simply paid lip service to the ideal. Nonetheless the fact that the girls found it necessary to support this convention, whether they believed in it or not, was an important fact in itself.⁽⁵⁾

Nice girls cannot have sexual desire outside love. For them sexuality is something that just happens if you are in love, or if you are unlucky, when you are drunk:

You might be at a party and someone just dragged you upstairs or something and then the next thing you know you don't know what's happening to you.

If this happens the general consensus of opinion is that it is the girl's fault:

It happens a lot. But then it's the girl's fault for getting silly drunk in the first place that she can't she doesn't know what's going on or anything.

Few girls were clear about what being in love meant though invariably love was given as the only legitimate reason for sleeping with a boy. The importance of love seemed to be therefore in permitting sexual excitement while offering some protection from sluttishness. This failure to recognise sexual desire meant that girls often changed their minds about whom they loved.:

You think you're in love and then when it finishes you find someone else who you like more and then you think the last time it couldn't have been love so it must be this time. But you're never sure, are you, 'cos each time it either gets better or it gets worse so you never know.

You think you're in love loads of times and you go through life thinking 'God I'm in love' and you don't do anything. You want to be with this person all the time. Then you realise you weren't in love, you just thought you were.... I thought I was in love and then I went away and when I came back I realised I wasn't. It wasn't love at all. So I finished it and I was much happier.

The girls here could just as easily be describing the way they felt attracted to a boy and then lost interest. Some girls said they had "been in love loads of times" whereas others said they "had never really experienced it":

It takes a while to happen. I mean it sort of dawns on you that you finally love this person. Don't think it happens straightaway. I mean you might say 'Oh look at him I love him', 'I think he's really nice' but you can't really say that until you know him really well.

Given the ambiguity about what love involved it could well be that love is used as a rationalization for sleeping with someone after the event, rather than as Wilson suggests as always existing before sex could occur. The confusion that girls experience over whether or not they are in love arises from the confusion of using the word love to express what is really sexual desire. Love is supposed to last for ever or at least for a long time, and is the main reason that girls give for getting married. The distortion of what is really sexual desire into 'Love' means that girls must find it difficult to

separate their sexual feelings from decisions about marriage and long-term commitment. As Jacky said:

Girls have got to keep quiet about sex and think it's something to be ashamed of.

However it is quite legitimate to talk of love. The 'legitimacy' of love is precisely its role in steering female sexuality into the only 'safe' place for its expression: marriage. The result is that a girl either suppresses her sexual desire or channels it into a steady relationship that is based on an unwritten contract of inequality - that she will be the one to make compromises over where she works, lives, and spends her leisure. She will bear the main burden of domesticity and child care without pay and adjust herself and indeed contribute to her husband's work, lifestyle and demands.

The importance of the threat of being regarded as a slag in pushing girls to channel their sexuality into the 'legitimate' channels of love which results in marriage is illustrated by the realistic, as opposed to romantic view of marriage which most of the girls had. Almost all the girls took it for granted that they would get married yet they are remarkably clear about the grimmer aspects of woman's lot in marriage. As one girl put it:

'The wife has to stay at home and do the shopping and things. She has got more responsibility in life and they haven't got much to look forward to.... We've got to work at home and look after the children till they grow up, you've got to go out shopping, do the housework and try to have a career. The man comes in and says 'Where's my dinner?' when we've been to work. They say 'You don't work'. It's because boys are brought up expecting us girls to do all the work. They expect their mums to do it and when they get married they expect their wives to do it. They're just lazy'.

The realism about marriage was based on the observation of their parents:

My dad won't do anything, he won't make a cup of tea, he says he does the work for the money and the rest is up to my mum - she does part time work too.

The most important reason that girls put forward for getting married was that they saw no alternative. Life as an independent unattached woman is always open to risks:

If you don't want to get married and want to live a free life and you go out with one bloke one week and another the next, everyone will call you a tart, like you've got to go out with a bloke for a really long time and then marry him.

Besides the constant fear of being regarded as a tart or slag, living alone is seen as too frightening. The need for protection emerged in a number of the interviews. Charlotte describes how her brother is treated differently from her:

Boys are a totally different physique. I could go out and be raped whereas he couldn't. He'd have more chance of protecting himself. I think that comes up the whole time. It's not that a boy is more trusted. It's that he's freer.

The harsh reality of existing in a male dominated world was that you needed protection from sexual harassment. Girls could never go out on their own - or even with girl friends - without fear.

Say you have a boy protecting you. It's as if no one can hurt you or nothing. You're protected and everything. If someone does something to you, then there's him there too and it just makes you feel secure.

The threat of male physical violence takes its place alongside the verbal violence associated with labelling a girl as a slag to steer girls into the acceptability of marriage. However it is not just the constraints on an independent sex life that lead girls to marriage but that the family is seen as the "only hope we appear to have for the fulfilment of needs for warmth and intimacy and love".⁽⁶⁾ Lesbian relationships can of course offer these but only if the girl manages to face the pressure towards conformity and, of course, if she is attracted to other girls.

In the face of these strong pressures the girls inevitably subscribed to the idea that they wanted to marry. Nevertheless their realism about marriage, based on the observation of their parents already noted, led them to devise ways of rationalising or cushioning its inevitable impact. Almost all the girls wanted to put marriage off for some time. By delaying marriage many girls thought that they would be able to have some fun, often fantasised as travel and seeing the world. Marriage was something you ended up with after you had lived:

I don't really want to get married 'cos I want to go round the world first like me dad did....they got married when they were thirty years old, they just sort of had their life first and then they got married and had us but when you're an air hostess you don't start the job until you're twenty so I want to work until I'm thirty-five.

Girls who did want a career often realised that relationships with boys might upset their intentions and therefore steered clear of them:

If a boy does ask us out we say 'no' don't want to know, because we want a career and go round the world and all that lot. So we just leave them alone....

or Janey put it more strongly:

I don't really bother about boys now - just get on with my homework. I was brought up not to like boys really 'cos I've heard so much about what they do, robberies, rapes and all that so I keep away from them!

When asked what she meant by being brought up not to like them she replied:

Well my mum told me never to go with them because they're bad and they damage your health and things like that, don't know.

Boy friends and marriage could easily interfere with career intentions - the girls could see what had happened to their mothers and how little autonomy they had.

Another way of attempting to avoid the predicament of marriage was to attribute the unhappiness that they saw in marriage around them to the wrong choice of partner. The subordinate position that many women found themselves in was often attributed to the lack of good sense in choosing the right husband rather than to the general structural constraints on women at home with young children. Alice, looking

at the 'mistakes' her mother made - in choosing the wrong man - believed.

But not all marriages are like that though are they? like if your mum's goes bad, yours might go good, it's what husband you pick.

Alice is right in one respect. Some men allow women more autonomy than others. She does not however criticise the unfairness of the marriage deal itself, particularly if children were involved. Although having children was something that most girls wanted, again, the way in which this inevitably constrained freedom was recognised:

I think that once you decide to have kids then you've got to accept the fact that you are gonna be tied down for a while. That's why it's important not to get married too early - until you're twenty-eight or so.

In short the girls were not aware of positive attractions attaching to the married life yet, as far as they saw it, there was just no alternative. Romanticism about choosing the 'right man' can be seen as a way of attributing personal responsibility for structural oppression but the fact of structural oppression is realistically understood. Nevertheless, despite the unattractiveness of marriage the question is, as a girl from Leonard's study⁽⁷⁾ in Cardiff put it, not of **choosing** to get married or not but whether you **fail** to get married. My argument has been that what forces this closure on all alternatives to married life is above all the power of the 'slag' categorisation for the unattached woman who is sexually active. Once we understand the way in which female sexuality is constructed and constrained by the categorisation of slag, how a woman's femininity and sexuality is only rendered 'safe' when confined to the bonds of marriage, we understand why there is just no alternative, as the girls see it, to married life.

Sex, class and subculture

As I have noted, most studies of male youth culture have been conducted from a subcultural standpoint in which youth culture is seen as resistance to and temporary escape from, the pressures and demands of society. Yet the experiences of the girls that I have portrayed here can hardly be seen as resistance or escape. On the contrary the processes which I have illustrated are very far from resistance. They are the processes of constraint and the channelling of aspirations and behaviour along the well established paths of sex and gender relations exemplified by the institution of marriage and the role of women in the domestic sphere. To see the rehearsal for entry into a major social institution such as marriage and the domestic sphere as a form of 'subculture' or resistance is, in effect, to deny the reality of the domestic sphere as a social institution akin, say, to economic life and social class relations and to see it purely as a cultural phenomenon. In this way the questions of subculture and debate over sex and class relations are crucially linked. If the main structural forces or forms of stratification in our society are seen as economic class structures then of course rehearsal for domestic life, when seen from the standpoint of those structures, will be seen as a form of cultural behaviour unrelated to class, or possibly as a form of resistance to the consequence of class determined life chances - in the way in which, for example, Willis describes the process whereby working class **boys** reconcile themselves to working class

jobs.⁽⁸⁾ But if gender divisions are seen as of equal significance to economic class in the constitution of social structure and social institutions then it is less easy to view girls' behaviour as 'subcultural'.

There are several reasons for agreeing with Eisenstein⁽⁹⁾ when she describes the position of women as that of a 'sex-class'. Firstly, marriage is a similar experience for women irrespective of differences in economic class relations. All the girls in this study, irrespective of differences in the economic class background of their fathers approached marriage with the same mixture of realism, cynicism and resignation. They were all approaching the same institution. Irrespective of differences in economic class, and of course these are very real, women are never independent of the domestic sphere and its associated labour of childrearing, nurturing, consuming, domestic labouring, in addition to their participation in wage labour. Secondly, differences between sexes can be as profound and more covert than economic class differences as a lived experience. A working class girl will use the same language and terms as a middle class girl and can understand her and describe her life. But a boy of any class - economic class that is - will not be able to describe and will not have the vocabulary to describe the impact of, for example, sexual reputation on a girl's life, or the way her social and sexual behaviour is constrained. Thirdly, and perhaps most crucial, at the level of material economic relations sex-gender relations are of at least equal importance to those established around the institution of wage labour and capital. Sociologists usually classify women into different class groups with reference to their husband's socio-economic class, thereby regarding economic class stratification as the only significant form of stratification. But it is women's dependence on their husbands that is **itself** a form of economic stratification of equal significance.⁽¹⁰⁾ It is this dependent status that hides the massive forms of labour surrounding housework and childcare which are simply regarded as non work and thus outside the sphere of economic relations and stratification which is of interest to sociologists. The family is itself a system of stratification crucially determining the distribution of economic resources between men and women. Pahl's⁽¹¹⁾ study of the distribution of money within the marriage relationship indicates how unequal this often is and there is evidence that after divorce some women experience a higher standard of living on supplementary benefits than when they were married because of their lack of access to their husband's wage.

Implications for education

The implications of this for education are far reaching. It is clear that educational reforms should be as oriented to the problems of sexual stratification as they are to class stratification. But the implication is not simply one of extending compensatory education programmes from one area into new ones. Compensatory education has been aimed at social **mobility**. This is of course viable as regards economic class: assisting working class kids to become better qualified and get middle class jobs is at least a coherent strategy. But it makes no sense to apply the concept of 'mobility' to overcoming the effects of sexual stratification. It is **the critiques and reworking of the insitutional arrangements of the domestic sphere** which have to be incorporated into the aims of the education system. In this concluding section I shall try and

draw out some of the consequences.

Compensatory education programmes have focussed exclusively on class. This is in spite of growing recognition of sexual discrimination and inequalities in schools. One difficulty is that teachers who are aware of class differences and disadvantages are much less sympathetic to equal opportunity policies in regard to girls. At a recent conference sponsored by the Equal Opportunities Commission the director of a research project Margaret Spear⁽¹²⁾ reported that the majority of the teachers surveyed in her research appeared to be in favour of equal opportunities in principle but were far less committed in practice. Some teachers claimed that equal opportunities were irrelevant to their work and some argued that discrimination was necessary. One said 'Schools have to prepare pupils for work in society as it is. Some boys need restricted workspace more than girls'. A separate paper revealed that secondary teachers firmly believed that technical education is of greater importance to boys than to girls. Nearly half the sample thought that women were not as good as men at complicated technical problems. 42% thought that a woman's career was not as important as a man's and 29% that a woman's place was in the home.⁽¹²⁾ One third of the teachers believed that innate psychological differences between boys and girls were responsible for career choices. So teachers are by no means united in accepting the need for compensatory programmes for girls or that equal opportunity programmes are necessary. There are four main areas where discrimination needs to be challenged.

Firstly, the whole issue of social relations - and gender relations in particular - should be given far more attention in schools than at present. There is evidence that boys monopolize two thirds of class teachers' time and that teachers pay less attention to girls and even find it more difficult to remember their names.⁽¹³⁾ The way that boys and girls integrate in school should be a focus for debate and more attempts should be made by teachers to counteract any indication that boys are either receiving more attention or depriving girls of the use of any school facilities.

Secondly, sex education not only needs to be given far greater attention but needs to be approached with reference to the powerful and taken-for-granted assumptions about sexuality which, rather than being natural and biologically given, are social and reflect and reinforce the subordinate position of girls and women in our society. It is only by approaching the question of sex education in this context with a knowledge of how sexual relations are structured by the norms and constraints outlined in this article that progress can be made. There are two areas that I would like to discuss from this standpoint.

Sex education in the traditional sense usually focusses on different methods of contraception and descriptions of the biological make up and mechanics of the sex act. Even at this level, according to Spencer,⁽¹⁴⁾ little has changed since 1965 when research indicated that adolescents received little guidance about sex education, virtually none about contraception and sexually transmitted diseases and that unwanted pregnancy was a major problem. Although birth control is now free and until recently has been available to all teenagers without their parents' consent, in practice only a third

of all sexually active teenagers regularly use contraception. This has been explained by girls' hesitancy about approaching doctors and birth control clinics but what may be more significant is the operation of the double standard that condemns her if she does not use contraception as irresponsible but condemns her if she does use it as unrespectable. It appears that using birth control and contraceptives runs particular risks in relation to a girl's reputation. If she uses contraception on a casual date this involves laying herself open to the charge that sex is premeditated and that she is therefore consciously choosing to anticipate that sex might occur with someone she is not 'in love' with or in a steady relationship with - she is therefore a slag. On the other hand if she has sex without contraception this can be explained as something which 'happens' without previous intent. In fact it is interesting how often girls describe their sexual encounters not as something that they consciously choose to embark on but as something that 'happens' to them. As Hannah said in an earlier quote:

You might be at a party and someone just dragged you upstairs....and the next thing you know you don't know what's happening to you.

Of course what's happening is rape. But it is too simple to regard the boys as totally blameworthy and 'potential rapists'. They too are locked in to regarding girls in a contradictory way. On the one hand there are pressures on them to regard girls as conquests and to 'make' as many girls as they can. On the other hand there are also pressures on them as individuals to treat girls well and as friends and to care for them. It is almost as though there are two kinds of sexuality, one that is without emotional feeling and treats women as dirty and provocative and the other that involves strong feelings of desire and compassion, and that those two concepts of sexuality are inextricably linked to the concepts of the virgin and the whore. This may be why even raping a virgin or a respectable married woman as occurred in 'The Rape of Lucretia' is still regarded as if not the woman's fault at least a taint on her character. The transition between the two types of sexuality has been crossed and the woman, if raped has crossed irretrievably into the 'slag' category. This is one reason why so few women report rape to anyone. In Lee's research on sex education in schools she describes how whenever rape was discussed there were at least a couple of boys who said:

"But women really want it Miss" or

"You have to knock them about a bit for them to enjoy it".⁽¹⁵⁾

The difficulty with these statements is that it is easy to reject them out of hand and regard rape as uncontrolled inhuman aggression of one human being towards another - which it is - and stop the analyses there. What must be questioned is why these views are so prevalent, and what exactly is at stake. The girl has to deny her sexual desire to remain respectable but should she in any way indicate that she is open to advances she is regarded as fair game and the implication is that rape is not the violent assault that it in reality is but is 'only what women really want'. Now it may be true that women do want to express their sexuality. They do want active sexual lives but this choice is denied them. Any indication of desire whether in the form of the way a woman dresses, speaks, looks or flirts is taken as grounds for the

man to assault a woman. A slippage has occurred whereby the assumption of desire in a woman turns her from the 'good' virgin into the 'rapacious' whore who will go with anyone anywhere. "You have to knock them about a bit for them to enjoy it" - and knocked about women are, night after night, month after month. This is shown by the studies of family violence that are emerging out of a wall of silence that has surrounded the cruelty that many women suffer within the privacy of the 'domestic haven'. It is such issues that need to be brought up and questioned in sex education classes though it is unreasonable to expect teachers to take on such a task without preparation and further training. Rape and violence cannot be explained as the behaviour of psychopathic sex maniacs but rather as actions which are the extension of the normal oppressive structure of sexual relations. It is by challenging the terms on which girls participate in social life that boys and girls can be encouraged to see their relationships not in sexist stereotypical ways but to see each other as human beings irrespective of their sex.

Thirdly, sex education - in the traditional sense - is also important as there is evidence that girls particularly have little knowledge of their sexual organs and responses, let alone the freedom to express themselves. Jane in this study graphically described her sister's fears about her pending wedding:

Jane *She's frightened of the night. She hasn't been to bed with boys or anything so she's frightened. She's getting married this Saturday.*

Sandra *Wonder woman she won't be.*

Jane *What's she gonna do when he jumps on top of her?*

Their description of sex as 'jumping on top of her' and as a searing experience is hardly a romantic or informed depiction of sexual love.

Tracy when asked whether anyone talked about sex to her replied:

My mum does talk about it. When mum explains it she talks like she's carrying a heavy load.

Sexual experience is for many women just like that - carrying a heavy load rather than an experience that lightens their load and lifts them out of themselves.

Likewise Jackson in **Learning to Lose**⁽¹⁶⁾ describes how the girls she interviewed equated sex with coition and had acquired little information about their own sexual responses or their sexuality. Given the focus on intercourse and reproduction in the knowledge available to adolescents, boys cannot but identify the penis as their chief sexual organ. Most girls on the other hand, did not even know of the existence of the clitoris. Investigation of the genitals is so heavily tabooed that few girls do so, as is implied by what the two girls, Sandra and Jane in this study say.

Finally, sexual harassment in schools should be recognised and taken seriously. As Helen put it:

My school work reflects how the rest of my life is going. If I am being sworn at at school or have trouble at home, my work suffers.

The sexual abuse that is often a taken-for-granted aspect of everyday life in comprehensive schools amounts to a form of

sexual harassment. Speech is a form of action and even if it is a reflection of the inequality between men and women which will only change when that inequality is overturned, sexist language can also be seen as a way of reinforcing the subordination of girls and women. The elimination of sexist language is a necessary condition for eliminating sexism in our society. The use of racist and sexist language, as Lakoff⁽¹⁷⁾ suggests, is connected to the inferior social roles of blacks and women and needs to be continually challenged. A disciplinary code should be drawn up in all schools where such terms are outlawed, and deemed to be quite unacceptable. Sexual harassment and sexual abuse need to be taken as seriously as racial abuse. Teachers who turn a blind eye to them or even actively collude in denigrating girls should be rebuked. One difficulty is that many teachers are not aware of the double standard or accept it uncritically. A good sample of this lack of concern is given by Griffin who reported this conversation with a fifth form teacher, Mr. Yates, about girls who reported they had been attacked:

Mr. Yates *Some of the girls have been saying they've been attacked coming to school.*

Chris *Yes some did mention that to me.*

Mr. Yates *Yes, well you don't believe them do you when they say that?*

Chris *But if they're worried about it...*

Mr. Yates *Yes, but some of them wouldn't know what it means. They're just having you on. These attacks are just nothing. They're not serious you know.*⁽¹⁸⁾

There is therefore a need for educating teachers and making them aware of the discrimination against girls, not simply in terms of option choices and career opportunities but also in terms of the unfair structure of social relations. Nonetheless, sociologists have been more blinded to the effect of gender than teachers, so it is hardly surprising that such attitudes persist.

Conclusion

The changes in educational policy are of course easier to formulate than to carry into practice. They face formidable obstacles; obstacles so powerful that they are still not recognised as such by large numbers of sociologists. As I have suggested in this article much of this blindness stems from an uncritical application of categories of class and resistance derived from studies of male youth culture to understand the position of girls. This emphasis has served to deflect attention away from a study of the social discourse of boys sexist language through which the interests of boys subordinate those of girls and develop a hegemony which is finally consolidated in the institution of marriage itself.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. McRobbie, A. & Garber, J. 'Girls and Subcultures' in Hall & Jefferson (eds), *Resistance through Rituals*. Hutchinson 1975
2. The research was carried out with Celia Cowie with a grant from the Nuffield Foundation and the IEA
3. Robbins, D. & Cohen, P. *Knuckle Sandwich* Penguin 1978
4. Sumner, C. 'Rethinking Deviance: Towards a Sociology of Censures' in *Research in Law, Deviance and Social Control*. Vol. 5p 187-204 1983
5. Wilson, D. 'Sexual Codes & Conducts' in Smart, C. & Smart, B. (eds) *Women Sexuality & Social Control*. Routledge 1978
6. Smart, C. *The Ties that Bind*. Routledge 1984
7. Leonard, D. *Sex and Generation*. Tavistock 1980
8. Willis, P. *Learning to Labour*. Saxon House 1977
9. Eisenstein, Z. *Feminism & Sexual Equality*. Monthly Review Press 1984
10. Delphy, C. *Close to Home*. Hutchinson 1984
11. Pahl, J. 'Patterns of Money Management within Marriage' in *Journal of Social Policy* Vol 9 (3) 1980
12. Spear, M. 'Teachers attitudes towards girls & technology' in eds Whyte J. et al 'Girl Friendly Schooling' Methuen 1985
13. See Marshall, S. & Borrill, C. 'Understanding the invisibility of young women, *Youth and Policy*, Summer 1984 and Stanworth, M. *Gender and Schooling: A study of sexual division in the classroom*. Hutchinson 1983
14. Spencer, B. 'Young men: their attitudes towards sexuality and birth control' in *British Journal of Family Planning* 1984 10
15. Lee, C. *The Ostrich Position* Writers & Readers 1983
16. Jackson, S. 'Girls and Sexual Knowledge' in Spender, D. & Sarah, E. (eds) *Learning to Lose* Women's Press 1980
17. Lakoff, R. *Language & Women's Place* Harper & Row 1975
18. Griffin, C. *Typical Girls* Routledge 1985

Nothing Happens In Isolation WORKING WITH GIRLS



MAKES THE LINKS

Why Subscribe?

Because Young Women Are Everywhere

If you are a part-time worker, full-timer, or administrator, *Working With Girls* makes the links for you. If your remit is detached work, if you are club-based, if you work in a rural setting, or are interested in sport, junior club work, training, unemployment, homelessness... if your central aim is participation then *Working With Girls* puts you in touch with others who have similar interests and concerns. To understand Girls' Work is to understand the interweave of all youth work theory and practice.

Because It's Regular

It's your news, your views and your reviews - six times a year.

Because WWG Is A Two Way Process

It is written by the readership to exchange information, document practice and contribute to current debates around the work.

Because WWG Understands Connections

It understands the inter-relatedness of oppressions; racism, heterosexism, able-bodiedism, anti-semitism, agism, to name but a few. *Working With Girls* understands the relationship between girls' work and anti-sexist work with boys.

MAKE THE LINK SUBSCRIBE TO WORKING WITH GIRLS!

Please send me.....copies of each issue of *Working With Girls* starting with issue.....

I am subscribing as an individual ☐

I am subscribing as a statutory/grant aided club/project; training institution; library; youth office; social services dept. etc. ☐

I enclose a cheque/PO for £.....
(rates £5.50 per annum - individual £12 per annum - institutional)

Name

Address

Agency

Tel. No:

Date No: 14701118

SEND TO: NAYC Girls' Work Unit, 30 Peacock Lane, Leicester.

Telephone: (0533) 29514

death of an i.t. programme

MIKE NELLIS

This account of the rise and fall of the Tunbridge Wells IT programme between 1978 and 1984 concentrates on the inter-organisational, administrative and personal factors in its success, rather than on the content of the programme and its undoubted impact on local rates of care and custody. The description of its eventual collapse is something of a novelty in the IT case study literature, 'failure' in social policy, at whatever level, being much less discussed than 'success', and its significance for theorising about IT in general will therefore be briefly assessed.

By way of introduction a few biographical details are necessary. I was a Senior IT/Court Officer in Kent Social Services, based at Tunbridge Wells, between July 1981 and September 1984. I resigned in frustration at the lack of local management support for the aims, and more particularly the standards achieved by the programme in its six year history. In one sense its collapse was a direct result of my departure, confirmation that the local managers had simply lost interest in young offenders and juvenile justice policy, and left the entire burden of this work to a handful of committed, but overworked staff. It is a matter about which I still feel strongly because the outcome could so easily have been different, and I am undeniably "not immune to protective feelings about the project's reputation", as Adams *et al* put it. Nonetheless, I also agree with them that "project leader who choose to write in some detail about their project may well be willing to admit its shortcomings, for they see these in the context of wider successes and aspirations".⁽¹⁾ It is in such a spirit of tempered objectivity which, if truth be known, is more widespread than routinely admitted, that this article is offered.

A useful framework for analysing the development of IT programmes within larger welfare bureaucracies and community networks is provided by Ellickson *et al*.⁽²⁾ They assessed the ways in which 37 innovative criminal justice projects were, or were not, translated into routine practices within their host organisations. Successful innovations were defined as "those which altered organisational behaviour and made some progress towards achieving the innovators original goals",⁽³⁾ and the following features were listed as correlates of success: a) sincere motivation at outset; b) supportive leadership; c) cooperative external agencies; d) staff competence; e) cost-effectiveness; f) clarity of goals and procedures; and g) clear lines of authority. The strategies most likely to achieve success were further identified as i)

those producing multiple payoffs; ii) those ensuring key actor participation in planning and problem solving and iii) those which built in a flexible problem solving process. I will not describe the development of the Tunbridge Wells IT programme precisely in terms of these categories, but their applicability should become apparent as the account proceeds.

The prosperous reputation of Tunbridge Wells is partially belied by a ring of council estates and a degree of urban decay in the centre, and it is from these areas, as well as some of the surrounding villages that most of the youngsters on the programme were drawn. Provision for poorer youngsters generally is not adequate, despite several good clubs and an extremely caring off-site tuition centre. Unemployment among 16-19 year olds, however, once YTS schemes had been accounted for, was only 1% in 1984. Juvenile crime, is nonetheless perceived as a serious problem and although the numbers of youngsters referred to the Juvenile Bureau in 'D' Division, approximately 600 per year in the 1979-84 period, declined by 8% in 1981 and 7% in 1982, the Chief Constable's reports for both 1980 and 1982 refer to outbreaks of public disorder among youth in the town, the former involving 83 arrests.⁽⁴⁾ Burglaries, theft and criminal damage are by far the most common offences; both violence and car theft are negligible in the juvenile age group. Approximately 50% of youngsters apprehended in the division are cautioned, the rest go to court, and it is almost exclusively from these two groups that youngsters on the IT programme are drawn.

The Growth of the Programme

IT came late to Tunbridge Wells. The Divisional Management Team in the local SSD office formulated a new policy for children in 1977, which included a much stronger emphasis on the reduction of residential care in general and the making of Section 7 Care Orders in particular. IT was deemed central to the new approach and a senior social worker, Peter Southern, was appointed in December 1977 to develop a pilot scheme. The programme he designed - which in crucial respects became the basis of all the Kent programmes - was operationalised six months later, and a year after that, in June 1979, a second IT officer, John Tovey, was appointed to cope with the demand that had been generated. The form of provision was altered and improved as experience grew and in 1981 the programme as a whole was evaluated by the then research officer, Jim

Stewart.⁽⁵⁾

The reasons behind this evaluation were promotional rather than operational: the Division wished to draw attention to a scheme of which it felt justifiably proud, rather than conduct enquiries with a view to modifying practice. The method consisted of analysing statistical data provided by the Division, and interviews with key personnel in the SSD and in related agencies. Within these limits the evaluation is useful and fairly accurate, although the numbers of youngsters said to be involved (i.e. 234 between 1978-80) were greatly exaggerated, and included groups in youth clubs whose only relationship to the IT programme was having borrowed equipment from it. The programme was always well staffed, but there were never sufficient personnel work effectively with this many youngster, given that each youngster was involved for about a year.

Stewart's report concluded "that the IT programme in the Tunbridge Wells division has been thoroughly planned and executed".⁽⁶⁾ Using statistics from the 1974-81 period, it showed that there had been a significant reduction in committals to care, which had once been considerable, and also in committals to detention centres and borstal, which had not in fact been high to begin with, although as the offenders were hardly 'serious' they were no less inappropriate than many of the placements in care. Stewart identified a number of factors which had been crucial to this achievement, which resemble in some respects those listed by Ellickson *et al.* The factors were a) the explicitness of divisional policy and the backing given to the IT officers, b) the inclusion of court liaison work in the IT officers job description, and their monitoring role in regard to Social Enquiry Reports (SERs) and c) effective liaison with the Juvenile Bureau, education welfare and local magistrates. He added pertinently, that "the personality of the two post holders has clearly been very important to establishing the credibility of IT both within and outside the Division".⁽⁷⁾

The programme's first test was the departure of the founding IT officers. I replaced Peter Southern in July 1981, at the same level of seniority (senior social worker) but, in effect, 'number two' to John Tovey. When he left eighteen months later the second post was downgraded to level 3 for purely financial reasons. It was eventually filled by a newly qualified worker without previous local authority experience who was, in practice, being asked to take on a job that had previously been done by an experienced senior social worker. (The myth that level 3 posts, introduced as a career grade after the 1979/80 social work strikes, are only given to experienced practitioners is perpetuated even in some radical social work text.⁽⁸⁾ The line manager for IT, the Assistant Divisional Director who had largely initiated the new children and families policy, did his best to ensure the smoothness of these transitions but neither he nor anyone else gave much thought, at the time of the second one, to the likely impact on the programme of an inexperienced co-worker.

My own early impression was that while the programme's reputation elsewhere in the county was a little overrated, a core of excellent work was undoubtedly being undertaken. Nevertheless, the extent to which the programme's credibility had depended on Peter Southern's charisma was soon

apparent. When I became responsible for the programme in 1982 I gave greater priority to publicising its structure, mapping out in readable detail the inter-relationship of aims, activities and methods, so that it could be judged more for what it was than by who ran it. This seemed doubly important in the absence of an identifiable IT centre - it had been deliberate policy to use local halls, this being considered a more authentic form of 'community care' - which made it difficult for some colleagues and agencies to think of IT as a tangible, on going resource. In the course of this enterprise I introduced a few changes, adding a community service element and regular girls' groups and losing the junior group, weekly meetings of 10-12 year olds which the Division had once felt it wanted but which none of the IT officers felt happy with, given the programme's orientation to offenders.

The Substance of the Programme

There was nothing unique about the activities in IT programme - no special formula which was uniquely responsible for its success in reducing the use of care and custody. The blend of groupwork, individual counselling, residential outdoor pursuits, project work and community service is common to many IT programmes throughout the country and was never calculated in any precise way. In our publicity we made great efforts to render the various components of the programme coherent and intelligible to our various constituencies, seeking always to match 'practice' with 'theory', and to avoid making greatly inflated claims about ourselves. For five years, except in parts of the summer when outdoor pursuits courses took place, and for a month at Christmas when the groups closed to allow for advance planning, there were never less than four evening groups running, and often six, together with occasional weekend activities and day time school holiday schemes. Being there and being reliable, providing an ongoing resource into which youngster could grow in their own time was a crucial ingredient of the programme's success. The staff commitment, both professional and volunteer, which made such persistence and continuity possible was the main reason why the programme came to be appreciated by other agencies.

The majority of the youngsters on the programme - approximately 40 in any given year - were not compulsory attenders, although almost all had been to court at least once. At any one time there were never more than 10 youngsters on Supervision Orders with IT involved in the programme, and although they followed a notionally more intensive programme than the rest, they shared a number of the same groups with them. 'The rest' were variously referred by the Juvenile Bureau, education welfare, social services and probation, and occasionally by the child guidance clinic. As individuals a number of them had far greater personal and domestic difficulties, and in some cases even longer criminal records, than the ostensibly more 'serious' offenders placed on formal orders, and they made correspondingly greater claims on our time.

The way in which the Stewart Report summarises the aims of the IT programme, emphasising opportunities for personal growth and improving self esteem, place it firmly at the preventive rather than the anti-custodial end of the IT spectrum, although Southern's original strategy document⁽⁹⁾

made clear that it encompassed those youngsters who, in Tunbridge Wells, were at risk of detention centre and borstal sentences. Their numbers each year were so small - the peak was 10 in 1978 - that it would not have been cost effective to set up a 'heavy end' programme for them alone. Additionally, they were not necessarily serious offenders by standards that pertained elsewhere, often being youngsters who were making their first or second court appearance. Locally, there were never more than 5 who were sentenced to detention centre between 1981-83, and none under 17 were sent to borstal for the programme's entire duration.

In terms of the typology used by Adams *et al*, the objectives of the Tunbridge Wells IT programme can be described in terms of **social education**, (in which I would include horizon-broadening, **compensatory** activities), and **treatment**, which focused on the emotional and behavioural difficulties of individual participants. Aspects of the justice approach, involving surveillance and restitution, and the social change approach, involving community development, political action and participatory management, were not much in evidence, although had the programme survived these were the directions (surveillance excepted) in which I would have liked the programme to evolve. Only the rudiments were there, although the emphasis placed throughout on offenders' capacity to act responsibly, even to plan their own group activities, would have provided a sound basis for such a move.

In one sense I would argue that the establishment of the IT programme in the town was itself a kind of social change, particularly in regard to the input from local volunteers. Except for brief periods in its six year history the programme was never really short of them, most being recruited through networks of friends rather than by formal advertisement. Some stayed for only six months, others for several years. Their motives varied, and some were looking to gain experience before embarking on social work courses. A niche was found for almost everyone who turned up and although very few of our formal training arrangements suited everybody we tried to offer a great deal of on-the-spot learning in the basic techniques of counselling and groupwork, and received few complaints. The availability and enthusiasm of these volunteers is a large part of what I would mean by the IT programme's success. The department's decision to establish it led, in the town itself, to the mobilisation of sentiments and energies which would otherwise have gone untapped, as well as creating opportunities in the lives of certain youngsters that had not existed before. Over the above statistical evidence of effectiveness, or the recounting of particularly spectacular case histories, the generation of new local arrangements on the edge of the local criminal justice system, in a place renowned for its conservatism, seems to me to be a very valuable achievement.

Not every initiative we tried worked. Some youngsters did not engage. Some presented persistent control problems. Neighbours were not always happy to have an IT group next door, largely because they had unwisely been left out of the original decisions to make use of local halls. Staff shortages in the local office limited the amount of family work we would have liked to see undertaken. Finally, we never achieved a significant presence in the rural area because our

own resources never quite matched our remit to cover it. It is arguable, however, that rural offending was never sufficiently serious to warrant large scale intervention.

Relationships with Other Agencies

The Tunbridge Wells Juvenile court, even though it did not rely heavily on custody, conducted its criminal proceedings in a fairly formal atmosphere and erred towards a deterrent rather than a welfare approach. Fines of under £50 constituted more than half the disposals each year, and while the magistrate often recommended informal use of the IT programme as an adjunct to whatever sentence they passed, they were highly selective in their making of Supervision Orders with formal IT requirements, sometimes giving them to youngster whose age and criminal record would have precluded a custodial sentence. This was one of several points of disagreement between us.

Until August 1982 the Clerk to Justices had regularly convened joint meetings between the magistrates, police, education and social services but, for reasons which are not clear, these came to an abrupt end. One result was that the magistrates never got to know the second generation of IT/Court Officers as well as they had known the first and that points of conflict could only be aired in the courtroom itself, or in unsatisfactory exchanges of letters. Despite these problems neither the Assistant Divisional Director nor the Area Manager who replaced him in the departmental reorganisation seriously attempted to restore the meetings.

The root of the difficulty was the low threshold of seriousness which obtained among the magistrates. Many of the older, first, second and third offenders placed on supervision with IT might not have been considered serious from a conventional 'heavy-end' perspective.

Yet in Tunbridge Wells, as subsequent experience showed, they would undoubtedly have gone to detention centre if the IT programme had not been available, or perceived as badly run. In the absence of inter-agency mechanisms for discussing this, we felt on the IT programme that we had no choice but to accept it, and managed to ameliorate some of the worst excesses of their heavy handedness by running a programme which was less disciplinarian than the magistrates might have believed. The nadir of our relationship with them, the inevitable outcome of a failure to re-establish liaison, came when the IT programme was itself in decline, when seven youngsters, including four first offenders, were sent to detention centre in the autumn of 1984, and the court officer who sought to remind a magistrate of his obligation to state openly his reasons for such sentences was rebuked for impertinence.

'D' Division, the police area which comprised Tunbridge Wells, Sevenoaks and Tonbridge was served by two Juvenile Bureau Officers (both constables), one male, one female. They processed all juveniles arrested in the area and were in effect the gatekeepers of the local juvenile criminal justice system, although their discretion was heavily circumscribed by their superior. As gatekeepers, they had been befriended early by the first IT officers and the rapport established lasted for the duration of the programme, withstanding changes of staff on both sides. This rapport took the form of

a readiness to discuss the backgrounds of the more problematic offenders and to consider the appropriateness of involvement in the IT programme as an adjunct to a caution. Such involvement was never made a precondition of a caution but was offered to families, without strings, as a potential means of forestalling future trouble. There were sometimes differences of opinion between ourselves' and the bureau as to who was suitable, and not every family offered IT accepted it.

In early 1982 the woman constable was invited to become a member of staff in the Monday evening IT group, and participated for a year in all the group's activities. The question of possible role-conflict and her expectations of discipline within the group were thoroughly aired beforehand, and while she did have more natural authority than any other member of the group's staff her role outside was never unduly obstructive. She secured the confidence and respect of some youngster in a way that she could not have done as a police officer, and showed a surprising tolerance of testing out and horseplay. One valuable side effect of her involvement was a further improvement in the IT programme's reputation with other agencies, particularly among the schools she also worked in, but also among the magistrates, who had somehow got to hear of it.

The degree of personal rapport that existed between the staffs of the Juvenile Bureau and the IT programme should not be taken as a sign of coinciding interests and attitudes in the larger organisations of which they were a part, but more as a kind of makeshift symbiosis. While the IT programme existed the police were prepared to give it the benefit of the doubt, but the actual degree of cooperation and support they gave it was based entirely on the levels of friendship that existed between the personnel. The police could - and eventually did - manage without it, and had relations between them and social services been more formal, they could always have ignored it. As it was, the informal relationship gave the IT officers access to information about offences and offenders that would not otherwise have come their way, and enabled the Juvenile Bureau Officers to offer help in a way that suited their temperaments.

The ideological differences, and the differential distribution of power between the various agencies involved in criminal justice were brought to the surface by the setting up of a junior attendance centre at Tonbridge in October 1981, the third in the county. Prior to this, the juvenile courts in Sevenoaks, Tonbridge and Tunbridge Wells had not had access to such a facility, but as all three areas had had a structured IT programme available since the late seventies, the immediate need for it was not obvious. As far as I can ascertain it, the pressure for its establishment came from the Sevenoak's Clerk to the Justice, and plans went ahead without any formal consultation with the SSD whatsoever. When the centre first opened the police inspector in charge encouraged magistrates to make use of it, lest underuse prompted the Home Office to close it. This advice was readily taken, and in Tunbridge Wells, despite an attempt by the Assistant Divisional Director to have it seen as a high tariff penalty, it was often used for first and second offenders.⁽¹⁰⁾ Paradoxically, when youngsters were breached for non-attendance, fines were the commonest response.

The low threshold of seriousness in the juvenile court, its readiness to make custodial sentences and the establishment of an Attendance Centre at a time when there was no obvious need for it, suggest a social context in which the welfare principles underlying IT could not easily take root. That the programme established itself so successfully in only three years was partly a result of its initially presenting a different face to its different constituencies, and only gradually working towards an honest disclosure of its methods of work. Apart from the policewoman who worked in the Monday group, only the Senior Probation Officer (post 1982) and the Senior Education Welfare Officer, among other agency managers, fully understood the robust, frank and informal nature of the groups and appreciated their merits as ways of working with adolescents. They both gave considerable moral support to the programme, particularly the SPO, who compared it favourably to the IT he had been familiar with in London, and who was exceptionally helpful as a bridge-builder with the magistrates when the liaison meetings collapsed.

Other agency 'managers', headmasters and magistrates for example, wanted to see us as more disciplinarian with youngsters than was in fact the case, but the one factor which was common to the perception of all our constituencies was the commitment of the IT staff, professionals and volunteers alike. Adams *et al* suggest that hard work and good organisation are regarded as at least as important to other criminal justice agencies in their assessment of IT programmes as a proven ability to reduce offending rates,⁽¹¹⁾ and my experience in Tunbridge Wells would confirm this.

The Demise

In terms of the factors outlined by Ellickson *et al*, some of which were echoed in the Stewart Report, it can readily be seen that the Tunbridge Wells IT programme thrived for fairly conventional organisational reasons. Its founders were highly motivated and almost all the people connected with it, including its first line manager, had been deeply committed to promoting youngsters' welfare and reducing the use of custody. A high level of departmental support was initially given to it, so much so that it encountered accusations of favouritism from other groups in the office. The cooperation of related agencies, once won, was sustained, albeit more by friendship than the hammering out of mutually agreed policies. The professional staff, with one exception, were experienced in childcare, and able to provide effective training. Specific target groups were identified early and, initially at least, lines of accountability were clearly drawn. The cost effectiveness factor was more problematic as nothing explicit was said about this when the programme was first established. That came later. In 1977-79 it was taken for granted that IT would be cheaper than residential care, which is where the county was more concerned to make savings, and money was never a problem. The allocation to each programme in the county was loosely based on a formula pertaining to the number of groups run in each division; this may have been the reason why the numbers of participants in the Tunbridge Wells programme were initially exaggerated. The annual budget, excluding salaries in the 1978-84 period never exceed £10,000 - the very minimum annual cost of keeping just one child in care.

As regards Ellickson *et al*'s strategies, there were multiple payoffs in terms of job satisfaction for the staff, kudos for the department, a degree of fulfillment and/or instrumental gain (in 'social work experience') for the CSVs and voluntary aids and, most significantly, the provision of a facility which made the task and workload of social workers and other agencies that much easier. The inclusion of key actors in planning was facilitated by the involvement of representatives from the social work teams, and the Senior Probation Officer, in the monthly IT management meetings, but what the programme never had - or rather what the office never had - in Ellickson *et al*'s terms, was an effective means of solving administrative and professional problems, and this, in part, was what proved disastrous.

The background to the difficulties which arose in the IT programme in late 1983 was a 'departmental reorganisation' which affected the entire county. Its ostensible objective was to create six large areas out of the fifteen small divisions, and to give each one a much higher degree of local autonomy, while at the same time vetting all policies in terms of a 'value for money' criterion operated from head office. Allied to this were new developments in policy towards children and families which were to entail the setting up of Family Support Centres, combining short term residential, field and day care provision, in each of the areas. The main way in which such major changes are initially felt in local offices are in terms of staff anxieties about their status and workload. The Assistant Divisional Director was an early casualty, and after much visible unhappiness, took early retirement in 1983. Several months elapsed before he was replaced, by a new-styled Area Manager, and for much of this year my own supervision was negligible. As morale dwindled within the office, I felt that the IT programme was slowly being cut adrift from it. A strike during the summer, of which I, unlike my Level 3 colleague, was not an active supporter further complicated the situation and led indirectly to the resignation of a team leader who had been an active behind-the-scenes supporter of the IT programme. These blows, and my sense of the administrative chaos into which the office was sinking prompted me to concentrate almost completely on direct work with the youngsters on the programme and in this sense the situation of being adrift had its advantages; we got on with practicalities and, relatively speaking, our own morale was high. Nonetheless, it was brought home to me at this time that not only the quality, but also the very existence of the programme was now dependent on the commitment of the people working in it, and I had the same acute sense as Norman Alm in his Dundee IT centre "of creating the whole thing every day".⁽¹²⁾

This situation could perhaps have been sustained until the department settled down again, had there not also been a growing tension between myself and my Level 3 colleague concerning the standard of his work, which was beginning to create significant increases in my own workload and to divide loyalties among the IT staff. After failing to resolve this between ourselves in February 1984 we took it to the new Area Manager, the obvious route for problem solving, but regrettably he proved indifferent to the consequences of my colleague's activities, and did not discourage his approach. This destroyed the fragile unity which still pertained among the IT staff, who were now confused by having

two different standards to work to, and made it virtually impossible to deliver an affective service. Coupled with the Area Manager's persistent unwillingness to engage the magistrates in dialogue and thereby reduce our vulnerability as court officers, this incident convinced me that the IT programme as it had run for the previous five years had, by default, lost the support of the new management. Only the goodwill and determination of three people maintained a semblance of good service until September 1984, when a key CSV left, and I resigned, leaving initially to go on study leave. In the following three months, seven local youngsters were given detention centre sentences. Four of these were first offenders and one was a lad on a Supervision Order which the department had inadvertently 'forgotten' to operationalise for a year. The number of IT groups were reduced, yet in November an incident of staff incompetence occurred at one of them which was too gross for management to ignore, as the police had been in attendance. Fearing scandal, they asked my erstwhile colleague to leave. One IT group remained operational until April 1985, when it dissolved into a short-lived adventure playground construction group associated with the new Family Support Centre.

It was a messy and inglorious ending, attributable to management indifference on two key issues, the magistrates' low threshold of seriousness and the question of acceptable social work standards, on both of which they had been forewarned more than six months previously. Clearly, one cannot rule out the possibility of a second IT programme running in Tunbridge Wells in the future, and by September 1985 two new IT Officers had been appointed; they, however, had to start from scratch and, moreover, from within an office which had lost a good deal of local credibility over its mishandling of the first one.

Conclusions

The Tunbridge Wells IT programme collapsed in a department which had an explicit policy on IT a long history of good practice, and a flamboyantly supportive director. It had at one time been a 'showpiece', had been positively evaluated by a departmental researcher and had even received a published accolade from a visiting magistrate.⁽¹³⁾ Within three years it achieved the targets set for it and subsequently maintained them. It won and sustained a high degree of cooperation from the local community and from other criminal justice agencies, who perceived it, almost to the end, as a sound professional operation. Management assured continuity in the transition between the first and second generation of IT officers but by the time of my own departure, reorganisation had entailed a progressive loss of support and this, coupled with the fact that the programme was no longer in the hands of an experienced worker, guaranteed its collapse. Ironically, loss of management support and the resultant stresses on IT officers had been identified as a potential problem for IT programmes by Kent's principal IT officer as early as 1978.⁽¹⁴⁾

A number of administrative, professional and political points can be drawn from this experience which are of relevance to IT in general. While several studies refer to problems between management and workers and to 'personality clashes' (a term which can hide a multitude of legitimate conflicts) between staff, none to my knowledge pursue enquiries into

the power relationships obtaining in the wider organisational context, and their significance for the provision of services for young offender. It should be clear from Tunbridge Wells that neither an agreed policy nor its successful execution are any guarantee of support for its continuation and this observation is as true at national level as it is of the local one. Large organisations such as local authorities cannot properly be understood without reference to the elites and cliques within them, whose interpretation of, and enthusiasm for, particular policies will always determine the final form of their implementation. Even within a country as committed to IT as Kent, it was always possible for powerful groups and individuals to block policy, and for a newly appointed manager to put the process of consolidating power and attracting acolytes so far above the defence of basic standards of professional practice that he was prepared to jeopardise the credit and goodwill which the IT programme had brought to the local office.

The question of standards in IT (as opposed to 'training' which may, or may not, be connected with them) is rarely ever raised, and usually restricted to concern about safety in outdoor pursuits.⁽¹⁵⁾ It has the ring of a right wing issue, but the left neglect it at their peril, for there is a great deal of 'tokenism' in the services offered to working class communities and to the marginal groups within them. In IT, discussion of the subject is inhibited by ambiguity about the nature of the task, the high premium placed on social worker autonomy and the wider problem of attributing particular levels of competence to particular career grades. Yet there are certain matters which, if persistent, require judgement, e.g. inadequate supervision of youngsters in public, allowing them alcohol, neglecting their safety, a bureaucratic unwillingness to put oneself out for them, and generally buying 'matey' relationships at the expense of any attempt to exert influence. The pressure to do all these things is very great when one works informally with adolescents; expertise lies partly in overcoming them. It is impossible to estimate how widespread such failings might be, harder still (with some of them) to insist on firm guidelines. But many IT programmes have an **underserved** reputation for sloppiness precisely because traditional notions of how to discipline adolescents are still widespread among personnel in criminal justice agencies.

Those programmes or groups which are sloppy do a disservice to the rest, and offer precious little that is of value to delinquent youngsters or their neighbourhoods.

The tendency towards 'tokenism' in social services, towards merely being **seen** to be doing something, militates against a raising of standards.⁽¹⁶⁾ Staff incompetence can always be explained away in terms of, e.g. the stress of the job, the perfectionist attitudes of others. In IT this is made easier by the absence of much public concern about the welfare of young offenders compared, for example, to battered children, whose fortunes in SSDs have generated more debate about professional accountability than any other client group. It is unlikely, though not impossible, that a senior manager who allowed seven children to be battered over a three month period, despite having been apprised of the factors which might prevent it, would withstand recrimination as effectively as one who allowed seven youngsters to be given

detention centre sentences. The public has no regrets. If voices are raised in protest, excuses or scapegoats can always be found.

Not every activity which takes place under the rubric of IT is a good thing and the massive trend towards 'prevention' with pre-delinquent youngsters, at the expense of reducing the use of custody, needs to be resisted.⁽¹⁷⁾ The problem of promoting sound anti-custodial practice remains nonetheless and this study shows how organisational as well as ideological and professional factors impinge on a programme's effectiveness. IT can 'fail' less because of ideological opposition, (although that exists, and will seize upon any faults it can find) and more because the organisational context in which it is set easily renders it dispensable. Keeping youngsters out of custody does not reduce local authority expenditure, management careers do not depend on it being done successfully and expectations of good practice are correspondingly low. Magisterial criticism and public indifference further diminish local authority investment in IT's success which, in many areas, has in fact been quite considerable. This, however, in no way guarantees its future, nationally or locally. Indeed if the demise of the Tunbridge Wells IT programme illustrates anything, it illustrates that success is one of the less likely factors to determine the direction of social policy with young offenders.

Without the efforts of Colin Tucker, Ellie Stuart-Black, Steve Lewis, Carol Brownless and Tim Higginbotham, among others, the Tunbridge Wells IT Programme would not have lasted even as long as it did. My thanks to them.

REFERENCES & NOTES

1. Adams, et al. 'A Measure of Diversion?' NYB 1981.
2. Ellickson, et al. 'Implementing New Ideas in Criminal Justice'. Nat. Institute of Justice/Rand 1983.
3. Ibid. p.4.
4. 'Kent Police. The Annual Report of the Chief Constable 1980', p.27; and 'Annual Report of the Chief Constable of Kent 1981', p.31.
5. J. Stewart *Evaluation of the Tunbridge Wells IT Programme, May 1978 - June 1981*. Unpublished, Kent Social Services 1981.
6. Ibid. p.8.
7. Ibid. p.8.
8. C. Jones 'State Social Work and the Working Class'. Macmillan 1983 p.136.
9. P. Southern 'IT Profile'. Unpublished, Kent Social Services 1978.
10. The Chief Constables' Reports for Kent 1982-84 record attendance centre sentences in the Tunbridge Wells juvenile court of 18, 12 and 6 respectively.
11. Adams et al op.cit.
12. Quoted in Adams et al. op.cit., p.148.
13. M. Calvert, 'Young Adult Offenders' in *Justice of the Peace* 23.5.1981 p.306.
14. R. Moss: *Intermediate Treatment in Kent*. Unpublished Kent Social Services, 1978.
15. J. Cobb: *IT Mailing II*. NYB July 1982.
16. For a critique of 'Seeborn factories' see B. Jordan 'Invitation to Social Work'. Martin Robertson 1985.
17. See, for example, J. Pratt 'Intermediate Treatment and the normalisation Crisis' in the *Howard Journal* vol. xxii 1983.

ERRATA: Issue 15

Community uprising or riot? Hutchinson/Williamson Interview:

P.2 The meaning of 'white structure' - this should have been set separately in the text with the italics ending at *White people, or white managed structures do not.*

P.26 The title of the King/Petit article should read **Thin Stick and Fat Carrot - the French Juvenile Justice System.**

P.30 In the same article, Table II and notes 15 and 16 should be located after note 14 p.31.

reforming the secondary examinations system

HARRY TORRANCE

Assessment and certification practices in secondary schools are in a state of considerable flux. The article reviews the background to current initiatives in terms of the educational issues at stake and the various interest groups engaged in the debate. It argues that current developments can be analysed in terms of a struggle for control over the curriculum, with teachers ultimately having to make sense of the as yet still fragmented, but increasingly technicist, aspirations of policy.

The secondary school examinations scene is in a state of considerable change, not to say confusion, at the moment. The new Certificate of Pre-Vocational Education (CPVE) for the post-16 age group is getting off the ground this academic year, while the replacement for GCE and CSE - GCSE, the General Certificate of Secondary Education - is due to start in September 1986 with first certificates awarded in 1988 at the end of the two year courses. In parallel with these changes the Government is funding nine pilot development schemes in Records of Achievement (or Profiles) with a view to requiring that all school-leavers should receive Records by the end of the decade. Taken together with other initiatives such as ad hoc LEA - and/or Examinations Board-sponsored developments in graded tests (particularly in Modern Languages but also in subjects like Maths, Science and English) and more overtly curricular initiatives such as the MSC-funded Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI) the prospects for change are clearly very significant. It may be, however, that current developments simply serve to rationalise and control the wide range of critiques of and emerging alternatives to traditional secondary school examinations which have been generated over recent years, rather than give real expression to these critiques through a significantly different approach to schooling.

It is difficult to discern exactly what is the purpose of some current initiatives and at who they are aimed. Some developments - GCSE and CPVE for example - seem clearly demarcated in terms of age range of 'target groups' and indeed in terms of their overall orientation towards higher or further education. But Records of Achievement, graded tests schemes and the modular integrated approach to curriculum planning of many TVEI schemes seem to cut across any easy demarcation by age of academic/vocational categorisation. Certainly the rhetoric of Records of Achievement and TVEI suggests a whole-school, integrated approach to curriculum issues for the full 14-18 age group

which is significantly at variance with the traditional, single subject, 14-16 approach of GCSE. Furthermore, although Ranson⁽¹⁾ interprets developing provision at 17+ in terms of the construction of a "tertiary tripartism", it is one thing for a development to aspire to such an arrangement, quite another for it to be realised in action. Schools and colleges can only provide the range of courses which their resources permit and students can vote with their feet with regard to, for example, re-sitting GCSE rather than taking a chance on an unknown quantity such as CPVE.

The situation then is far from clear. The rhetoric of some current developments often conflicts; and in practice while some schools may well be taking on GCSE, CPVE, TVEI and Records of Achievement all at once, thus having to make some sort of sense of these different initiatives, others - particularly 11-16 secondary schools - might yet be faced only with the move from GCE and CSE to GCSE. However, overall the unifying feature in the current situation is that debates about assessment and curriculum are going hand in hand. It never was the case that examinations could be discussed in isolation from curriculum and pedagogy, yet this did often happen. The impact of changes in examining on schools went undiscussed if not unacknowledged. Now however, not only is the relationship being acknowledged, those involved in examinations reform are intending that it be utilised in practical fashion. Thus current developments are not only concerned, in terms of explicit aspiration, to make assessment fairer and more meaningful, to change assessment and certification practices per se, but also to have a concomitant impact on curriculum and pedagogy. In a very real sense we are now faced with assessment-led curriculum change. But why such varied change and what are the details of its expression? The remainder of the article will sketch in some of the background to current developments and identify some major themes and specific issues embedded in them. The article will take GCSE as a principal focus - since the new system of examining will have the most widespread influence on schools, at least in the short to medium term - but will also make reference to other developments as appropriate.

The Background to Current Developments

The current situation arises out of very lengthy debate and growing dissatisfaction with public examinations, primarily public examinations at 16+: GCE and CSE. Many criticisms of examining have been made over the last fifteen to twenty

years (and indeed beyond) but these have been articulated by different groups with different interests and different definitions of what would count as a solution to 'the problem'. Within the education profession criticism might be conceptualised in terms of logistical and educational issues, with solutions posed ranging from slight reform to produce a single more easily administered system, to complete abandonment of formal examining at 16+. More broadly, and especially in the wake of the 'Great Debate', discussion has revolved around the relevance of secondary school curricula and examinations, and teacher accountability, with solutions posed again varying enormously, though often paralleling those of educationists in one form or another. Indeed, some strange bedfellows have discovered each other under the weight and gloom of the blankets which the debate has piled up. As discussion has continued a more and more visible feature has been the merging of debates about the fairness of examinations - their validity and reliability - with debates about curriculum - whether we ought to be examining what some argue to be a very particular and narrow range of educational achievements, irrespective of whether this can be done fairly. Thus many educational critics have claimed that formal examinations attend only to academic achievement, ignoring the broad range of social and sporting activities in which pupils engage, both within and outside of school.⁽²⁾ As such, examination results are partial and unfair measures of pupil achievement (and school performance) and effect a restricting influence on the curriculum in the latter years of secondary schooling. The import of such criticism would be either to broaden examination syllabuses and methods (to include more coursework, fieldwork and practical work to render schooling more practical and more flexible) or to move over fully to some sort of holistic Record of Achievement or Profile, possibly controlled as much if not more by the pupil than the teacher or examiner. This latter suggestion is often underpinned by highlighting the fact that many pupils sit very few or no examinations in any case.⁽³⁾ Similar but much more specifically curricular points have been made by employers and indeed government. Thus secondary schooling as a whole has come under fire for being irrelevant to the needs of the majority of pupils and, more particularly, employers, and for not developing appropriate skills for and attitudes to industry.⁽⁴⁾ Such concerns have been articulated and manifested in the assessment field by the development of far more prescriptive, skill-based and vocationally-oriented profiles within FE than have generally been suggested within the context of secondary schooling. However, such profiles (developed particularly within the Youth Training Scheme) have gained considerable visibility⁽⁵⁾ and stand as potential models for developing school practice.

Moving on to a second area where educationist and industrialist critiques overlap, examinations have been seen as becoming too complicated to be either cost-effective or really meaningful. Running GCE and CSE side by side has become increasingly costly for local authorities and difficult to manage for schools when so many candidates are considered 'borderline' and require double-entry. In addition the large number of Boards (originally 14 now 12, CSE Boards plus 8 GCE Boards, including the Welsh which also runs CSE in Wales) and correspondingly large numbers of subjects and syllabuses have become increasingly difficult to

compare, resulting in questions about the fairness of results to candidates.⁽⁶⁾ In parallel with this employers have complained about the proliferation of titles and the lack of any real meaning in a bald statement of, for example, a grade C in GCE, or a grade 3 in CSE. Such results say nothing about what a candidate can actually *do*. A *de facto* divide has arisen with GCE being broadly interpreted as signifying 'something' and CSE signifying very little if anything, other than 'failure', especially at the lower grades. Parents and pupils have come to similar conclusions with concomitant effects on motivation, attendance and hence the nature of the educative experience for pupils and teachers alike. The implications which flow from these sorts of concerns are largely expressed either in further support for some sort of Record of Achievement (though this would still beg many questions about the comparability and hence fairness of such a Record) or in support for more specifically graded assessments - perhaps graded tests - which would possibly be linked into a more vocationally-orientated curriculum such as TVEI. The logic underpinning graded test schemes derives from the largely American literature of behavioural objectives, mastery learning and criterion-referenced testing. Ideal practice would involve teacher and pupil knowing the objectives of a course or a particular element of a course, with sequential 'graded' tests being set at regular intervals to reveal whether or not the pupil has been successful and if so, at what: i.e. the content of each course is publically known and the grades awarded describe what pupils can do in relation to the objectives of the course. Such prior prescription of objectives raises many questions concerning the control of the curriculum and teaching methods and I will return to these below. But because the 'goal' of examination success is potentially attainable for pupils in small, regular stages teachers claim that motivation is greatly enhanced.⁽⁷⁾

A further impetus towards reform has come from proponents of the comprehensive ideal and out of debates about what a comprehensive curriculum for the comprehensive school ought to include. The line of argument can be traced from philosophical reflection⁽⁸⁾ through sociological analysis,⁽⁹⁾ to the interventions of Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI) in the late 1970s and early 1980s,⁽¹⁰⁾ though of course not all of the arguments put forward necessarily agreed in detail or were motivated by similar aspirations. Thus writers such as Lawton⁽¹¹⁾ were claiming that there is indeed such an entity as a common cultural heritage to which all pupils have a right of access and which can be expressed through a flexible but common curriculum. The import of such claims would be at the very least that comprehensive schooling required a single system of examining. Similar arguments concerning the 'entitlement' of pupils to common curriculum opportunities have been used by HMI, but they have also come to be enveloped in the fallout from the 'Great Debate', with concerns being expressed over too great a variety in provision, with standards of performance being allowed to vary from region to region and school to school. Again the import of such criticism would be a move towards a common system of examining but a system which would incorporate far more central prescription and direction. In fact Nuttall⁽¹²⁾ has argued that it is precisely because GCSE can deliver more centralised control of the curriculum that it has finally found favour (after twenty years of debate) with the DES. Such an interpretation is particularly

interesting when one thinks of the arguments put forward by opponents of the comprehensive system. From the Black Paper writers⁽¹³⁾ to the National Council for Educational Standards⁽¹⁴⁾ it has been argued that selective schools and by implication a dual examination system protect education standards, and indeed the latter base their claims on a detailed (though some would argue not very sophisticated) comparison of examination results. However it seems that the promise of curricular control has won out over the traditional conservative concern over 'standards'.

Aspects of this apparent paradox also surface in the last area of debate which I want to consider - that of teacher accountability and the role of school-based examining. A major mechanism which has been employed by teachers and increasingly by the examination boards themselves to render the curriculum more flexible and responsive to local resources and pupil and employer needs, has been that of school-based examining. Within CSE a particular syllabus and examination can be wholly designed and assessed by the examinations board (Mode I), designed by the school but still assessed externally by the board (Mode II), or wholly designed and assessed by and within the school (Mode III). Mode III examining expanded considerably in the 1970s and reached a plateau of about 25% of all CSE entries by 1980.⁽¹⁵⁾ Such procedures can also be used in GCE but very rarely are. Exactly why Mode III schemes come to be developed varies considerably from school to school and indeed from teacher to teacher, but a common feature is the management of change (for example RoSLA and the concomitant need to provide courses for all pupils up to 16+) and the utilisation of local resources (local sites for history and geography fieldwork for example, or local industrial processes for science). Such flexibility and responsiveness was in many respects precisely what the 'Great Debate' ordered - schools responding to the needs and resources of local industry and rendering the curriculum far more relevant and practical. But these developments depended on teachers being in control of curriculum decision-making and design and thus ran into trouble with the other major theme of the 'Great Debate' - that of standards, teacher autonomy and teacher accountability. The implications of this contradictory position were that if the curriculum was to become more 'relevant', but at the same time standards were to be maintained, and indeed improved (as must be the rhetoric of all social change) then, again, central prescription must play a larger role than previously in defining the limits of flexibility and what counts as an appropriate standard of achievement.⁽¹⁶⁾

The Emerging Settlement

It is out of the interaction of each of these four broad areas of concern and the sometimes overlapping, sometimes contradictory aspirations of the interest groups involved, that GCSE has emerged. Other reforms - Profiles, or Graded Tests linked to modular and sequential curricular developments, perhaps within TVEI - may yet fully emerge not only to parallel GCSE but to challenge it, and I shall briefly return to this below. But for the moment it is probably worthwhile examining some of the key elements of GCSE in order to more fully understand the nature of the compromises involved and how they are likely to be operationalised in practice.

GCSE will involve the merger of CSE boards with GCE boards into five regional Examining Groups. The GCE boards will still survive as separate entities within the Groups in order to continue their other activities such as running A-level examinations. Furthermore, the GCE boards are charged with the responsibility of overseeing the award of grades A-C (the top three grades) in GCSE, while the CSE boards, in-as-much as their personnel and regional offices will still be identified within the new organisational structure, will oversee grades D-C. All syllabuses and examinations which the Groups produce will have to meet detailed General and subject-specific National Criteria which have been approved by the Secretary of State following recommendations made to him by the Secondary Examinations Council (SEC).⁽¹⁷⁾ These recommendations have been generated by subject working parties, staffed by current examination board personnel and subject panel members, given the overall brief of the need to produce National Criteria in each subject. (It is also interesting to note in this context that the SEC was directly appointed by the Secretary of State after the dissolution of the Schools Council). Working parties are continuing to meet under the auspices of the SEC to produce even more detailed criteria - grade criteria - by which individual grades in the new examination would be linked to specific competences and achievements. All syllabuses and examinations produced are required to 'differentiate' between candidates, with some subject-specific National Criteria (particularly Maths and Science) insisting that this can be done by pupils sitting separate examination papers leading to the award of different grades. The National Criteria also insist on GCSE examinations including at least an element (sometimes a very significant one) of coursework assessment or practical assessment; i.e. teacher involvement in school-based **assessment** is being expanded (though not necessarily in school-based **examining**, for example the **design** and assessment of courses).

Clearly then, the interests and issues in the debate about examinations have found expression in a new system which is largely and unprecedentedly centralised, but which has taken on board certain features of the more critical aspects of the debate in ways which might not have been predicted and indeed were not.⁽¹⁸⁾ Thus some element of practical work and fieldwork will be built into syllabuses with teachers assessing their own pupils on these elements of work throughout the course. However, teachers will be expected to mark work according to the published assessment objectives and the prescribed grade criteria when they become available, so it may be that the potential curricular flexibility of teacher involvement in assessment is not realised, as teachers become little more than conscripted examiners assessing objectives defined by others. A similar point can be made in relation to course content and to the meaning and interpretability of grades. Defining assessment objectives and grade criteria pays heed to criticisms of examination courses being too varied and results being too uninformative. Centrally approved objectives could be interpreted as a move towards uniform national provision and the access of every pupil to a full and comprehensive education. No doubt key actors within HMI and the SEC perceive GCSE in this way. But without adequate funding to allow the most to be made of new opportunities (particularly with respect to fieldwork, laboratory provision for practical work, and so

forth) such claims are a trifle hollow. Furthermore, a shift of power to the centre will restrict the ability of schools to respond to the particular needs and resources of their communities while providing a mechanism for hierarchical accountability and appraisal construed in terms of performance monitoring - 'there are your objectives, there are your goals, now meet them or else'.

Overall then, these more detailed aspects of GCSE, taken together with the board organisation of GCSE into grades which the GCE boards monitor and grades which the CSE boards monitor, and the use of separate papers for different groups of candidates (leading back almost inevitably to all the problems of streaming and double entry which schools currently face), suggest that, of itself, the new examination will change very little within the school and within the classroom, save that teachers will find it more difficult to respond to the individual needs of their pupils and their locality.

In this respect developments such as Records of Achievement and modular assessment in TVEI, which do attend to the issue of local responsiveness, albeit within an overall assumption of broad 'guidelines' or even 'core' objectives, are coming to be perceived as potentially more appropriate to current circumstances. Nuttall, a former CSE board secretary, concluded in a recent conference paper that he saw the common system as divisive, bureaucratic and retrogressive. I should like to think that it is obsolescent, but my fear is that it will not be permitted to become obsolete soon enough.⁽¹⁹⁾

Similarly Macintosh,⁽²⁰⁾ a current CSE board secretary, makes the assumption that GCSE is not really worth any further serious thought and that educationists must look to sorting out issues of flexibility, validation and accreditation in locally-based profiling schemes if they are to have anything worthwhile to contribute to the still malleable parameters of CPVE and TVEI.

TVEI and CPVE remain largely unknown quantities at the moment, and considerable potential for flexible development exists, particularly with regard to the pattern and practice of assessment. Early evidence from TVEI suggests that modularisation will not find itself easily accommodated within GCSE⁽²¹⁾ and the development of a criteria-based Record of Achievement will thus have many attractions for those intent on rendering the curriculum more practically-based and performance oriented. However, as noted previously, most readily available models for such Records derive from the world of FE. Likewise teachers involved in CPVE are likely to look to the practice of FE for guidance, especially if they have already been involved in 'foundation' courses such as City and Guilds 365. Borrowing from these models might then become much more widespread in schools for two reasons. First of all teachers becoming involved in the DES's pilot programme in Records of Achievement are equally likely as those in TVEI or CPVE to look at existing models, particularly if colleagues already have experience of them in 365 or CPVE. Secondly, one of the funded pilot schemes actually involves the City and Guilds developing its work in schools (in Lancashire) for fourth and fifth years. The more schools look to a 'basic skills' model of profiling, of course the more likely it is that

any educational potential inherent in the idea of broadening the ways in which we recognise the achievements of all pupils is likely to be eclipsed, with profiling becoming at best a low status and probably pastoral adjunct to GCSE, at worst, a defining characteristic of a vocationally orientated track pre-16.

The teacher's role

The alternative to the 'basic skills' approach would be for schools to attend to a broader range of learning outcomes and achievements than they do at the moment. At least one of the other pilot schemes is attempting this.⁽²²⁾ It may be that similar attempts might be stimulated by some of the changes which GCSE is likely to bring. One of the ironies of GCSE is that teachers are being required to assess all pupils across a broader range of activities than previously - fieldwork, laboratory work, data analysis, oral work and discussion - but these will still be subsumed into one aggregate grade at the end of the examination process. Reporting different aspects of the teaching and assessment process as separate grades would be one step, however minor, towards broadening our perceptions of assessment generally, and towards generating an understanding that people perform different tasks in different ways in different settings. More immediately, it would provide a basis on which the potentially discreet and divisive practices of GCSE, CPVE and so forth might come together. This last point highlights the ultimately crucial role which schools and teachers will have in the realisation of current policy initiatives. Despite broad realignments of power within the education system teachers will carry responsibility for providing the formal educational experiences which pupils actually encounter. It may be that current concerns over pay and the overall funding of the system will result in teachers frustrating the aspirations of GCSE, CPVE, etc. This may come about self-consciously but it need not - as already mentioned, resources for broadening curriculum and assessment do not seem to be forthcoming and unwilling conscripts are unlikely to prove to be effective 'deliverers' of new 'packages'. Such a situation, however, with schools doing as little as possible, simply incorporating various initiatives into their established and routine patterns of organisation and provision, as and where they can, is likely to mean that the opportunity for change is lost. Indeed even more rigid categorisation of pupils that at present pertains may well come about by default.

However, at one and the same time, teachers are not just being confronted by current policy, they actually give it expression and because of their responsibility to pupils must of necessity render it as intelligible and coherent as possible within the school. The very dynamics of the school situation means that operationalising confusing and even contradictory initiatives will not be easy for teachers - either managerially or psychologically. Ways and means of 'making connections', 'keeping options open' and so forth, are likely to be sought. Because issues in assessment and examinations are so visible at the moment, the creation of a coherent whole-school approach to assessment may well be the vehicle alighted upon by senior management in schools to help make sense of current curricular developments and to focus the professional development which their staff will require. If so, then the criticisms of examinations referred to above, generated by so many different groups with so many diffe-

rent perspectives, will have to be revisited within the school, and in this way the possibility of a more integrated approach to pupils' learning and achievement could be considerably enhanced.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Ranson, S. *Towards a Tertiary Tripartism: new code of social control and the 17+* in Broadfoot P. (ed.) *Selection, Certification and Control*. Falmer Press 1984.
2. See for example: Burgess, T. & Adams, E. (eds) *Outcomes of Education*. Macmillan 1980.
3. See for example: Stansbury, D. *Record of Personal Experience*. Pipe Publications, South Brent, Devon, 1974 and Scottish Council for Research in Education (SCRE), *Pupils in Profile* Hodder and Stoughton, 1977.
4. D.E.S., *Education in Schools: A Consultative Document*. HMSO, 1977.
5. Further Education Unit, *Profile F.E.U.* 1982 and *Profiles in Action F.E.U.* 1984.
6. Goldstein, H., *Models for equating test scores and for studying the comparability of examinations* in *Educational Analysis*, Vol.4 No.3 pp. 107-118. 1982.
7. Buckby, M. *Graded Objectives and Tests for Modern Languages: an Evaluation*. London Schools Council. 1981.
8. Hirst, P and Peters, R. *The Logic of Education*. RKP 1970.
9. Lawton, D. *Class, Culture and the Curriculum*. RKP 1975.
10. D.E.S. *Aspects of Secondary Education* H.M.S.O., 1979 and *The School Curriculum* H.M.S.O., 1981.
11. Lawton, D. op. cit.
12. Nuttall, D. *Doomsday or a New Dawn? The Prospects for a Common System of Examining* in Broadfoot P. (ed.) op. cit.
13. Cox, C. and Dyson, A. (Eds.) *Fight for Education: A Black Paper*, Critical Quarterly Society. 1969.
14. Marks, J. et al *Standards in English Schools*, London. National Council for Education Standards, 1983.
15. Torrance, H. *Mode III Examining: six case studies*, Longmans. 1982.
16. Bowe, R. and Whitty G. *Teachers, Boards and Standards: the attack on school-based assessment in English public examinations at 16+* in Broadfoot P. (ed.) op. cit. Bowe and Whitty provide a much more complete account of this aspect of the debate. Following Raymond Williams they detail what they see as a struggle between the 'old humanists' and the 'industrial trainers' over what counts as appropriate secondary schooling.
17. DES. *General Certificate of Secondary Education. The National Criteria. General Criteria*. HMSO 1985.
18. See for example: Torrance H. *Current Prospects for School-based Examining* in *Educational Review* Vol. 37 No. 1 pp. 39-51 1985. Also: Nuttall (1984) op cit and Whitty (1984) op cit.
19. Nuttall, D. *Evaluating Progress towards the GCSE*, paper presented to the annual meeting of the British Educational Research Association, Sheffield 1985.
20. Macintosh, H. *The GCSE and the Future* in *Forum* Vol. 28 No. 1 pp. 7-9 1985.
21. Adams, R. and Wilmut, J. *The Somerset TVEI Scheme: an approach to modular assessment*, paper presented to the annual meeting of British Educational Research Association, Sheffield 1985.
22. Dorset/SREB Assessment and Profiling Project: Discussion Document No. 1., Dorchester, Dorset LEA 1985.

IS CHANGE REALLY POSSIBLE without a fundamental re-think of the secondary education system?

When you consider the way in which the education system is **actually** preparing people for life in this society, it is not surprising to discover the general reluctance to question authority, to look for other ways, or to "become involved". It is not surprising to discover the unprecedented levels of apathy, indifference, and downright ignorance in the course of day to day campaigning for social justice.

Those of us who have ever campaigned in any way for the preservation of basic human rights and basic social justice are constantly faced with a demoralising uphill struggle.

Why should this be? Are we not a literate society? Are not our fellow citizens equipped with the same critical faculties as we? Can they not see the clear rationality of our arguments?

Apparently not.

Join the campaign to democratise schools. Subscribe now to DPE, Rivermill House, St. Ives, Huntingdon, CAMBS, PE17 4EW. Tel: 0408 63541. £3.00 for four issues.

RURAL YOUTHWORK NETWORK

ARE YOU A RURALLY-BASED YOUTH WORKER?

DO YOU FEEL DETACHED FROM THE HIGH-PROFILE PROBLEMS OF THE INNER CITY?

DO YOU NEED SUPPORT AND HELP IN YOUR WORK WITH ISOLATED YOUNG PEOPLE?

In conjunction with the NYB we are trying to set up a network for rural youth workers throughout the United Kingdom.

If you are interested contact (S.A.E.):

IAN JOHNSON,

7 Cranfield Avenue, Wimborne, Dorset BH21 1TH.

Some thought for discussion and development are:

Regular mailings, exchanges of ideas, working methods etc., perhaps even a major conference to pool resources and support.

TRAINING FOR YOUTH AND COMMUNITY WORK

Are you interested in developing as a youth and community worker? If so why not look at our courses - which lead to full professional qualification.

We have a Two Year Full-time Course based at the College and a Three Year Part-time Course which allows you to train on-the-job.

YMCA NATIONAL COLLEGE

- Working for young people.

For further information write to:

**The Registrar,
YMCA National College,
642a Forest Road,
Walthamstow, E17 3EF.**

juvenile bureaux

TERRY THOMAS

A growing number of Juvenile Bureaux are being established in England and Wales. These aim to divert young people from unnecessary prosecution in the Juvenile Court. Their style of operation and practice approach can vary considerably. This article examines some of the issues raised by this development.

The decision to prosecute alleged offenders in the juvenile court is, at present, one taken by the police and nobody else. As and when the Prosecution of Offences Act is implemented, the decision will pass to Crown Prosecutors. Over the last decade various attempts have been made to assist and improve this decision-making by providing the police with extra information and advice. The police have, in turn, been encouraged to take note of this input and to accept the idea that it is not necessary to take every young person who has offended to court. In some parts of the country forums for discussing each individual juvenile are known variously as juvenile liaison panels, juvenile consultative groups or juvenile bureaux.

The essence of the bureau idea is that the police discuss individual cases with representatives of Social Services Departments, the Probation Service, Education Welfare Departments, Youth Services and any other parties considered to have relevant information. The meetings are regularised and relatively formal, rather than casual or ad hoc. They allow alternatives to court to be considered more fully and philosophies of diversion from the criminal justice system to be applied. As the Government in 1980 put it:

All the available evidence suggests that juvenile offenders who can be diverted from the criminal justice system at an early stage in their offending are less likely to re-offend than those who become involved in judicial proceedings.⁽¹⁾

More recently, the Home Secretary has re-iterated his view that:

The prosecution of a juvenile is not a step to be taken without the fullest consideration of whether the public interest (and the interests of the juvenile concerned) may be better served by a course of action which falls short of prosecution.⁽²⁾

Police Juvenile Liaison has a long history, going back to the fifties and it is usually considered that Liverpool City Police set up the first scheme in 1949. At that time the priority was

on direct police supervision rather than on consultation over prosecution decisions. The Home Office encouraged other forces to follow suit.⁽³⁾

The 1963 Children and Young Persons Act gave statutory effect to the need to prevent children and young persons coming into care and again the Home Office, which at that time had oversight of both police and children's departments, asked Chief police officers:

.....to extend as far as is reasonable practicable the arrangements (now believed to exist in a number of areas) for informal consultation with the children's department of the local authority before a child is brought before a court.⁽⁴⁾

The growing awareness of background factors contributing to crime and of the ill-effects of labelling young people, found expression in the 1969 Children and Young Persons Act. Section 5 of the Act introduced the idea that prosecutions should not proceed unless the appropriate local authority had been consulted and their views taken into account. In effect Section 5 would have put bureaux on to a statutory footing and ensured a dialogue between the police and other professionals concerned with young people. After 16, however, Section 5 of the Act has never been implemented, and presumably, after this length of time, never will be. The 1969 Act was followed by the return of a Conservative Government in 1970 that was much less open to sociological ideas of labelling, but was prepared to listen to lobby groups like Magistrates and police officers who interpreted Section 5 as having their authority undermined.

During the early seventies, in the spirit of the Act and in anticipation of a possible early implementation of Section 5, police forces continued to build up their bureaux and consultative machinery with local agencies. The Home Office gave its clearest advice yet on how bureaux should be constituted, whilst at the same time leaving discretion to local officials, and deliberately avoiding making specifications that were "too detailed or cut-and-dried".⁽⁵⁾ Arrangements were to cover areas such as the circumstances in which a police officer should either take no action or give a caution, on the degree of consultation necessary with local authorities before either such decision was made. It was recognised that some juveniles would require a fairly sophisticated assessment "involving fuller enquiry and consideration", compared to others who could be given a more cursory examina-

tion.⁽⁶⁾

The result was a variety of schemes and efforts pursued with varying degrees of vigour. Problems of lack of staff were cited as reasons for delay, and the frictions set up between social workers and police as they tried to hammer out joint working practices caused difficulties that still exist today. These difficulties were born of differing forms of recruitment, training, occupational cultures, organisational structures and ideologies. The differences could be as basic as police officers being in the main male and without any form of higher education, sitting around a table with social workers who are predominantly female (at basic grade), and far more often likely to be graduates. The intervening gap between these practitioners of the 'welfare' and 'justice' schools of thought remained a wide one, and a difficult one in which to find a common currency of exchange that each could value. Senior officers and academics could agree joint policies, but their execution had to be defracted down through pragmatic approaches to work held by more junior officers which sought to make sense of everyday policing and social work on the ground.

The Bureaux in Devon and Cornwall and in Northamptonshire have been offered as models of what could be achieved.⁽⁷⁾ In West Yorkshire, on the other hand, having originally set up bureaux type schemes, the police, under the guidance of former Chief Constable Ronald Gregory unilaterally withdrew in 1977, and any consultation between individual officers of both services thereafter was strictly ad hoc. All that remained was the formal notification that the police were required to give to local authorities in accordance with the 1969 Act. Sections 2 (3) and 5 (8) of the Act requires anyone bringing a child or young person before a juvenile court to notify the appropriate local authority where-in the child normally resides. This would in effect be the police, or the NSPCC in the case of child neglect, or else it would be the local authority themselves, who are bringing the child or young person before the court.

The discretion afforded to local police forces, probation and social services has resulted in wide variations of practice around the country. With Section 5 unimplemented, the Home Office's guidance was simply to

.....leave it entirely to the police forces and local authorities in each area to work out their own arrangements for consultations, including the scope and nature of consultation as well as the machinery.⁽⁸⁾

Part I of the Criminal Justice Act 1982 which deals with the treatment of young offenders, made no mention of liaison or bureaux. The variations in practice are in part illustrated by police juvenile cautioning figures as an alternative to prosecution, and their inconsistency between force areas, that has led the Home Secretary to again exhort the police to review local arrangements and:

Where this has not already been done, to ensure that liaison arrangements with social services departments, the probation service and where appropriate the Education Welfare Service, are such as to encourage the participation of those agencies in decision making.⁽⁹⁾

The ideal of the Bureaux is that young offenders are not

brought unnecessarily to court, that with effective selection alternatives such as reparation schemes and social work intervention are brought in for appropriate individuals, and a degree of diversion for the juvenile criminal justice system is achieved. Labelling, alienation and anti-authority resentment is hopefully avoided. Police decision-making is improved because it is more informed. Wider issues of crime prevention may also be discussed and a generally improved working relationship is established amongst the practitioners who are daily involved with young offenders.

Apart from the national variability of bureaux schemes, critics have identified a number of other problem areas that could weigh on the rights of children and young persons.

Bureaux have no built in mechanism for allowing client representation of them, either for child or family. Although it has been suggested that solicitors be present on behalf of those discussed,⁽¹⁰⁾ the normal practice makes for bureaux being geared directly to inter-agency and inter-professional work, and nothing wider.

The dangers of personal information held on individuals and families being freely passed between agencies poses clear problems of confidentiality. What constitutes relevant information and whether avoidance of a court hearing is sufficient reason to pass it to other agencies, is a matter of fine balancing. The danger is in police officers picking up information which it is not their business to know and vice versa. The information being handled is not likely to be computerised but if it were it may well bring Bureaux into conflict with one of the principles behind the Data Protection Act 1984, which is that information collected for one purpose should not be used for another.⁽¹¹⁾ Information given in confidence to a social worker may be finding its way on to the local police collator's file where all sorts of odd information is filed. Inter-agency work, presumably including bureaux work is seen by the police as a part of their community relations work or community policing, and at least one Chief Constable has baldly stated that community policing is primarily to provide "this vital community intelligence"⁽¹²⁾ necessary for police work.

Apart from the breach of trust and confidence between public and agency, the police or social services for example, could each receive information that leads them to further investigation which negates any diversion policies, draws more people into the net, and creates a suspicion amongst the public that does see information offered for one reason being used for another. The so called 'potential offender' or child at risk of offending gets labelled before anything has happened, as does the family believed to need 'help' from social services.

The differing ideologies and frames of reference of the professionals involved in Bureaux, also poses questions over just how decisions are negotiated and arrived at. The police, for example, may have less sympathy with diversion as a concept, and feel they are judged more by the number of convictions they can get. This was noted within the police force researched by Parker et al, who were able to hypothesise "that 'letting off' juveniles with minimal official action is unpopular with most urban policemen and

anathema to others".⁽¹³⁾ The sub-Divisional Commander was a working policeman:

He shares main-line policing goals; he is susceptible to the associated pressures and expectations. He runs a police station, not an assessment centre for adolescents. He has no specific lengthy training in youth work or social work nor is he expected to be conversant with theories of delinquency, delinquency control or child care. He is more concerned with catching criminals and sending them to court.⁽¹⁴⁾

Social workers may be expected to have ideologies along a continuum from welfare for juveniles to justice. There is however, also evidence to suggest they are not as averse to a more punitive care and custody line, as they would like to believe⁽¹⁵⁾ and there are still many within the welfare field who are not conversant with Diversion theories. The author can cite anecdotal evidence of an embryonic bureaux where education welfare officers in attendance were under the misapprehension that the idea was to do a trawl to ensure the police did not miss any potential offenders! With that sort of attitude and the possibilities of informal post-bureaux meetings over coffee between members of like minds, the unintended consequences are clearly quite worrying. It is also true that a number of former police officers do take up positions within the welfare professions⁽¹⁶⁾ and that in turn can at times cause difficulties.⁽¹⁷⁾ With all of these sub-currents going on, the negotiations to arrive at an agreed working practice are fraught with pitfalls. Non-police agencies involved know they still have to tread carefully given the overall voluntary nature of bureaux and their precarious existence, and being aware that at the end of the day it is still the police who have the final word in deciding to prosecute.

At one extreme the inter-agency talks may break down altogether, while at another, the Bureaux could establish their own common working culture, that creates its own informal criteria. In either case some outside monitoring and statistical collation is essential to ensure that agreed policies are being kept to. The problems the Bureaux face are common to any inter-disciplinary work, namely, who has overall co-ordination and control, who devises the rules that prescribe action and how is the division of labour agreed?

Organisational, cultural and procedural constraints of a bureau may also lead to efforts at short-cutting or by-passing procedures. Having the option to charge immediately for serious cases may encourage this course of action amongst police officers disinclined to bureaux. Similarly, the increasingly popular 'instant caution' administered within 24 hours may by-pass a bureau.

The future of Bureaux, for the time being appears likely to remain a varied one with differing schemes at various stages of development. Within the political arena it has to be said that the continuing moral panics over lawless youth, mugging old ladies, starting riots, and killing policemen do not lend themselves easily to talk of diversion from the courts. The author, in putting forward the idea of a bureau, was recently howled down in a public meeting convened under the auspices of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act, s.106, whereby the police consult with the public. The hostility was

not from the police but from working class people who saw themselves as victims of juvenile crime and wanted them all in juvenile court regardless of age or seriousness of offence. Perhaps it is only belated statutory implementation that will achieve a standardised service. Meanwhile, the movement toward Family Courts and the role of the new Crown Prosecutors when they arrive, and their relationship with Bureaux, remains to be resolved.

REFERENCES & NOTES

1. Home Office "Young Offenders" Cmnd. 8045, London HMSO (1980).
2. Home Office Circular 14/1985 "The Cautioning of Offenders".
3. Home Office Circular 102/1954 "Police Juvenile Liaison Officers".
4. Home Office Circular 22/1964 "Children and Young Persons Act 1963, Parts I and III".
5. Home Office "Part I of the Children and Young Persons Act 1969". A guide for courts and practitioners, HMSO (1970) paras. 92-97.
6. Ibid. Para 94 in particular.
7. "Division - Corporate Action with Juveniles", Northants. County Council and University of Lancaster (1984).
"Exeter Joint Services Youth Support Scheme". Devon and Cornwall Constabulary (1984).
8. Home Office (1970) op. cit. para. 92.
9. Home Office Circular 14/1985, op. cit.
10. A. Morris, "Legal Representation and Justice", in A. Morris and H. Giller (eds.) "Providing Criminal Justice for Children. Arnold (1983).
11. In practice rather than principle both police and social workers could probably exempt themselves under the Act by saying it was essential to the pursuance of their work.
12. J. Anderson, "The Reality of Community Policing", Police Review (26.3.82), p.584.
13. H. Parker, M. Casburn, D. Turnbull, "Receiving Juvenile Justice", Blackwells (1981) p.39.
14. Ibid, p.35.
15. D. Thorpe, D. Smith, C.J. Green, and J.H. Paley, "Out of Care: the Community Support of Young Offenders", Allen & Unwin (1980).
16. See for example, "Police Liaison with Education Service", D.E.S. (1983) para. 16.
17. T. Thomas, "May the Force still be with you", Social Work Today, Vol.12, No.48 (18.8.81).

ISAGA

International Simulation And Gaming Association

17th Annual International Conference
Theme : Simulation & Communication
University of Toulon, French Riviera

Conference : 1 - 4 July 1986

Theme to be interpreted as broadly as possible, e.g. :
social interaction, intergroup relations, language learning,
intercultural communication, negotiation, decision & policy making,
management communication, media, information technology...

Session types include :

keynote presentations, buzz groups, participation workshops...

Workshop : 28 - 30 June 1986

participation in special version of NSIST
(a world-wide, multi-institution, international relations,
computer-assisted simulation)

Summer school : from 7 July

courses in French as a foreign language
(reductions for conference-goers)

For more information, please contact :

Crookall / ISAGA 86, Université de Toulon, Ave de l'Université.
83130 LA GARDE, France. Home tel.: 94.75.48.38



Working Space is a new section of the journal aimed at those who may not normally consider contributing an article, particularly field workers and young people.

The contribution does not have to conform to the style of the rest of the journal and can be written in a form the writer feels most comfortable with.

Items should be sent to Malcolm Jackson, 14A Heaton Hall Road, Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne NE6 5NQ.

Our first contributor to working space is a young man not yet 21 who is currently serving a 3 year prison sentence for robbery. His contribution concerns his feelings whilst he was awaiting trial and it is his attempt to reflect on his lifestyle to date.

The Life I Have Lived

My life is a life I will never understand. Even if I could explain it, you would never understand it. I am not a very intelligent person, and this is the first time I have ever attempted to write about myself. I'm afraid I won't be able to explain in full detail.

Well, to start off with, I need to tell you that I come from a very poor and strict family. I can only think back to when I was four years of age and can vaguely remember my mother and father having a fight with each other and it ending in my old man leaving her, and straight after my mother walking away from us. I remember this, as when I was trying to catch up with her, she stepped onto a bus, even though I tried my hardest to catch the bus I knew there was little hope, and after the bus started to fade into the distance I remember seeing my mother look out of the back window at me. I can't remember much more, but then I was picked up into a woman's arms and taken to her house, I think this woman knew my mother, and was put to bed, I'll always remember that as I was so frightened and shocked that I cried myself to sleep and that is as much as I remember about that day. But somehow I knew that from that day onwards my life was to change drastically. I was taken sometime later, I'm not sure when, to my new mother and father (who were to be my first foster parents) where I stayed for about 2 years. Then I was taken to my new foster home, where I was to meet the rest of my family, two sisters and three brothers. I remember liking my new parents, because the old man used to let me play on his motor bike and it was great fun.

Eventually, when I was seven years old, the whole family were reunited with my mother, who by now had a house of her own. I'll always remember this day because when I asked her where my dad was she just started to cry, and tried to get the whole six of us in her arms. From there, I started my first school, junior school, and can honestly say that I hated it, I hated it so much that I used to run off from school nearly every day with a friend. Really it was worth it when I thought about it, because my old man was not there to give me the stick when I came home at night. I used to always come out with some "cock and bull" story every time I ran off from school, and my mother was so soft-hearted that she just sent me to bed without any tea. This went on for about 3 years until I was 10 years old, and even then I can remember not even being able to spell my name. Sometime during my school days I got rather friendly with this lad who was about the same age as me and who used to run away from school with me (he is now serving a 9 year sentence for arson). One day we were playing in some old houses, just down the road from where we lived, and the next thing I knew was this house, that we were playing in, went up in flames and my mate came running down the stairs, laughing his head off and started running for the back door, I did not have time to ask him what was going on, so I just followed him and we ran all the way back to our houses. When I turned back to look down the road all I could see was the sky full of smoke.

Anyway being only 10 years old, not even old enough to understand the facts of life, I was sent away to where I was to stay until I was 18 years old. I didn't really know what was going on and all I can remember is coming from a room (which I now know was a court) and seeing my mother crying again, another woman then took my hand and led me away. From that day on I did not see my mother again for the next 1½ years. When I was 11½ years old I was allowed to go home for 3 days and in those 3 days I realised how much I missed and loved my mother, when the time came for me to leave I did not want to. The love and affection I felt for my mother was unbounded and to leave her again brought me so much pain inside. Eventually they managed to take me back, with tears streaming down my face, as I saw my mother close the door in front of me. As I was led away to the Social Workers car and even when I was going back to the home, the feeling of freedom and to be back with my mother was burning inside me. I was only back about 4 days when I decided I would run away, eventually I did run away and being free again to roam the streets where I'd lived for so long and especially seeing my mother was a great feeling for me. But, it wasn't long before I was picked up by the police and taken back, where they locked me up and put me on supervision. From the first time I ran away the feeling of being free was always on my mind. Anyway time went on, and to cut a long story short, I managed to run away another two times before they eventually decided that I should be put somewhere where I would not be able to run away from, but by now I knew that they would not be able to hold me no matter where they put me. The thought of being hundreds of miles

away didn't really bother me, in fact I never really gave it much thought at all. The only thing I did think about was wanting to be back into my own neighbourhood and to be back with my mother and mates. I did realise that I would have to find some sort of transport and in a way that is when I really became a criminal.

I started running away on a regular basis and started to pinch bikes and eventually moved on to pinching motorcars.

By now my mother did not like what I was doing and was getting very worried. Sometime, when I was about the age of 13 years, my old man came back to live with my mother, that really done me in, him doing a shoot for about 9 years and then thought he could come back as if nothing had ever happened. I think the rest of the family were quite happy to see him, but I suppose it was because they weren't in the same position as I was, anyway finding him back meant I would have to find somewhere else to stay (I never ever got on with my old man). Even though I tried to persuade my mother to tell him to leave, as he is no good, he has broke my mother's heart again and left her. I knew I was the one in the family that he hated most. By now I was associating with the big lads, the ones that caused all the trouble, and pinched out of shops. When I was picked up I was charged with stealing a bike and motorcar, they held my date back for court until I was 14 years old, so that I could be sentenced to three months DC. When I got it, it was the most frightening thing that had ever happened to me. Anyway I got through my time and the thing that got me through was the thought that one day they would set me free, and I would be free for good, to go back home and live with my family and my mother. But I was to find out that I was wrong.

On the day of my release I was taken to a van and took straight to another home, it really broke my heart, and the feeling of being free to live a normal life vanished from my mind. When I got to the home I ran away again, this time it was different from the rest as I managed to stay on the run for about 5 months. In this time I realised just how much my old man hated me as he told me that if I was to stay in the same house as him I had to pay board money. It did not shock me, all I felt was a sickening feeling inside me. When my mother heard about it she hit the roof as she knew I was only 14 years old and that I could not work, but my father was the man of the house by now and I knew he meant what he said. Somehow I managed to get work by getting a horse and cart from a scrap yard and at the age of 14 years I had responsibilities and somehow I was a man in a child's body. Anyway I paid my board even though it was against my mothers will. Well the days grew cold and by now the snow was beginning to live on the ground and I got fed-up with going out on the horse and cart, because I was cold and the work I had to do was taking everything out of my body and I knew that I couldn't last very long the way I was going. I went into crime as if it was nothing and somehow I got satisfaction out of doing it. I don't know why, but I did. Eventually I was caught again and this time I was sent away to Borstal. I served about 10 months of my Borstal sentence then I was released but by this time my parents had given up all hope on me and they knew there was nothing they could do about it. Being released from Borstal meant that I was free, but being the way I was and the way I had grown up, I quickly returned to Borstal again. On release it was the same all over again even though I vowed never to get into trouble again. By this time I had met a girl I fell madly in love with (and is now my wife). We tried to make a go of things and it seemed as though it would work as I had never had anyone who had loved and cared for me. But after 9 months I was back "inside" again, but this time I was to receive a 3 year sentence for a Burglary I had committed. I can not explain to you how I felt or how my girl took it, but it was the most heart breaking time of all my life as I really loved the girl I am now married to. I did my time and my girlfriend stood by me. I was again released, where upon I married and settle down with my new wife, who I loved so much. We were together for about 12 months and then I was up at court again for handling, which I got found guilty of, and received a 6 month sentence. In that time I grew to miss my wife more than I had ever before and it really done my head in. I had 6 weeks left of my time to do and couldn't take in any longer. I absconded to be with my girl and I was out for 2 months. I committed a further offence and I was charged and brought back inside to finish the rest of my sentence (it being 6 months). I was also on remand for the further charge and was expecting in the region of 4 years. My wife is prepare to stand by me and I can't tell you what that means to me. But I also know what I'm putting her through.

I don't know what the future holds for me as I'm writing this story in a pad in prison. For all I know this might never have an end, but I intend to try because I don't want to lose the most precious thing I've got, which is my wife. But if I keep on going this way I'm going to lose her as well.

I have told you my life story. I have left some out for reasons I only wish to know, but as you can see the life I have lived is no life at all as I have feelings the same as everyone else. I believe that being taken away from my family for an offence I never really committed, is what destroyed my life.

Well to finish this story off, I want to tell you that I have been to court for the further offence, and I received a further 3 years on top of my 6 months, so now I am serving 3½ years. I am still nineteen years of age so I will be serving my sentence in a YCC prison, there is nothing to look forward to in this early stage of my sentence, as the time of my release seems to be a life time away, even though I have got a date. I can only hope and look forward to my parole date now, as it is the only slice of happiness I feel within myself apart from the fact I know my wife is going to stand by me but I don't know whether I should feel happy or sad about that as I know my wife is going through as much pain as I am and it hurts me to know this, so I try to avoid the thought as much as I can. I know now that one day I will be free but until that day comes I am going to try and make something out of the time I will serve. I may catch up on some education which I lost a lot of in the early years of my life, but the fact still remains with me that I have come to terms with my life and the way I have used it.

reviews

Malcolm W. Klein (Ed)

WESTERN SYSTEMS OF JUVENILE JUSTICE

Sage Publications 1984

ISBN 0-8039-2125-X

£25.00

pp. 240

We can welcome this book since it tries to present what has not been done before, namely a comparison of Western juvenile justice systems. The editor has brought these contributions together in an effort to advance the "Conceptualisation of systems". This had required the individual contributors to stick to a format which includes a complex system diagram and a detailed description of the structure and function of the system.

This unfortunately makes for fairly tedious reading because what is interesting about systems is not the similarities but the differences between them. What is even more interesting are the reasons for these differences. I presume, for example, that most people in this field of endeavour have wondered why the massive incarcerations of youth witnessed in England and Wales in the 1970s and 1980s were paralleled by an even more dramatic de-institutionalisation of young offenders in Holland during the same period. The answer is not to be found here because the book is essentially about what exists rather than what its existence means. This is evidenced by a glance at the author index. Where are Aaron Cicourel, David Matza, and Anthony Platt, we may ask? Surely they are important post-war theorists on juvenile crime and justice. They are not here because this book is concerned with description, not interpretation; it is empiricism at its starkest. This makes it the sort of book which people who hated studying sociology give as their reason.

A further problem with the book is the apparent lack of clarity about what "Western" means. The editor has called for contributions from the U.S.A., Canada, England and Wales, Israel, Holland, the Federal Republic of Germany, Denmark and Sweden. What! (the astute reader will ask) whatever happened to Iceland, Norway, Finland, Scotland, Ireland, Spain, Belgium, Luxembourg and Austria? Perhaps more importantly though, what happened to Portugal, Italy and France?

Portugal in the 1970's in the wake of its socialist revolution attempted to introduce a form of popular justice. To have discovered what has happened in the interim would have been very interesting. In Italian cities like Bologna, with communist administrations, changes have been attempted in order to promote the interests of working class young offenders - did they work? France apparently introduced and implemented legislation similar to our 1969 Children and Young Persons Act at around the same time. We could have

learned from this what happens when a full-blooded welfare-oriented juvenile justice policy is given a chance to operate. These are serious oversights.

The book avoids the interesting questions and the more interesting innovations and will not as a result grab the attention of the general reader or indeed the non-specialist. If however, one is very interested in juvenile justice then it is possible to stumble upon all sorts of suggestive details.

We learn for example that 36% of all serious felonies (CI offences) were committed in the U.S.A. in 1980 by males under 18. When these arrests are broken down by race the proportion of white murderers is 55.4% as against 44.1% black. For forcible rape the figures are 43.2% and 55.3% respectively. Now these figures are dynamite - what do they mean? What is the proportion of black citizens in the population, in the socio-economic groups from which murderers and rapists emerge; in the neighbourhoods in which these offences are highest? One presumes this staggering disproportion in the arrest rate of blacks has "knock-on" effects throughout the system. This is after all the U.S.A., a nation notorious for the racism and racial conflict within its penal institutions. One presumes all this because one is not told, one is merely offered a table of arrest rates. Interestingly, in the U.S.A. any policing agency with more than 75 employees is required by the Federal government to establish its own juvenile investigation unit which will take major responsibility for dealing with juvenile offenders. There have been instances recently in which juvenile judges have taken control of, and closed some institutions, on the constitutional grounds that they are inflicting cruel and unusual punishments. How interesting it is to reflect upon what might happen to Glenochil and Aldington detention centres if similar powers existed here. Overall the U.S. contributors are pessimistic. The swing to the right in the U.S. has led to reduced funding for diversion programmes. Probation is under enormous stress and most correctional personnel it seems are reduced to a caretaking or community function.

In Alberta, which is as far Right as you can get in Canada, we see responses to young offenders softening. But why? It would have been useful to know if this was a result of the rigorous application of the due process model, or whether the Right was in fact paternalistic, as if utilitarian, merely concerned to save a dollar or two. These observations would have been useful in order that we might gain a better understanding of the broader contours of the development of systems of social control. Alas, they are not there. The explanation of the fit between ideology, political pragmatism, policy and practice in these pages is at best vague and at worst staggeringly naive.

England and Wales presents a more depressing picture, with David Farrington observing that in the wake of the 1969 C and Y.P. Act magistrates avoided sentences for which social workers would have to take responsibility. This accounts, he argues, for the parallel growth of discharges and fines and Borstal and detention centres while welfare disposals, like the supervision order, withered on the branch. This is not an orthodox view, the usual story has a passive bench responding to a punitive social work profession, but it is a useful and plausible one. What a shame then that we were not given a flavour of the current debate. Farrington is perplexed. He writes.

"I find the lack of well-controlled research

and the English juvenile justice systems almost unbelievable. It is tempting to think that the government, the Home Office, and the DHSS do not want an adequate evaluation of their juvenile justice activities". pp. 90

· Tempting, it's unavoidable, particularly under the present Home Secretary who seems to regard evidence against his policy intentions as a challenge rather than a warning. Current juvenile justice policies in the U.K. lurch between short-term pragmatism and ideologically inspired public spectacle. If as Farrington suggests, we do need more research it may well be within the malevolent psyches of the present cabinet that we will reap our richest rewards and not as suggested in evaluation of institutional regimes or policy initiatives. This is not a wholly facetious response because all the contributors seem to be straining towards the creation of the optimal juvenile justice system in almost total innocence or ignorance of any relationship between crime, the state, and social control.

Since the 1960s the number of children under judicial control in Holland has dropped from 42,000 to 22,000 and the number of institutional placements has dropped from 26,000 to 14,000. This was achieved, claims Josine Junger-Tes, because the right people held the right ideas. Judges, prosecutors, probation officers and prison governors all believe, it seems, in labelling theory. All, it seems, believe that delinquency is just a phase which adolescents pass through. All, it seems, are disillusioned by the results of official intervention. All, it seems, are influenced by the demand on the part of young people for a voice, and participation in the school and other systems which affect them. You can't help noticing how many people seem to agree with each other in Holland. This is of course the land where people spend five years studying to be a juvenile judge and where they have to study psychology and sociology to qualify but nonetheless there does, according to this chapter, seem to be an uncanny level of unanimity throughout the system, of which the author is both senior researcher and senior policy adviser.

The tantalising questions remain. We can give all sorts of reasons for the persistence and worsening of punitive systems of juvenile justice but how do we understand such liberalisation. A book like this should have helped us more with a problem like that. Ironically the West German contribution suggests to us that the very factors which apparently led to liberalisation in Holland have evoked an authoritarian backlash in West Germany. Why? Perhaps some cultures find the assimilation of dissent and innovation by the young easier than others. Perhaps some countries like and value their children more than others. If this is true then we, the British, must be a nation of child-haters if our juvenile justice system is anything to go by.

The German contribution also points up the technical difficulties of the book. The three pages of system diagrams have more arrows than the Bayeux tapestry. In the desperation induced by this alleged visual aid I turned to the text for elucidation and there I read the following:

"Section 105 of the JCA advises the judge to follow sentencing rules of the JCA if (a) the adolescent has performed a criminal act that, under certain conditions is assessed as a typical *Jugendverfehlung* (juvenile trick, frolic thoughtlessness, foolishness, or the like), and/or (b) the adolescent shows in terms of intellectual and emotional maturity, a typical

Jugondlickeit (youthful personality). The legal idea is that these two conditions should constitute an exception to the rule. However in everyday practice, nearly half of all adolescents brought before the juvenile court in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) "are treated in this way. (A few states within the FRG approach the 95% level)" p.152.

Michael Caine once remarked, "Not a lot of people know that".

John Pitts

Sue Ward (Ed)
DHSS IN CRISIS
Social Security Under Pressure and Under Review
Child Poverty Action Group No 66
March 1985
ISBN 0 903963 83 3
£2.30

This collection of articles edited by Sue Ward and published by the Child Poverty Group appears at a time of widespread re-appraisal of the income maintenance services, stimulated by the Fowler reviews of pensions, housing benefits, benefits for children and young people, and supplementary benefits. As well as providing a valuable analysis of topical issues, the book considers fundamental long-term principles concerning the role and function of social security in Britain.

Throughout the ten discrete aspects of the DHSS analysed by the contributors, recurring themes can be identified which give coherence and unity to the book. These include: a stress on the contradictions arising from pressures to cut public expenditure on social security at a time of rising demand for benefit: the social factors contributing to the claimants recourse to means-tested benefits: the impact of increasing work load on administrative staff: and a clear commitment to the value of universal benefits and the rights of claimants. This last is well exemplified in Adam Sharples' statement.

"We need to establish that public spending plans for social security should be built on the right of all who are dependent on benefit to share in the rising wealth of the economy".

The introductory chapter by Sue Ward focuses on the political background to the current reviews of social security. The C.P.A.G. fears that social security will be increasingly directed towards the relief of poverty, to the neglect of income transfers between groups, and of collective insurance against risk. Adam Sharples examines the economic background to social security and argues convincingly that there are no economic or demographic reasons for cuts in the social security budget. Judy McKnight's challenge to current government definitions and approach to "efficiency" in management of the DHSS staff in 1982. The immensity of the backlog of work is graphically portrayed.

"The local manager estimated that 536 telephone queries had not been dealt with, 1,500 pieces of post were outstanding, and there were 300 claims for health benefits and 350 cases of over payments which had to be chased up. Two hundred and fifty claimants were coming in each day, a third of them asking about delays in payment of their benefits".

Nick Raynsford examines the introduction of housing benefit in the context of housing subsidies

and benefits in the 70's, the false hopes and assumptions concerning the new scheme and the rapid pace of implementation. Rick Middleton demonstrates the marginal position of boarders and single homeless people without families in the analysis of regulation of 1983 and draft proposals for 1984, benefit rates, special DHSS offices for homeless people and resettlement units.

The contradiction between rhetoric advocating the encouragement of young people's growth to independent adulthood while social security policies reinforce continuing dependence on the family is pointed out in Janet Allhesan's chapter on young people. The cuts and effects of the cuts on benefits, Y.T.S. training allowances and earnings of young people are discussed and she examines why they tend to be vulnerable to reductions in benefits.

Jonathon Bradshaw's article is concerned with the low level of take-up of means tested benefits, and Roger Smith examines the current concern of the DHSS to limit fraud and abuse, to the possible neglect of other aims. In the conclusion Fran Bennett expresses concern about the lack of publication of the oral and written evidence to the review teams and outlines the central proposals on benefits of the Child Poverty Action Group.

This journal has as its sub-title **The Journal of Critical Analysis** and this approach to social policy is adopted in **DHSS In Crisis - Social Security Under Pressure and Under Review**. The book is compact and chapters are concise, with useful references and footnotes. It provides readily accessible, up-to-date and clear discussion of the maze of entitlements to social security benefits and the impact of recent policies. It will be of interest both to those working directly with young people and those who are concerned with the planning, in-service education or administration of the Youth Service.

Two serious and surprising omissions must be noted. None of the case studies analyses the impact of recent changes in social security policies on women, or on members of the ethnic minorities, despite increasing awareness and recognition of the impact of gender and race on life chances within British society.

Diana Gower

Carol Lupton
MOVING OUT: Older teenagers leaving residential care.
Social Services Research and Intelligence Unit,
Portsmouth Polytechnic, 1985
ISBN 0 948168 01 3
£5.95
pp. 205

Whether a young person leaving care is adequately prepared for independent living, offered assistance with accommodation, rehabilitation grant and after care support or simply dismissed to either sink or swim seems to depend on the vagaries of individual Social Services Departments. The consumers of the service tell us that there are glaring inconsistencies in the extent to which different departments take their responsibilities.

Carol Lupton's report, on older teenagers leaving residential care, offers a comprehensive framework to those local authorities and social workers who are concerned with planning for the

longer term well-being of the young people in their care. Social Work and consumer (National Association of Young People in Care) conferences and working parties have pointed to both the deficiencies in the services and to the lack of information and interest in many Social Services departments on the fate of young people leaving care. "Moving out" is a commendable testimony to the interest of Hampshire Social Services Department to enquire into their own services and the outcome for their young people leaving care, with a view to detailing aspects of policy that might improve the provisions for those young people. Apart from its application in Hampshire and its use as a model for other interested parties the report has the merit (all too rare in research reports) of being easy to digest. The style and presentation (statistic tables and all) make for an interesting and informative read.

The need for a coordinated approach is a theme which runs throughout the report. It suggests that the effort of those social workers in the residential setting who may be producing imaginative pre-leaving programmes will have minimal impact unless management develops a policy to coordinate all the stages of the transition to independence.

There is useful information for anyone who may be involved at any of the stages whether offering emotional, practical or material help.

Those concerned with the formidable problem of accommodation are reminded of the particular difficulties of being young, single, and homeless and of the low priority that some housing departments give to this growing problem. Many young people leaving care will join the ranks of this group of homeless people unless social work departments follow the lead set by a number of departments to foster good working relationships with housing officers in order to secure appropriate and secure tenancies. The report effectively summarises the information that is being assembled by concerned groups about the circumstances of young, single, homeless people - an issue that will be allowed to lie dormant if it is administratively convenient. The range of the sources and references which Lupton explores in this theme and many others is a laudable feature of this little publication.

There have been occasions in the past when attention focussed on significant gaps in social work provision has generated an industry which then acquires and spends its resources with improper haste and with a degree of success which reflects insufficient enquiry and planning. At a time of growing interest in the welfare of young people leaving care and when money is scarce, 'Moving Out' ought to provide a practicable reference for developing a relevant accommodation policy. There is a caution to those who may be considering a single expensive commitment to half way houses, hotels and staged accommodation. Lupton warns planners to beware of the assumption that young people leaving residential care, "are a sufficiently homogeneous group to warrant one particular form of accommodation". The study demonstrates the advantages of research to discover the expressed need of the client group and also the resources that may be available in the locality. It may be wise to develop ways of exploiting existing private and public housing and deciding on appropriate supplementary projects. This awareness of local resources plus cooperation between Social Services and housing departments is likely to be the corner stone of an effective response to the varied needs of young people leav-

ing care. There will be existing joint committees in many local authorities where Social Services staff meet with housing personnel - the study encourages the use of such meetings to develop co-operative planning. 'Moving Out' ought to be a useful source book for anyone wishing to inform discussions in such joint meetings.

Whilst the author is always careful to acknowledge the limitations of the report there is much to sharpen the awareness of most people who have an interest in young people in care. The chapter which explores the size of the problem through a review of the statistics of those who left the care of Hampshire in 1981/82, not only provides a sound working base from which to develop services but it also points out some interesting characteristics of the 'in care' population of the 1980's. There has been significant growth over time, in the number of teenagers now being taken into care. Lupton's study demonstrates that half of the young people leaving care at the time of her enquiries had first entered care after their fourteenth birthday. The increase in the number of teenagers leaving residential care is likely to add to the size of the vulnerable group as there is more likelihood of young people over the age of sixteen choosing to move into lodgings or semi independent living schemes.

The report stresses the need to avoid generalising about the situation and expectations of all young people leaving care. It contains some interesting comparisons between the experiences of young men and young women. Of the young people Carol Lupton traced, teenage girls over the age of sixteen were more likely to go into lodgings than were boys. When this is considered in the context of a private rental sector which prefers not to offer accommodation to young women because they are regarded as a "potential nuisance", then it is evidence for selective planning. Simple assumptions about the vulnerability of all young people may lead to inappropriate and simplistic gestures rather than informed and effective policies.

There has been a tendency in some of the earlier literature on this topic to place the major burden of responsibility with the staff in residential units. 'Moving Out' determinedly avoids the assumption that preparation for independent living is the exclusive responsibility of residential workers. Whilst it acknowledges the essential role they play, it also points out the constraints within which they often operate: the habitual problems in the residential setting of having too many responsibilities with too few workers and of attempting skilled sensitive work often with untrained and inexperienced staff. The young people in this sample admit that residential staff have often "done as much as possible to help". However, in too many cases, what is on offer, is severely limited by administrative 'straight jackets' such as clothing vouchers and bulk food buying, which can make it impossible for staff to introduce young people to the skills of managing money.

Where resources are available the report will be useful in indicating the components of an innovative residential programme. It also makes clear the need for skilled and sensitive counselling and this is illustrated by Lupton's comments on the apparent lack of information given to young people about health care. It seems that essential information relating to teenage sexuality is not offered or alternatively it is communicated insensitively. One can sense the shuffling adult embarrassment that limits advice to ensuring that "you do teeth and bath every night".

Of course there is much more to the attainment of independence than the communication of essential information and the acquisition of survival skills. This report leaves the reader in no doubt that effective strategies require a planned and adequately resourced policy and that the responsibilities of local authorities cannot be met with hasty gestures in the last six months of a young person's period in its care. The lesson is that "attainment of independence is a gradual incremental process that can, and perhaps should, take years". So, beware of instant social work remedies. In this study the clients have been given the opportunity to speak and the message seems to be "they treated me like a child until sixteen and told me to get out to a hostel".

Tony Marron

Chris Murray
'THE SOCIAL CONDITIONS OF YOUTH IN BRITAIN'
Occasional Paper 15, 1983
Centre for Youth Studies, Department of Adult and Higher Education, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M1 9PL.
£4.00
pp. 129

This paper represents a United Kingdom contribution to a comparative project organised by the European Centre for Social Welfare Training and Research (Vienna) as a contribution to International Youth Year 1985. The participants in the project decided that for each participating country there should be produced "...an overview of statistical material describing the condition of youth in their own countries with the textual comments being restricted to a minimum".

Chapters 2 to 7 of this working paper exactly correspond to this description and consist of digests of relevant U.K. official statistics dealing with each of the following topics - Population; Families and Households; Schooling; Labour Force; Social and Cultural Activities; Deviance. Chapter 1 is an addition to the brief which provides an overview of "Youth: Theory and Research in International Perspective".

I would say that chapters 2 to 7 represent a competent, if not particularly imaginative fulfillment of the brief outlined above. There is a good deal of material here which will be useful to teachers and students in the field, particularly those who for one reason or another do not have easy access to a library taking out a reasonably complete subscription to British Government Publications. Even for those who have such access, Murray has saved them a certain amount of work. However, the published statistics do not tell us all that much as they are both originally presented and represented by Murray. This is not a criticism of the author of the working paper. He had to work with what was available. However, one can find out a good deal more by re- (or secondary) analysis of the data from which the published tables are compiled. Some interesting work in this direction is being done by Kathleen Kierman and colleagues at the Centre for Population Studies, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, and this is worth flagging here.

I found chapter 1 - the survey of work - less useful. Murray identified five "areas" of work on "Youth" - work on youth movements; work on historical processes; work on the social and psychological marginalisation of the young; work

on relationships between (sic) the generations; work on physical development and character processes". This classification followed on the presentation of an avowedly heuristic scheme for the classification of focus, which itself followed an essentially interactionist account of the field of work under review. I think that there were two reasons for my problems with this chapter. One is a simple matter of presentation. Murray mixed in a survey of work with an attempt at theorisation in a way which I sometimes found difficult to disentangle. However, there is an international review in here and it is, when disentangled, useful.

I cannot say the same for the 'theorisation'. I was disappointed by this chapter. Murray started off by saying: "It is ... necessary to state that in regarding youth as an age category rather than a psychological state we are inevitably drawn into a consideration of global demographics and social trends which affect all age groups. Clearly to treat youth as somehow isolated from these trends is to engage in reification of an absurd kind" (p.2). Good stuff and this was followed by a very sensible discussion of how in using the notion of 'cohort flow' we were to be aware of how age cohorts - aggregates - pass through a changing social structure. I thought I was in for an account of how a 'lost generation' of people were encountering the impact of deindustrialisation and its social consequences in U.K. society in the 1980s and I didn't get it. Instead Murray moved off into an essentially individualistic account at the level of the social psychological rather than the structural.

To my mind this sits rather poorly with the sort of account which emerges from a critical consideration of the data presented in chapters 2 to 7 of this working paper and yet in the brief conclusion, Murray, (admittedly in an effort at illustrative example rather than in specifying the research programme), delineates areas for research which are essentially concerned with individualistic adaptation rather than structural change and its general implications. I don't want to be harsh here. This comment is less a criticism of what after all is a working paper than an indication of how my thoughts developed on reading through this piece.

Let me conclude the body of this review by spelling this out. This working paper raised, again, for me the urgency of a sustained investigation and consideration of how the largest every U.K. generation, age-cohort, whatever, is moving into a social structure radically different from that entered by the cohort to which I belong and which my cohort retains access to. The phrase 'lost generation' has a lot of implications. We need to explore them both conceptually and empirically. We can begin to piece together a picture on the basis of the quantitative material collated here but we can only begin. We need more material but at least this can help us to think through what is going on.

I think this working paper is worth buying. It is useful, as I have already suggested, as a source of material in a reference sense. It is also useful as a provocation to thought, although I wish the author had been more daring here because I had to more or less work out my own provocation. However, it is a working paper - that is what such things are for.

David Byrne

Dave Rimmer
LIKE PUNK NEVER HAPPENED
Culture Club and the New Pop:
Faber and Faber 1985
ISBN 0 571 13739 3
£4.95

There is a popular mythology about the pop of the 1950's and beyond that. Pop stars are, somehow, born and not made. There is an assumption that natural and not cultural phenomena are at work in forming this particular role. Like all myths there is an interesting contribution that has been made by the 'musicians' themselves in underplaying their self-conscious, even self-seeking and scheming acquisition of this role.

This book looks at the formation of Culture Club and other New Pop bands. One of the more useful aspects of this account is an attempt to make explicit the processes whereby it was done, how it was that these pop phenomena could come about. Rimmer's book is another insiders account of pop phenomena. It is somewhat interesting in that Rimmer's perspective on the Boy George etc. phenomenon is largely based on his employment in the music press. This is particularly in relation to the New Pop and his job with Smash Hits, the number one selling pop magazine.

However, one of the weaknesses of the book is that he does not speculate enough, for my analytical curiosity, on the mutual interdependence of pop star, pop stars management team and entourage and the 'journalists' of the music press. What he does say is conventional enough. Their relationship is mutually parasitical; but he does not go on to culturally conceptualize the commonsense assumptions associated with these relations, i.e. how have they been brought about as a cultural form? What may surprise some readers is the comparative ease with which the likes of Boy George could make himself and others a pop star. Again Rimmer's account does not do justice to the interests of record companies, retailers and the media in securing a regular supply of the pop commodity with the best interests of profit maximisation and social reproduction in mind.

Rimmer does move towards an explanation of the New Pop in terms of post modernist cultural production and consumption, but he does not really draw out the theory as he might. Where he does reflect the post modernist debate is with the question of performance. A good deal of this account of pop is about performance, and particularly pop performance in relation to some pretty firmly fixed criteria in 'the pop industry' itself about what is necessary.

What it is at issue here is what these post modernist pop phenomena might represent culturally. Essentially the new Pop is pastiche and parody all at the level of performance and effect. There is no reaction to alienation here because the reasons why alienation might be relevant to the cultural production and creative processes are forgotten. There is no history, hence no alienation; the struggle does not exist, all that matters is the nature of the performance and comparison is based on any 'truth' is quite irrelevant. Of course it is commonplace to see post modernist culture as dissolved into commodity production processes. The mass produced work of art, as a commodity fix and little else, has been a fact of life at the heart of most recent discussions about whether any Pop can be radical or meaningful in terms of social change for the better, and improvement in the lives of most people. What often seems depressing

for people like Rimmer looking at the New Pop is that the hopeful days of Punk have been lost and wasted. Punk seemed to represent an attack on the commonsense about social relations and inequality. Even taking into account the obvious fact that Punk was not a homogeneous phenomena it has been argued that an alternative manifesto was on offer and that cultural forms like popular music should largely be about an exposition of the inequalities and injustices of life. Ironically Punk often seemed to be about conflict when it could be argued that inherent in it was an attempt to construct an ideal system of communication that could in fact facilitate consensus. One of the more interesting features of Rimmer's account is the underlining of the 'sad' fact for the newly privileged Pop stars that their days are always numbered. They help to form and replicate a system where the whims of the record etc. buying 'youth' create stars out of them. But the cruel reality is that this same process replaces them equally quickly.

What Rimmer seeks to point out is that Pop is always returning full circle, that what is taking place now can not be seen in any necessary way to be 'progressive'. The essence of '**Like Punk never Happened**' is to suggest that commercial forces linked with the devalued cultural forms of late capitalism will, for the time being, continue to reassert themselves and that each new generation has perhaps to 'relearn'. This is a pessimistic view of the media but not one without a certain amount of truth. The combined cultural weight of the media with its institutionalized commercialist values is indeed a major force for any avant garde to tackle, and at the moment we are not all that clear what the relationship between culturally focussed avant garde and the wider political struggle should be.

John Astley

Marion Leigh and Andy Smart
INTERPRETATION AND CHANGE: the
emerging crisis of purpose in social education. A
history of the enfranchisement Development
Project.
National Youth Bureau, 17-23 Albion Street,
Leicester LE1 6GD
1985
ISBN 0 86155 094 3
£4.25
pp. 144

We are told by the publishers, the National Youth Bureau, that this book offers "a history of one of the most controversial, exciting and innovative developments to influence youth work practice". Translated from it's original NYB Speak this reads: "an account of a project which made some interesting attempts to change some workers thinking".

Beginning with a brief history of developments in UK youth work over the last forty years, the writers proceed to provide an account of the origins of the Project and its life prior to their joining it. This is done in a novel fashion by splitting up and commenting upon, a version of the verbal explanation of the project that was used as a prelude to training sessions. The comments are made on the basis of their subsequent experience.

From this we then reach the core of the book, some 70 pages or three chapters described as a "loosely chronological description of the com-

mentary on the workings of the...Project" (p.6). The structuring of the chapters reflects the three phases of the project's work - sticking with the original project brief; attempting to extend the terms of reference; and trying to refashion the coherence which was a feature of the first period. We are given an account of the worker's growing frustration with the original conception of enfranchisement, the inherent problem of under-valuing the experiences of young people, the desire to restructure the approach around a more thorough going conception of power and the necessity of an analyses that fully addresses class, ethnicity and gender.

Some of the most interesting material concerns the growing radicalisation of youth workers through the period of the project. Whilst there appeared to be this tendency, workers seemed able to accept the premises for, yet were unable to follow the logic of, the argument for oppositional practice.

Chapter Six provides a rambling account of some of the work and discusses some of the tendencies and factors which influenced the operation of the groups of workers set up by or run in cooperation with, the project.

The final chapter is a review of some further implications of a line of argument developed in earlier chapters. It suggests that the Youth Service is faced with three broad options - becoming a social re-education service, developing a truly oppositional youth work and staying essentially the same (The Social Education Reportoire and stoic optimism). The implications are examined both for individual workers and for training. The chapter is brief and I think that a number of possible scenarios were overlooked including 'born again character building' and the sort of rampant leisurism that has surfaced in recent years. However it does have the merit of having been written from an explicitly left perspective and it does address the growing obsolescence of much youth work in the context of the particular forms of crisis experienced by British capitalism.

Throughout the book there is refreshing amount of critical reflection on thinking and practice and this does allow the reader to see how their arguments developed. They make a spirited attack on some of the dross which has passed for theory and practice in youth work training and the general anti-intellectual atmosphere of youth work. Here the unthinking adoption of 'structured experiences', human awareness training and the like is specifically attacked.

One of the key reference points for the text is Butter's **Realities of Training** and they make a critique of this which could have been usefully expanded. Indeed the fact that Butter's is the only published work of the last decade that is substantially referenced and the writer's use of Butter's notion of a 'social education reportoire' is a testament to the barrenness of youth work theory. However whilst 'social education' appears from time to time in the text, there is little sustained effort to address "the emerging crisis of purpose" in it.

At this point I must come clean about some deep seated prejudices that have affected the way I approached the book. First I am not at all happy with the chronological report form of write-up for projects. The approach lends itself to a lot of story telling and a neglect (sometimes) of theory making. In the end I don't think that it worked here. The element of the central argument could have

been drawn together into a substantial occasional paper. As it is I think that some of the power is lost, submerged by reportage that could have been consigned to a mimeographed report.

Second there is my prejudice about the National Youth Bureau which seems to have the ability to do extra-ordinarily strange things to both ideas and people. Thinking which is basically 'back of an envelope' standard somehow becomes presented as 'a major innovation which will change the face of youth work' and thereby receives substantial amounts of funding. People who are bright, creative and literate fall prey to NYBthink and NYBSpeak. Acres of paper and hours of time are spent in the promotion of highly generalised ideas about policy and practice that bear all the signs of a lack of dialogue with the field.

Thankfully the writers, on the whole, do not appear to have been worn down by the 'dull compulsion' of NYB employment. Indeed their account sheds a great deal of light on the sort of thinking and behaviour that runs through the Bureau. Ominously the book took three years to go through the NYB publication machine - it's radicalism out of step with the bland requirements of the Bureau's senior management following the criticisms of the agency by the Cockerill Report (1983). A sign of the times is that the book comes complete with a disclaimer in bold type - the views expressed are not necessarily those of NYB. Taken together with the attempted censorship faced by Kerry Yeung when she recently updated *Working with Girls* (NYB, 1985), a rather disturbing picture emerges. One which places profound question marks against the Bureau.

Third there is my prejudice concerning the notion of enfranchisement. From the first time that the "trident" of formal, informal and non-formal processes of enfranchisement were described to me (prior to the writers joining the Project) I was deeply unhappy about the assumptions made and the direction indicated. By placing emphasis on 'becoming adult' there was a great danger of undervaluing 'being young' (whatever that means). There could be a tendency to encouraging acceptance of what is, rather than what should be, and the notion did not appear to connect with the economic and social realities of people's lives. The writers became increasingly concerned about 'enfranchisement' and the divisions between Chapters 3 to 5 display the way in which they grappled with the notion. This was where a chronological account pays off. However to get a full view of the argument it was necessary to skip from chapter to chapter.

In summary the book has some interesting things to say about the current state of youth work and the way in which ideas and practices of limited worth become greeted as universal truths, at least until the next thing comes along. It also contains a wealth of material that will be seized upon when someone comes to write 'The rise and fall of the National Youth Bureau'. From what the writers have to say that day is very close.

Mark Smith

Suzanne S. Ageton
SEXUAL ASSAULT AMONG ADOLESCENTS
Lexington Books: 1983; D.C. Heath and Company
ISBN 0 699 06322 3
£21.00

This book about sexual assault of young women

by young men is essentially a book about research, methods, procedures and data analysis.

The research which the book describes was carried out in America for a two year period from July 1978 - January 1980, and grew out of a larger study of delinquent behaviour researched for five years. The value of this piece of research is essentially that the sample is not limited to reported crime statistics for rape and sexual assault; cases reported to the police represent only a small proportion of sexual assault cases, invariably omitting assault occurring within the context of a date/relationship. The research tries to analyse a sufficiently representative sample of youth for a long enough period of time to be able to describe and assess victim reactions to sexual assault, both initially and over a period of one to three years after the assault. Such information is essential to understanding and developing both prevention strategies and treatment/support for victims.

One of the limitations of the book for me though, as a worker working with young women, is that it makes no attempt to look at either prevention strategies or possible methods of treatment/support for young women who are victims of sexual assault.

An additional objective of the research was to test certain ideas about young women's vulnerability to sexual assault; - to see whether certain attitudes to sex role stereotyping, or involvement in delinquent behaviour put some young women more at risk than others; and to examine the appropriateness of a 'delinquency' model for explaining the adolescent male role in sexual assault.

It would perhaps be useful to mention here that 'sexual assault' was defined for the purposes of the research to include, all forced sexual behaviour involving contact with the genitals. Attempted sexual assaults were also counted. Force was seen as mild as verbal pressure or as severe as a physical beating or injury from a weapon.

Most of the book is concerned with statistics and methodology, and I am not a statistician, but the research draws out some interesting conclusions. For example, the extent of sexual assault on young women. In each of the three years studies approx. 100% of young women were assaulted. It shows that our image of sexual assault victims is wrong. Young women of all racial, social, class groups appear to be equally at risk, though as one would expect young women living in the cities are more at risk than those living in the country, and violent sexual assault is most common amongst black and working class teenagers, the most disadvantaged. It also reveals that the majority of sexual assaults occur within the context of a date/relationship. Less than 20% of cases involved unknown offenders. For the majority of victims the assault occurred in one of three places, her home, his home, or a vehicle. The majority of these assaults are not reported to the police, usually because the victims did not perceive them as legitimate. The risk of repeated assault increases once the individual has become a victim, (over a 1/3 of young women reporting one incident reported another within the same year). The research does, as perhaps one would expect, reveal that there is a link between 'delinquency' and the offender, and that young women involved in 'delinquent' behaviour or who are part of a delinquent network may be putting themselves slightly more at risk of being sexually assaulted, than those who are better integrated into society. However, attitudes to sex-role socialisation did not seem to have any effect on vulnerability.

As I have already indicated, for me, the most important conclusions concern the effect of sexual assault on young women. The research indicates that approximately 2/3 of victims tell their friends, but far fewer tell their parents. Both friends and parents when told were generally supportive. Personal relationships with husbands/boy friends, where these were not the offender, were not generally seriously affected at least in the short term. However, where boy friends were the offender the relationship generally ended. Most important however are the indications that although many negative reactions appear to have disappeared within six months, (especially in cases where the assault was not completed), many had re-emerged, often more intensely, some two to three years later. Findings indicate that some reactions had intensified, these included feelings of worthlessness, fear of men, and of being alone, embarrassment, lack of interest in sex, and general depression.

To sum up, the book is obviously important reading for anyone researching into sexual assault, it is a mine of information for the serious researcher/academic, and clearly points to the importance of each research being carried out over a long period of time with the same sample to ascertain long term reactions to sexual assault. However it makes hard reading for the average youth worker/practitioner, who is more concerned with how to support/counsel young women who have been sexually assaulted.

The book is very inaccessible to the non-academic, the language seems very impersonal, e.g., it refers to young women as 'adolescent females' or 'the victims', never as young women. The author also uses a lot of abbreviations and statistical terminology (although there is a glossary).

The book is a valuable information base, but for practical strategies we must look further. The practitioner in the field needs pointers to action that can be taken, like methods for supporting young women who have been raped or sexually assaulted. The links between pornography and sexual assault need examining, as do the effects of unemployment and inner city decay in aggravating aggressive male ideology.

Caroline Thomas

Lorraine Tranchard & Hugh Warren
TALKING ABOUT YOUTH WORK
London Gay Teenage Group, 1985
ISBN 0 9509455 36
£1.50
pp.32

The authors state quite bluntly that "the youth service is not meeting the needs of young lesbians and gay men". Their pamphlet is designed to help all those involved in the youth service to do something about it.

Their aim is to offer an insight into what it is like for young lesbians and gays growing up in a social environment that, at best only offers grotesque caricatures of homosexuals, which say much about the people that propagate them and nothing about the people for whom they are intended, and at worse offers nothing.

The pervasiveness of discrimination is neatly summarised with eight annotated illustrations itemis-

ing the more common 'excuses' designed to mask bigotry, ignorance and fear: "everyone in my club is treated the same, this lesbian and gay nonsense is all middle class stuff: my club is working class; it's illegal; she can't be lesbian she's too attractive/ he's the best footballer in our club, he can't be gay; people would think I was a poof if I started talking about lesbians and gays; there aren't any young lesbians or gay men in my club; there are lots of black people in my club, they wouldn't want to know about white people's homosexual problems; lots of young people are just going through a phase, it doesn't last".

Trenchard and Warren go on to show how the youth service is failing to meet the needs of young lesbians and gays, interspersing their text with the experiences of some young lesbians and gays in their own words. This is followed with concrete proposals, the thrust of which is to invite youth workers to examine their own attitudes and practices. As they say, "homosexuality is not a problem, other people's reaction to it is", and until workers in the field recognise this and begin to change their approach they will be perpetuating the failure of the youth service.

One cannot expect thirty pages to obliterate generations of prejudice, myth and oppression but they offer an excellent foundation for starting to change towards a more open and positive approach to sexuality. This is the fourth and final publication of the London Gay Teenage Gay Group's GLC funded research project and deserves the widest possible readership. Certainly all training agencies and youth service sections should ensure that it is included in their programmes.

If youth workers are claiming to cater for all young people then there is an urgent need for in-service crisis intervention on the whole area of sexuality. Failure to act leaves the field wide open to the tabloid tirades adeptly manipulating discredited pathological medical models to bolster social prejudice in addition to their dreary daily diet of blatant sexist objectification of women. Trenchard and Warren maintain: "until anti-sexist and anti-heterosexist work is developed in youth clubs they will remain unsafe and inaccessible to young lesbians and gay men". Quite true, but they will also remain unsafe and inaccessible to young women in general.

If of course youth workers are not claiming to cater for all young people they should have the courage to say so, publicly, instead of sneakily banning young lesbians and gays and generally creating a hostile environment within their clubs. But first, they should complete the ten-question quiz at the beginning of the book, score themselves, read on, seriously considering the issues raised and then attempt the quiz again. After the second attempt, hopefully they will not still be scoring within the bracket which prompts the authors to say: 'you're in the wrong job - have you thought of joining the SPG?'

As a sample, here is question 3: During discussion with young people about sex, do you:-

- Assume that all the young people are heterosexual, and never mention homosexual sex
- Assume that all the young people are heterosexual, but talk about lesbian and gay sex if someone brings it up
- Assume that all the young people are heterosexual, but mention homosexual sex as something O.K. as an option for other people

- Discuss lesbian and gay sex as an O.K. option for some members of the group
- Avoid discussing sex at all costs?

Buy the book and see if you are ripe for the SPG, chartered accountancy, promotion to senior youth work management, youth work or just too good to be true!

Peter Kent-Baguely

Sue Ward
"ORGANISING THINGS - a guide to successful political action"
Pluto Handbooks
Pluto Press
ISBN 086104 7990
£4.95
pp. 272

This book may be very helpful to conventional community activists. At the same time, its approach raises fundamental questions about the nature of the Left's engagement with people if it is to gain popular involvement and support, particularly from young and black people. It's an easy to read and clearly laid out guide. Sue Ward quickly tells us what it isn't. It's not intended to lay down what campaigns you run and how to run them, committees or community groups. Instead it is a workshop manual "on the mechanism of running one-off events, from small meetings to major demonstrations". Here we can find out how to organise public meetings, chair and steward them; how to plan marches, demonstrations and lobbies and arrange mass events, petitions, conferences, festivals, fetes and bazaars. Sue Ward explains how to design and distribute leaflets and posters and how to get funds, help and information.

The book is subtitled "a guide to successful political action". But does this traditional model really offer us that for the future? We doubt it. Sue Ward speaks at the beginning of the "large amounts of time" she has spent over the last few years "in meetings deciding how to organise one thing and another", confessing, as most of us might, that a few have been successful and many have not. We see a number of problems in the inherent approach of this handbook. While it refers to organising things, what it is also about is organising **people**, and all the unresolved ambiguities and contradictions this has long raised for the Left remain.

The reality is generally small groups of people initiating and planning things for others. The way we do things, as well as our own implicit philosophies of political action play a large part in shaping this. A few people are prepared to put in the enormous amount of time at meetings that Sue has to get things done this way, but many more don't or can't. And if we look at who tends to be less evident and have less say in this kind of political action, just as much as in conventional national and local party politics, it is poor, black, young and disabled people, and women. If the 1985 disturbances in Handsworth, Tottenham, Brixton and elsewhere show anything, it is the exclusion of inner city inhabitants, particularly black people, from any effective say in their neighbourhoods or future and the unwillingness of their young people to tolerate it. Before the 1981 riots, we argued (Youth In Society, December 1980 and January 1981) that the key problem young people expressed was their powerlessness. They were ignored in policy, excluded from the political process and at

the mercy of aggressive policing.

According to our ideological position we will all place our different emphases and interpretations on 1985's disturbances; whether we were there and involved; whether we're black or white. We may have seen the bankruptcy of community policing as a palliative for racist and repressive government policies and when set alongside prevailing police methods. Yet still we hear Labour trotting out the importance of jobs for young people as their unthought-out panacea, as though thousands more places on supermarket checkouts will solve anything for black and white young men and women. What are needed are not more hackneyed prescriptions, but new ways of involving and empowering people.

Much of Sue Ward's grassroots political action has been in Wandsworth. She was a member of the Labour Wandsworth Council which was praised for its radical left socialism, but which had little local involvement or support, and opened the doors to two terms of an appallingly destructive and divisive right wing Conservative Council, making Wandsworth "Mrs Thatcher's favourite borough". Last year Community Action magazine (Aug/Sept 1984) wrote of Wandsworth tenants standing by "with scarcely a murmur as hundreds of jobs have been lost in the name of efficiency and privatisation". It is a remark of towering arrogance and insensitivity. If the author(s) hadn't heard a murmur, it's because there are limited political ways to make yourself heard in Wandsworth any more. Wandsworth Council almost entirely ignores the public meetings, demonstrations, lobbies, community groups and so forth which are the substance of Sue Ward's book. If you complain there is asbestos on your council estate, it becomes an opportunity to privatise it and dump you somewhere else.

Nonetheless local people do have their own involvements and do have a lot to say, both condemning this Council and government and offering their own ideas of what's actually needed. Listen to the mothers at school sharing their support for ILEA. Hear what old people on the buses have to say about cuts in public transport. Listen to what black and Irish people feel about the abolition of the GLC. We can express our feelings to each other about these issues. We can develop our own discussions. The problem is getting access on our own terms to the formal political arena, be it community, workplace or party politics.

What are needed are not the traditional ways or organising the same old things. We need to explore new ways of working together that build on people's personal initiatives and relationships, and perhaps challenge them, but which transcend the often alienating, anti-social relationships and forms of traditional political and community involvement. This must be the crucial task on the Left's agenda if it is to build from the grassroots the broadbased and non-excluding support that alone offers the prospect of a popular socialist government.

Suzy Croft & Peter Beresford

Sue Adler and Annie Cornbleet (compilers)
ANTI-SEXIST RESOURCES GUIDE (1984)
ILEA Learning Resources Branch, Television and
Publishing Centre,
Thackeray Road SW8 3TB. 01-622-9966

Everyone Should Have One...

The guide was developed primarily for teachers, funded by ILEA and, it is suggested, the guide is especially useful to those working with the secondary age range. I would suggest that everybody should have one. For years, those devoted to struggling against sexism have developed their own bibliographies and references, used friends and spent hours in libraries... if only this comprehensive guide had been produced earlier. At a cost of only £3.00 (£2.00 ILEA) for anybody interested in challenging sexism and for those teachers, careers officers, youth workers, social workers, students, parents, health workers, and all those working with young and old people, males and females, it is a must.

The organisation of the guide is both clear, efficient and useful. It is even provided with punched holes for insertion into a ring binder, which is recommended, and its own sticky label. Space has been created after each insertion to enable notes, amendments and updating, especially beneficial in such a fluid and dynamic area. Wheelchair access and women only organisations are clearly specified. The five main parts includes womens organisations, general organisations, bookshops and bookclubs, publishers and distributors of research, books and films, the organisation of ILEA and map of teachers' centres. The second section details particular resources: films and video, posters and exhibitions, journals and useful guide to books. An index makes the tracing of obscure names and organisations an easy task. The guide places particular emphasis on the London area (the funding by ILEA does not make this surprising), although others are mentioned where relevant. This is the strength and also the weakness of the guide. For those situated within easy reach of London the resources appear overwhelming. For those in the provinces a glaring gap in provision is indicated. A similar guide for each Education Authority would be the ideal, not only in developing and highlighting existing resources, but in providing a supportive network for individuals and groups interested in combating sexism. If the definition of resources is stretched to include survival skills in a heterosexist, white, male dominated world, the inclusion of regional numbers of Rape Crisis and Women's Aid would have been beneficial (see Brownmiller 1975 and Stanko 1985 for convincing arguments). The inclusion of Incest Survivors' Campaign is however useful in the light of increasing awareness of this issue.

Each inclusion in the guide is provided with a brief description of the functions and activities of the group. In the first section on Women's Organisations 'Wiser Links' is described as an international information exchange project involved in establishing links with third world women and organisations working with women at the grassroots level. The coverage of organisations is extensive. National networks are included such as the NAYC Girls Work Unit and the WEAC. Women's Archive projects are included as are the Feminist Library and Information Centre and

Resources and Information for Girls Service. A few regional Women's Centres are listed alongside the London based ones. Music Workshops and Theatre Groups are included. Lesbian support groups and phonelines are detailed. Cartoonists, photographers, printers, silk-screen printers, computer advisers, video producers, radio producers and publishing support groups are listed. These represent a few of the ninety two entries within this section. Not only do these offer information but they exist as a tonic and token of the extent of the involvement and activities of the women's movement. The positive action pursued by most of these groups should act as encouragement to others. It should also indicate the pervasivity and strength of the organisation of women against structural barriers within education, media, youth work, health etc.

The second section provided information on national organisations not specifically organised by women eg NCCL, EOC and a selection of London based campaigning organisations and services. These include various teachers groups and centres concerned with issues from sex education to combating racism and fascism. Health organisations are included as are film and photography distributors. This section includes organisations which would usually be difficult to trace, for instance the 'Alternative Talking Newspaper Collective' for the blind and partially sighted and 'Triange Translations', a co-operative specialising in translating and interpreting European, Asian and African languages. Lesbian and Gay groups are particularly well represented within this section which again illustrates the strength of their organisation. The section on Bookshops and Bookclubs surveys the anti-sexist and anti-racist provision. The descriptions are particularly useful outlining provision of conference stalls, cafes, publishing facilities and mail order services. Some positively encourage writers to become involved, such as 'Blackwoman Talk'. Others are particularly useful for specific groups such as 'Tressel' which is owned, controlled and produces material specifically for teachers, and IDAF which produces material specifically on South Africa.

The section on ILEA includes all the teachers' centres and describes their functions and provision. Many provide resources, videos and films for hire. Lambeth and the History of and Social Studies Centre provide newsletters which are both supportive and informative. There is a separate section (p45) on Youth Service Projects including resources and support for both young women and youth workers.

The second part of the guide dealing with actual resources is useful, but rather scant. In the section on films and videos there is a lack of 'big screen' films. They can obviously be obtained from BFI or Cinema of Women (which are listed) but short reviews would have been useful, especially to those involved with youth projects. Channel Four's 'Pictures of Women' series deserves a mention, with the accompanying book by Jane Root, it is most stimulating and innovative. The same, cannot be said for the coverage of posters and exhibitions. Many teachers frequently indicate reluctance and lack of enthusiasm to exhibition. Display projects, however, can have far reaching effects, even on those for whom they were not initially intended. The range available and the low cost, in most cases, should be a positive encour-

agement to most institutions. The National Book League offers an exhibition of two hundred and seventy five books celebrating women's writing, which at thirteen pounds per week represent particularly good value and an excellent method for presenting alternative information. 'Sister Seven' offers a 'Brides Against the Bomb' exhibition - sounds interesting!

The Journal section offers a broad scope ranging from those concerned with practical reforms and action within schools, eg GEN, CASSOE and Ituz, a comic with contributions from schools, through to Achilles Heel and Men's Anti-Sexist Newsletter. The excellent Trouble and Strife which debates current international and national affairs is offered alongside the more theoretical journals such as Feminist Review and History Workshop Journal. Again a mere smattering of what is offered, but all have their place for those working with young people and in their own interpersonal relationships. The Book section is well organised, split into under fives; five to seven year olds; seven to ten; eleven to thirteen, fourteen to seventeen and a section for teachers entitled 'Gender and Education'. The earlier sections have particular relevance for parents and primary teachers. The later section provides useful references for all interested in issues concerning women. The absence of Ann Oakley's 'Subject Women' was disappointing as it has a specific informational value to teaching. The recently published 'Gender and Generation' by Angela McRobbie and Mica Nava should be added to the list. The inclusion of reference to particular articles in journals would have been useful as many of us spend hours searching through the same periodicals, also relevant debates to youth work have recently been conducted with Feminist Review which have wider implications for those involved with young people. The Womens Studies International Quarterley, available on inter-library loan or from the publishers is particularly useful in highlighting debates on recent issues, such as women and health, media, education etc. Inclusion of books and articles is both subjective and arbitrary. Suggestions for additional inclusions can be forwarded to the Equal Opportunities Librarian for ILEA, otherwise they can be added in the available space.

Moreover, it would have been beneficial to include reviews of experiments in non-sexist practice, such as the DASI projects at Clissold Park School and Woodberry Down School and the Skills for Living classes at Hackley Downs Boys School which offer positive encouragement to those who feel they spend the majority of their time banging their head against a brick wall. They also represent frameworks for action for solitary youth workers and teachers. These are minor points in relation to the potential usefulness of the guide in general.

To reiterate, the guide is of enormous value to ALL those interested in issues relating to women and young people. It is an absolute necessity to those working with young people. It also acts as an incentive and motivator to those already involved in anti-sexist initiatives. The positive contributions being made to challenging and combatting sexist practice should act as an example of the potentialities available to us all.

Beverley Skeggs

analysis

'Analysis' comprises several different categories of information relevant to the study and further understanding of youth in society. The format of the section may change from time to time according to priorities of content and available space, however the 'Monitor' feature will be regularly included. It is important to note the chronological sequence of some material. The editor welcomes enquiries for specific information, and general comments on the feature, though it may not always be possible to answer all requests for further material comprehensively.

law

The Law Column in the Autumn 1985 issue of "Youth and Policy" was devoted almost entirely to a critical examination of the proposed new criminal offence of "Disorderly Conduct". Under the heading "The Criminalisation of Disorderly Conduct", we considered the Government's proposal as set out in their White Paper, "Review of Public Order Law",⁽¹⁾ to make criminals of the following:

"Hooligans on housing estates causing disturbances in the common parts of blocks of flats, blockading entrances, throwing things down the stairs, banging on doors, peering in at windows and knocking over dust bins;
Groups of youths persistently shouting abuse and obscenities or pestering people waiting to catch public transport or to enter a hall or cinema;
Someone turning out the lights in a crowded dance hall, in a way likely to cause panic;
Those responsible for rowdy behaviour in the streets late at night which alarms local residents".⁽²⁾

In view of the fact that from the White Paper there has now emerged the Public Order Bill,⁽³⁾ and in view of the significance of the new offence for young people, we have felt it appropriate to devote this issue's column to an up-to-date on the progress of the proposed offence onto the statute books. Readers should note however that at the time of writing, the Bill is in Committee stage and that the final version of the proposed offence will almost certainly be an amended version of that set out in the Bill. This column will keep readers informed of the developments in the months ahead.

The White Paper Offence

The main elements of the new offence as set out in the White Paper, were as follows:

- "(a) Threatening, abusive, insulting or disorderly words or behaviour in or within view of a public place;
- (b) Which causes substantial alarm, harassment or distress".⁽⁴⁾

Readers are referred to "Youth and Policy" 14⁽⁵⁾ for the grounds on which we criticise this suggested offence. The criticism was based on two main grounds:

Firstly, we believe that existing Law gives the Police sufficient power to deal with many of the situations which the new offence purports to cover. Secondly, even if no such power exists, we believe that it is not in the long term interest of Society to criminalise what is essentially anti-social behaviour. One does not need to be a soothsayer to predict that the prosecution of young people for this offence will inevitably lead to ever greater alienation, particularly in the inner cities, between the young and the black from the Police.

The Bill Offence

It would seem that Douglas Hurd, the Home Secretary, either does not read "Youth and Policy", or does not take heed of the journal's law column. For, despite our criticisms of the White Paper offence, when the Public Order Bill was published last December, Section 5 contained an offence of striking similarity to that set out in the White Paper. However, there were important and significant differences, which should be high-lighted. Section 5 of the Bill states as follows:

- "(1) A person is guilty of an offence if:-
 - (a) he uses words which are threatening, abusive or insulting or behavior which is threatening, abusive, insulting or disorderly, and
 - (b) he has reasonable cause to believe that the use of the words or behaviour is likely to harass, alarm or distress another person.
- (2) Offences under this section may be committed in private as well as public places; but a person using words or behaviour inside a dwelling does not commit such an offence unless he has reasonable cause to believe that the use is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress outside that and any other dwelling.
- (3) [definition of "dwelling"]
- (4) It is defence for the accused to prove that his conduct was reasonable.
- (5) A constable may arrest a person without warrant if:-
 - (a) he engages in offensive conduct which the constable warns him to stop, and
 - (b) he engages in further offensive conduct immediately or shortly after the warning.
- (6) In sub-section 5 "offensive conduct" means conduct the constable reasonably suspects to constitute an offence under this section and the conduct mentioned in paragraph (a) and the further conduct need not be of the same nature.
- (7) A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding level 3 on the standard scale".

Differences between the White Paper Offence and the Bill Offence

1. The Degree of Alarm: The White Paper suggests that the alarm, harassment or distress should be "substantial". It makes it clear that "any degree of annoyance or disturbance will not suffice: because the offence would be concerned primarily to protect the weak and the vulnerable, the proposed definition requires evidence that the victim suffered **substantial** (the White Paper's emphasis) alarm etc".⁽⁶⁾ Yet, within the Bill, the word **substantial** has been omitted. The prosecution's task is thus made that much easier.

2. The absence of a victim: The White Paper made it clear that the behaviour to be caught by the new offence must "actually cause someone to feel alarm, harassment and distress (not that it is merely likely to do so)".⁽⁷⁾ The Bill abandons this safeguard. For a prosecution of the offence (as drafted) the Police will not need to call evidence that consequences of the offen-

sive words/behaviour were such as to give the accused reasonable cause for believing that their use was likely to harass, alarm or distress another. In other words, a crime with no victim(s) is created.

3. Venue of Offence: The White Paper suggested that the offence could only be committed "in or within view of a public place". The Bill goes further than this, and suggests that the offence may be committed in private as well as in public places. This is a significant extension and clearly the offence as drafted would now cover for example much hooliganism in football grounds (private places). It is interesting to note that since the publication of the Bill, Mr. Justice Popplewell has published his report on "Crowd Safety and Control in Sports Grounds",⁽⁸⁾ in which he has recommended, inter alia, that there should be a new offence created of "Disorderly Conduct at a Sports Ground". He did not believe that the proposed Public Order offence of disorderly conduct would cover much of the offensive behaviour in football grounds. Mr. Hurd made it clear immediately the Popplewell report was published that he believed that there was no need for the offence as proposed by Popplewell,⁽⁹⁾ believing that the offence within the Public Order Bill would cover football hooliganism.⁽¹⁰⁾ In view of the extension of the proposed offence to cover private as well as public places, it is hard to disagree with him.

4. Power of Arrest: The White paper stated that if there were to be an offence of disorderly conduct, "it would not seem necessary for it to carry a specific power of arrest".⁽¹¹⁾ Yet, Section 5(5) of the Bill specifically gives a Police Constable the power to arrest. It is hard to understand why this is necessary. Prior to the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, numerous statutes gave the Police the power to arrest for a named offence. In the realisation that this was confusing for both the Police and the public, the legislators in the 1984 Act repealed the vast majority of these powers. In their place, the Act gives the Police the power to arrest for **any** offence if one of the so-called "general arrest conditions" applies.⁽¹²⁾ These "conditions" set out the circumstance in which the use of a Summons would be inappropriate or impracticable. (For more details see the special feature article by Barbara Cohen in Youth and Policy No. 14).⁽¹³⁾ In view of the wide range of these "conditions" it would seem unnecessary for a specific power of arrest to be introduced into the Bill. In other words, the 1984 Act gives the Police considerable discretion in deciding whether or not to arrest, and the power to arrest within the section would seem to be superfluous.

5. The Penalty: When the White Paper was published in May 1985, it was thought that "a sufficient maximum penalty might be a fine of £100".⁽¹⁴⁾ Seven months later when the Bill was published in December 1985, the maximum fine had quadrupled to £400. The scene is being set for Magistrates to impose fines for this new offence as unrealistic as those already set by them for offences of breach of the peace etc. arising out of football crowd trouble.

The Effect of Lobbying

The White Paper stated that it would particularly welcome comments on the proposed new offence. Indeed, it was one of only three proposals (out of a total of 41) in the White Paper for which feedback was particularly sought.⁽¹⁵⁾ However, it was only allowed six weeks for a response and in view of the fact that all of the changes to the offence as envisaged in the White Paper, have resulted in a looser and more far-reaching offence within the Bill, it would seem that the "Law and Order" lobby has easily out-manoeuvred those Civil Libertarians alarmed like ourselves by the original proposals. However, at the time of writing, the critics are fighting back. Gerald Kaufman, the Shadow Home Secretary, has done an about turn with regard to his view of the proposed offence. He welcomed the White Paper offence⁽¹⁶⁾, but the changes are such that now he too is a strong critic.⁽¹⁷⁾ Newspaper reports indicate that the Home Office have conceded to the critics that the absence of a victim and the degree of alarm, harassment or distress that needs to be shown, are two matters which need to be reconsidered by them.⁽¹⁸⁾ We await their deliberations with interest.

What is certain is that in some form or other there is to be a new offence of Disorderly conduct. It is surely necessary that after its creation youth workers throughout the country monitor the extent, and effects, of its use by the Police. Evidence will be needed to support the present theoretical fears that the introduction of such an offence will create more problems than it solves. In the absence of such evidence, it can surely be predicted that although its birth is somewhat tortuous, once on the statute books it is assured of a long life. It took a long time for the "sus" law to be finally discredited. Will youth workers and others combine forces to similarly demonstrate the immeasurable harm than an offence such as this invariably creates?

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Cmnd. 95.0. May 1985. | 9. Guardian 17/1/86. |
| 2. Para 3.22 of White Paper. | 10. Para 3.26 of White Paper. |
| 3. Public Order Bill Dec. 1985. | 11. Section 25, Police & Criminal Evidence Act 1984. |
| 4. Para 3.26 of White Paper. | 12. pp. 41-47 inc. |
| 5. Law Column, page 48. | 13. Para 3.26 of White Paper. |
| 6. Para 3.26 of White Paper. | 14. Chapter 9 of White Paper. |
| 7. Para 3.26 of White Paper. | 15. House of Commons 16/5/85. |
| 8. Committee of Inquiry into Crowd Safety and Control at Sports Grounds. Final Report (published 16/1/86). | 16. House of Commons 13/1/86. |
| | 17. The Observer 16/2/86. |

YOUTH AND POLICY

the journal of
critical analysis

'Monitor for' this issue:

Sunderland Community Resource Centre

Richard Jenks

Merin Craigie

Sarah Morgan

Julie Wright

Marc Rough

We would like to thank Karyn Gill for her hard work over the last year

Code

All sources are Official Report (Hansard).

Headings are as published

The following code describes the references used.

monitor:

spring 1985 - autumn 1985

DIV	Division
D	in debate
S	statement
WA	written answer
AMM	amendment moved
OA	oral answer
RB	reading of Bill, 1, 2, or 3
V	volume of report
N	number of report
etc;	this item continued as such
adj;	adjourned
ans.	answer
exchange;	comment by Members on the subject at some length
table;	figures given in chart form
All items are available through our Copy Service	

V83 N164

16 to 19-year-olds WA

Mr. Terry Lewis asked the Sec State for Education if he will make a statement about financial provision for 16 to 19-year-olds.

Sir Keith Joseph: Young people in non-advanced full-time education have traditionally been regarded as primarily dependent on their parents for financial support until their 19th birthday. Parents receive child benefit in respect of such children, and in addition local education authorities have discretionary powers to pay grants and allowances to those in need.

Corporal Punishment

Mr. Teddy Taylor asked Sec State Education if he has issued any guidance to local education authorities regarding Her Majesty's Government's policy towards compliance by them with the decisions of the European Court of Human Rights on corporal punishment pending a final decision by Parliament on the Education (Corporal Punishment) Bill; what representations he has received on this matter; and if he will make a statement.

Mr. Dunn: Until there is a change in the law, the legal right to use corporal punishment in schools is not affected by the decision of the European Court of Human Rights in the case of Campbell and Cosans. As regards the Education (Corporal Punishment) Bill, I refer my hon. Friend to the answer earlier today to the hon. Member for Denton and Reddish (Mr. Bennett).

Covenant Payments WA

Mr. Meadowcroft asked Sec State Social Services (1) whether, for the purposes of claiming supplementary and other means-tested benefits, he will consider treating covenant payment representing parental contributions to student maintenance grants as local education authority grants; and if he will make a statement;

(2) whether, assessing the income of student claimants for rent allowance during term-time, covenant payments representing parental contributions to student maintenance grants are deemed to cover term-time alone or the entire calendar year;

(3) whether, in assessing the income of student claimants for supplementary benefit during the summer vacation, covenant payments representing parental contribution to student maintenance grants are deemed to cover term-time alone or the entire calendar year.

Mr. Newton: So far as supplementary benefit is concerned the chief adjudication officer has issued guidance which states that where the amount paid to a student under a covenant together with the tax refund is no more than the assessed parental contribution, the total should not be taken into account for benefit purposes during the summer vacation. Students are unlikely to qualify for family income supplement because they will not satisfy the full-time work condition.

For housing benefit, in general we would expect local authorities to take a parental contribution paid by means of a covenant into account on the same basis as the grant to which it relates. For most students this will mean that payments are taken into account only in term-time and the Christmas and Easter vacations. However, circumstances may arise in which the terms of a covenant are such that an authority decides to take the income into account over a longer period. We have no plans to change the relevant legislation. However, I understand that the chief adjudication officer is considering issuing further guidance on supplementary benefit.

Undergraduates WA

Mrs. Renée Short asked Sec State Defence if he will list the numbers of undergraduate students at universities who have received financial support from his Department for their courses in each academic year since 1979-80; if he will give a breakdown of the academic faculties and the individual universities in which they studied; and what specific new awards he plans to introduce for students for science-related disciplines.

Mr. Butler: My Department is planning to increase substantially from the start of the coming academic year the number of sponsorships it offers to students reading for first degrees in engineering, scientific and related disciplines. Our students engineer scheme, through which we recruit most of our professional engineers, will have its capacity doubled to sponsor up to about 140 undergraduates each year. We are, in addition, introducing a new scheme on the lines of the student engineer scheme to provide sponsorship for up to 100 undergraduates reading for science degrees in disciplines relevant to the Department's work programmes. I shall write to the hon. Member about the statistical information she has asked for as soon as possible.

Undergraduate (Maintenance Grant) WA

Mr. Meadowcroft asked Sec State Education why the maintenance grant for a married undergraduate is assessed on the income of the student's parents; and if he will make a statement.

Mr. Brooke: For the assessment of a parental contribution to be waived a student must normally have reached the age of 25 years before starting his course, or have previously supported himself out of earnings for not less than three years. Married students not satisfying one of these conditions have their grant abated by a parental contribution, since marriage alone is not considered to signify the degree of financial independence which would make it unreasonable to expect such a contribution. Married students not assessed for a parental contribution may nonetheless have their grant abated by a spouse's contribution.

Community Education WA

Mr. Jack Thompson asked Sec State Education what is his policy towards the development of com-

munity education.

Mr. Dunn: It is for local education authorities to decide on the pattern of educational provision locally, including the extent to which educational buildings might be used for community purposes. My right hon. Friend does, however, encourage local authorities to promote the shared use of school premises so far as resources permit.

V84 N165

Inner City Disorders

The Sec of State for the Home Department (Mr. Douglas Hurd): During the past six weeks there have been three serious riots - in the Lozells road area of Birmingham, in Brixton, and Tottenham. Four people have died, one a police constable who was savagely killed. There have also been disorders in Liverpool, Leicester and Peckham in south London. There were appalling attacks on the police with petrol bombs and other missiles, and especially in Birmingham and Brixton there was extensive looting of and attacks on shops and cars. So far 700 people have been charged with offences arising from the disorders.

The riot in Brixton was triggered by the tragic shooting of Mrs. Groce, and the riot in Tottenham followed the death of Mrs. Jarrett after a search had been made at her home. These police operations are being investigated by senior officers from other police forces under the supervision of the independent Police Complaints Authority. These arrangements will ensure that they are fully investigated and that any necessary action is taken. In the case of the Lozells Road riot, the chief constable of the West Midlands is preparing a report which will be published. HM's Inspector of Constabulary is being associated closely with the preparation of that report.

So far as police operations are concerned, although the other disorders were serious enough, the riot at Tottenham stands out for the problems which it presented to the police. In that riot, a police officer was killed, firearms were used and the police had to face a ferocious barrage of petrol bombs and other missiles. The design of housing estates like that at Tottenham poses particular difficulties in such circumstances. The Met Police commissioner is urgently reviewing the tactics of the force on such occasions. There must be no no-go areas in any of our cities.

The riot at Tottenham was the first occasion in Great Britain when the chief officer of police gave authority for plastic baton rounds to be used if necessary, though in fact they were not used. Plastic baton rounds and CS gas were made available to the police in Great Britain for public order use following the riots in 1981. They may be used only in the last resort, where conventional methods of policing have been tried and failed, or must from the nature of the circumstances be unlikely to succeed if tried, and where the chief officer judges such action necessary because of the risk of loss of life, serious injury or widespread destruction of property. That threshold was reached at Tottenham. The commissioner had my full support in making it clear that such weapons would be deployed if similar circumstances arose in the future.

These disorders are shocking events. It is of paramount interest to us all, young and old, people of all ethnic backgrounds, that public order should be maintained. I acknowledge - we all acknowledge - the social problems which exist in these areas, but it is no solution to loot and burn shops which serve the area or to attack the police. Mob violence must be dealt with firmly and effectively and criminal acts punished according to the criminal law. The police should have the support of all of us in striving to maintain order and uphold the law. It is their first priority. It is the Government's also.

Mr. Gerald Kaufman Five people have died in sad and savage circumstances, and the first duty of the House today is to send sympathy to those who are mourning Mr. Kamalia Molidina, Mr. Amir Molidina, Mrs. Cynthia Jarrett, Police Constable Keith Blakelock and Mr. David Hodge. We send our concern and best wishes for a speedy and full recovery to Mrs. Cherry Groce, a tragic victim of these dreadful events, and to all others - police, firemen, ambulancemen and ordinary innocent citizens - who have suffered injury in disturbances which have included arson, looting and the dreadful crime of rape.

Many have undergone serious financial loss, and I must first ask the Home Secretary what action can be taken to speed up the payment of compensation under the Riot (Damages) Act 1886 and to expand that Act's scope to take account of loss of income after the riots.

Only two days after the Brixton disorders, in April 1981, Lord Whitelaw, as Home Secretary, announced to the House an inquiry under Lord Scarman to start right away. After the latest riots, however the Government stubbornly refuse an inquiry. The police complaints authority inquiries do not begin to be a substitute because, as Lord Scarman in his report insisted,

"It is necessary before attempting an answer to the policing problem to understand the social problem".

The social problem referred to by Lord Scarman has broadened and deepened in the four years since his report, and the need for action is that much greater. Lord Scarman warned in his report that "to ignore the complex political, social and economic factors... is... to put the nation in peril".

Our fear is that unless the Governments response is much more far-seeing than has so far been demonstrated, Lord Scarman will have been right in his grim warning that "disorder will become a disease endemic in our society".

Those are the dimensions of the challenge which we face and which the nation expects us to meet.

Mr. Hurd I agree that if there are lessons to be learnt from the two incidents that are now being

investigated, we should not be afraid to learn them. The latest available figures show a reduction in the issue and use of arms by the police. In 1983, firearms were issued to police officers in England and Wales in 3,180 operations, while in 1984 the figure fell to 2,667.

It is clear that when things go wrong, we must inquire into what went wrong and what can be done to put matters right. That is happening through the criminal investigations by the police, through the investigation, under independent supervision, of complaints against the police, through the review of tactics in London, through the review of manpower, about which I have spoken, and through the review of spending, which I also mentioned, to make sure that it is effective. These are all inquiries or reviews which are going on among those responsible so that they can get on with doing their job effectively.

I do not accept the case for a long judicial inquiry overshadowing the efforts that are now being made to learn the lessons which must be learnt. As the right hon. Gentleman knows, such an inquiry would prejudice the possibility of criminal proceedings in some instances. Apart from that, it would impede the effective follow-up action at which we are aiming.

Mr. Mark Carlisle Can my right hon. Friend assure the House that the Government will, by the provision of men and equipment, ensure that they need to deal with any similar incidents in future?

Mr. Hurd: As my right hon. and learned Friend has observed, it is a matter of men and equipment. The only test is that of need and that is the only test that we shall apply.

Other matters need to be looked at. The defensive equipment introduced in recent years - helmets, shields and protective overalls - proved its worth. Without it there would have been more serious casualties. The Met Police are acquiring more shields and other defensive equipment. We have to consider whether any further equipment is required, and that is being done. There may be lessons to be learnt in relation to police training and deployment. The commissioner is pursuing these matters and I am in close touch with him. I shall ensure that any lessons learnt are disseminated nationally.

This Government have done more to meet the needs of the police than any in recent history. Since 1979 the Met Police have increased in strength by nearly 4,500 officers; and other forces in England and Wales are stronger by a similar number. Including civilians, strength has increased by some 12,000. Even after a welcome intake of recruits, the Met Police still have scope to increase strength by about 300 within its present establishment of 27,165. I support the commissioner in his efforts to make good this shortfall as quickly as possible. The force's reorganisation should, in addition, release 200 officers for operational duties; and I have authorised an increase of nearly 50 in the civil staff ceiling next year for further civilianisation.

Following my predecessor's announcement in July on drugs, I have told the commissioner that I am prepared in principle to agree to an increase of 50 officers in the establishment next year specifically to strengthen his efforts against drug trafficking. Taken together, these steps mean that there will be a substantial strengthening of the Met Police in the months ahead. Beyond that I have set urgent work in hand to assess where there are specific needs for further increases in the Met Police establishment, and I shall consider applications from provincial police authorities on the same basis - namely, that the police should have what they need in the fight against crime.

V84 N165

Board and Lodging Payments

The Sec State Social Services (Mr. Norman Fowler): I should like to make a statement about supplementary benefit board and lodging payments.

In April the Government took action to control rapidly increasing expenditure and to help curb abuse. Between December 1982 and December 1984 spending rose from £166 million a year to £380 million a year. At the same time, the number of boarders under 26 had more than trebled from 23,000 to around 85,000.

Regulations were introduced which provided for the maximum weekly amounts for board and lodging to be determined by Ministers, rather than by local offices. In addition, the regulations limited the period during which certain unemployed people under 26 could be paid as boarders. There was a wide range of exemptions to protect the most vulnerable who needed to be boarders, such as families with children. The regulations were scrutinised by the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments and debated and passed by both Houses of Parliament.

On 31 July, after Parliament had risen, the High Court decided an application for judicial review on the regulations. Mr. Justice Mann rejected the argument that we had failed properly to consult the Social Security Advisory Committee, and he also rejected the argument that the time limit of four weeks applied in this case was unreasonable. The judge did, however, find that the powers in the Supplementary Benefits Act 1976 were insufficient to make regulations enabling Ministers to determine board and lodging areas and limits. In other words, the judge's view was that the regulations would have been in order if they had themselves contained the board and lodging areas and limits. Mr. Justice Mann declined to make a formal order, on our undertaking not to apply the time limits pending the making of new regulations or the outcome of any appeal. Immediate action was taken to put this undertaking into effect and I should like to pay tribute to the efforts of our local office staff in carrying out this work.

We have lodged an appeal against the judgment and arrangements have been made for an early hearing in the Court of Appeal. This will take place at the end of November. However, as Mr. Justice Mann specifically recognised, there is a need for a sensible interim operation. It is in the general interest that there should be stability during which the outcome of the appeal can be given proper consideration and the review, which we are committed to carrying out, completed.

I have accordingly laid draft regulations today. They include temporary provisions - which will expire at the end of April 1986 - to meet the judge's points. There are two important differences from the regulations passed by the House in April. First, time limits will not apply to existing boarders on benefit. They will apply only to new claimants.

The second important difference is that I am also taking powers, in addition to the exemptions in the previous regulations, to exempt from the time limits claimants who would otherwise suffer exceptional hardship.

The House will appreciate, in view of what I have said, the need to clarify the position. The regulations achieve this without in any way prejudicing the outcome of the appeal. The House will have the opportunity to discuss the new regulations when they are debated next week.

We hope in this way to restrain spending, tackle abuse, but at the same time protect the interests of genuine claimants.

Mr. Michael Meacher (Oldham, West): Is the Sec State aware that in the past three months he has twice been found by the courts to have acted illegally in cutting board and lodging payments? On the issue of obedience to the law, about which the Government talk so much, the right hon. Gentleman has been found to have laid illegal regulations which have led to the deaths of at least three young people and have caused public outrage because of the untold hardship and distress inflicted unnecessarily and wrongly, as it turns out, on thousands of others.

Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, following the two legal decisions, only one of which he referred to today, the board and lodging regulations are in a shambles? After the second case on 18 September, Mr. John Laws, the Treasury counsel, conceded that the previous High Court hearing had effectively quashed the cash limits as well as the time limits in the regulations. How can the Sec State claim today that he is regularising the position when his new draft regulations affect only the time limits and do not touch the illegality of cash limits, especially given that it was on that latter point that the social security appeal tribunal found against the Department on 18 September?

More significantly, is the Sec State aware that my initial legal advice is that there may be grounds for holding that the new draft regulations are also illegal, because, contrary to the Minister's statement, they still do not address a main reason why Mr. Justice Mann ruled in the High Court on 4 August that the original regulations were illegal? Mr. Justice Mann said:

"Those questions"

he was referring the grounds on which regulations 2(1)(a) applies-

"are questions in regard to individual cases and are not questions as to the entitlement to benefit

of a class of claimant which are answerable in terms of rules of general application"

In other words, the judge concluded that the regulations were illegal, not simply because, as the Minister said, they did not contain the board and lodging areas and limits, but because they were applied to classes of individuals, and the Sec State had no power to do that. Is the Sec State aware that, on the basis, we shall be taking legal advice before next week's debate about whether the new draft regulations may also be ruled to be illegal and invalid?

As the new regulations are clearly still shot through with legal flaws, as well as - more importantly - being morally and socially indefensible will the right hon. Gentleman accept that the only honourable course for the Government is to withdraw the regulations in full and to replace them by the alternative remedies recommended by the Government's own Social Security Advisory Committee? How many times must the Government be told that the reason why total board and lodging payments have grown so sharply in 10 years is no fault of individual claimants, but is almost entirely due to the huge increase in unemployment, especially youth unemployment, and the almost complete collapse of the house building programme, especially flats for single people to rent?

Will the Minister accept that the new, revised regulations are still not in any way addressed to the root causes of the problem, but simply twist the knife in those who have already been victimised? Will he therefore, take the only proper and honourable course available to him and suspend these cruel and unreasonable regulations straightaway?

Mr. Fowler: I will not, and I am sorry that the long lay-off has not made the hon. Gentleman's judgement any better than it was before. The Cotton case resulted from the regulations which were passed by both Houses of Parliament and were scrutinised by the Joint Committee. Three issues were raised - consultation with the Social Security Advisory Committee, the reasonable time limit and the fact that my own powers are not of a general nature so that I could lay down time limits and board and lodging areas. It was only in the last case that Mr. Justice Mann found for Mr. Cotton. That position is covered by the new regulations which specify the areas and limits.

I hear what the hon. Gentleman says about what he terms his initial legal advice. We will obviously want to study what that initial legal advice amounts to. However, there is absolutely no question of our wanting or seeking to withdraw these regulations for the very good reason that the position before we acted was quite insupportable. Payments had increased out of all proportion. When the hon. Gentleman says that the number of boarders, for example, under 26 had trebled, that is far more than can be explained by housing problems or unemployment. We had a situation where the maximum amounts payable were determined by local offices, charges were being pushed up, and there was fraud and abuse. In other words, there was a case for action, and the Government have taken it. We shall seek to protect the interests of claimants, but the hon. Gentleman's basic case is insupportable.

Sir Hugh Rossi (Hornsey and Wood Green): As the regulations also cover payments for people in residential homes, does my right hon. Friend agree that part of the problem relating to abuse arises from overcharging, very often for extremely substandard services and accommodation for elderly people? Does he agree also that the answer is not a standard payment, which can disadvantage genuine charities which are struggling to provide a good service but are unable to do so within the standards laid down, but rather a form of investigation or inquiry into the different homes and laying down perhaps what each home should be able to charge for the service that it provides?

Mr. Fowler: Yes. I have a great deal of sympathy with that point, and that is the position to which I should like to move, but my hon. Friend, whose knowledge of these matters is substantial, will understand that it is not possible to move to that in one step. Nevertheless, there is a great deal in what he says and it is part of the review that we are conducting. I am sure my hon. Friend will also agree that one of the permanent parts of these regulations is the new increased financial limits. They will apply to residential homes and to nursing homes, and they will, I think, be welcomed by the voluntary bodies.

Mr. Simon Hughes (Southwark and Bermondsey): Will the Sec State take the opportunity that the court case now gives him to reconsider the whole question of time limits, particularly as before the reshuffle one Department told people to get on their bikes, and his Department then told them that they could not stay where they had arrived, thus showing some inconsistency in Government policy.

In the new draft regulations the right hon. Gentleman took on board one of the points made by my colleagues the hon. Member of Roxburgh and Berwickshire (Mr. Kirkwood) about extending the regulations to youngsters on bail. Will he tell us whether exceptional hardship cases will cover young people who find either a job or a home, but cannot take up either until after the time limit, so that they can be counted as being in exceptional hardship for the continuing period, which may well exceed the time limit which the regulations would otherwise lay down?

Mr. Fowler: I considered the last point that the hon. Gentleman makes, but the purpose of having an exceptional hardship clause is to give even more discretion to the exemption classes which already exist, and that is the spirit in which they have been introduced. However, I shall give further consideration to that.

As the hon. Gentleman will know, the time limits are currently suspended. Under the new regulations, the time limits will remain suspended for existing boarders. The difference is that new boarders - those who become boarders after the regulations come into force, if passed by Parliament on 4 November - will be subject to time limits unless they are exempt. Financial limits have never been suspended, and of course they continue to apply.

Mr. Roger Sims (Chislehurst): Can my right hon. Friend confirm that the reason why he brought in the regulations is that there was ample evidence of abuse? If the regulations are technically defective, surely the answer is not to withdraw them, as the Opposition suggests, but to bring them into line with legal requirements, which is exactly what he is proposing?

Mr. Fowler: Yes, I think that that is the position. There is, as we all know, evidence of abuse—

Mr. Meacher: By landlords.

Mr. Fowler: The hon. Gentleman speaks of abuse by landlords, and that, of course, is correct. We all know of the advertisements that have been placed. However, I have to tell the hon. Gentleman that there is clear evidence of abuse by claimants as well. I shall give one example. A special fraud investigation earlier this year in Euston showed that about half of those claiming to be resident at particular hotels were no longer there - about 600 cases out of 1,200. As a result, we have asked for other checks to be carried out in all regions. So the hon. Gentleman's immediate and superficial response, that claimants are not abusing the system, is shown, I fear, to be totally wrong.

Mr. Andrew F. Bennett (Denton and Reddish): Will the Sec State give very careful consideration to the way in which he is attempting to railroad these regulations through the House this week and next? He prayed in aid the Joint Committee on Statutory Instruments to suggest that he got them right last time round. He is now placing on that Committee an extremely heavy burden in carrying out its duty to scrutinise the regulations properly. As the Committee meets tomorrow, it will be very difficult for it to consider all the points put to it as a result of the right hon. Gentleman laying the regulations today, and if the Committee waits until next Tuesday it will be difficult to produce an accurate report to enable the House to have an informed debate. Will the Sec. State therefore consider delaying the introductions of the regulations until the House returns in the new Session?

Mr. Fowler: The Court of appeal will be looking at the position since April. There is nothing in any action that I am proposing that will affect that, or any rights that might result from that, but it is clearly in everyone's interest to have as much certainty in the matter as possible, and the new regulations are designed to take us through the period of appeal. That avoids the prospect of confusion. It allows the Government, Parliament and the public to consider the next step, and it also avoids what could be the absurd position of going back to the situation prior to April 1985, which would mean a reduction in some of the limits.

Mr. T.H.H. Skeet (Bedfordshire, North): Whilst appreciating that the matter is to be settled by appeal in November, and also appreciating the extent of the abuse, may I ask my right hon. Friend to bear in mind the totally unsatisfactory background to this problem, which is that mobility will never give a young man of 26 or under the opportunity to be in a place long enough to secure a job? This is a very real problem which my constituents face.

Mr. Fowler: That is certainly not the intention of the regulations. We have to strike a balance between allowing young people the opportunity to find a job - something which we aim to do, and will

obviously encourage them to do - and avoiding a situation where, as has been shown, some have turned to a permanent way of life in which, if they find a job, they will not be able to sustain the standard of living which they have been enjoying.

Mr. Harry Cohen (Leyton): Was not the PM most unwise, to say within days of the court decision that the regulations would be reintroduced? Are they not a source of great fear for the young homeless, and are they not detested by all the organisations that seek to help them? and are they not a recipe for more homelessness, vagrancy and crime among young people?

Mr. Fowler: It is absurd to believe that there is no problem or that things could be kept as they were, because that is clearly not the case. I think that that is recognised, perhaps even on both sides of the House. The hon. Gentleman claims that hardship has been caused. The early results of our monitoring do not show evidence of general hardship being caused by the policy. The survey in southern England showed that a quarter of claimants were covered by exemptions and that over one third, approximately, continued to live in the same accommodation. Therefore, it is not anything like the picture that the hon. Gentleman is painting.

Mr. Richard Holt (Langborough): when examining the detail, not only the time limits but the geographical definition of areas should be looked at. I am sure my right hon. Friend will agree that one can hardly regard the north-east coast of England as a seaside resort in its historical context, so the four-week limit will have to be changed. Will my right hon. Friend also examine cases of people being disadvantaged when they have to leave homes where they have been raised because of the brutality and the ignorance of their parents to move away from all their friends, relations, churches, clubs and everything else as a result of what is liable to happen under the regulations.

Mr. Fowler: The final point raised by my hon. Friend might be dealt with under the existing exemption policy, but if it is not, that is the point of adding to the exemptions a provision whereby such exceptional hardship can be dealt with.

Mr. Charles Kennedy (Ross, Cromarty and Skye): Will the Sec State explain how he can argue, as he did this afternoon, that he is trying to represent and "protect" the interests of claimants when the only reason why he is here making a statement is that it is the courts that are representing the interests of claimants against his intentions?

Mr. Fowler: That is not the position. Mr. Justice Mann envisaged the possibility of amending regulations, and he framed his judgment accordingly. It is in no one's interest that there should be uncertainty over the next months. The new regulations that I am proposing will expire after six months. That is the period in which the Court of Appeal will decide, and the parties can decide on further action. The regulations will not affect those living in board and lodging accommodation at the time they come into force.

Dr. Brian Mawhinney (Peterborough): Will my right hon. Friend explain who will have the right of judgement in cases of exceptional hardship?

Mr. Fowler: I shall have the residual discretion on exceptional hardship.

Mr. D.N. Campbell-Savours (Workington): How much will this reversal in the courts cost the Government? Where will the money come from within the right hon. Gentleman's budget? What is happening in DHSS offices? Is it true that in many offices staff are working day and night to clear the backlog of cases that have come forward?

Mr. Fowler: I have no evidence of the final point raised by the hon. Gentleman. With regard to what he said as the beginning of his question, I should tell him that the matter is the subject of an appeal. We are appealing to the Court of Appeal, so before the hon. Gentleman tries to count the cost the ultimate decision must be made.

Mr. Jonathan Aitken (Thanet, South): From now on, will my right hon. Friend concentrate on a point that is worrying many in the communities most affected - the much suspected incidence of fraud and abuse? My right hon. Friend has said that he has positive proof of such fraud. Will he say a little more about that and what he will do about it in south coast seaside towns, such as my constituency, which have been affected by it?

Mr. Fowler: As I said, we have conducted a special fraud investigation in Euston, which showed, a totally unsatisfactory position. The result is that I have asked for other checks to be carried out in all the regions. We would be failing totally in our responsibility if we did any less than that. In addition, there is evidence of different charges being made, with DHSS claimants being charged a higher rate than ordinary residents. That all adds up to the fact that it is not enough to say that the existing situation can be preserved, because the position before we took action was totally unsatisfactory.

Mr. John Butterfill (Bournemouth, West): Representing as I do a seaside town, I should like to say that we still have a considerable problem which is not entirely solved by my right hon. Friend's statement today.

There are still thousands of claimants in my constituency, many of whom have no intention of seeking work. That is evidenced by what my local DHSS officer tells me. It also told me on Friday that there is no doubt that charges by boarding houses in my constituency were put up substantially, to the maximum level. In fact, that became the minimum level. Therefore, we have an acute problem, and I urge my right hon. Friend to deal with it as quickly as possible.

Mr. Fowler: I hear what my hon. Friend says, that a balance must be held, but the evidence that the Department and I are receiving is that some of the major problems, particularly in some of the seaside resorts, have become considerably easier over the past month.

Mr. Meacher: How will the Sec State seriously exercise the discretionary exemption himself? Did I hear him say that he would reserve that power to himself? How will that operate in any widespread way? Secondly, does the right hon. Gentleman really believe that two, four or even eight weeks is enough time for a young person to get a job, when no fewer than a quarter of young people leaving school are unemployed? Thirdly, will the right hon. Gentleman tell us how many young people have been forced out of their bed and breakfast accommodation, or board and lodgings, since 29 April as a result of the regulations?

Mr. Fowler: On the last point, we have only the early results of our own monitoring at present, but I shall try to make the evidence that we have available to the House before the order is debated next week.

The time limits, again, are a matter of judgment. I believe that reasonable time is allowed for people to look for jobs in a particular area.

On the question of discretion, the exemption policy already covers a wide range of situations, and probably about one quarter of all cases are covered by the existing exemption policy. In addition, I shall now have discretion to exempt cases of exceptional hardship. Clearly, such exemption will be exercised through the DHSS, and particularly through the headquarters division of the DHSS.

V84 N171

YTS Managing Agencies OA

Mr. Park asked the Paymaster General to comment on the fact that many schemes are still used as a source of cheap labour and that the quality of the training is not up to the standards that we should expect to enable young people to move from a training scheme to a job?

Mr. Trippier: Seventy five per cent. of the schemes to which I referred in my substantive answer meet all the required standards of YTS. Those that do not - which fall down on relatively minor points - can be put right within the life of the programme. On several occasions the Opposition, not least the right hon. Member for Chesterfield (Mr. Benn) who talks about slave labour markets, have said that this is a cheap form of labour. The money that is made available is an allowance; it is not meant to be a wage.

Labour Statistics OA

Mr. James Hamilton asked the Paymaster General how many young people are currently unemployed.

Mr. Trippier: On 11 July 1985, the latest date for which figures are available, the numbers of unemployed claimants aged under 18 years in the United Kingdom was 177,600.

Mr. Hamilton: Will the Minister concede that it is a diabolical scandal when such figures are presented to the House? Has he read the survey prepared by Marplan, which states categorically that three out of four of those interviewed took the view that the Government do not care two hoots about

unemployment and creating jobs for the unemployed? Is he aware that the survey reveals that many of those who are on the youth training scheme regard it a cheap form of employment? Will he urge his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State, who, is, of course, a member of the Cabinet, to flex his muscles and get the Government's policy changed in order to get young people back to work as quickly as possible.

Mr. Trippier: It is disgraceful of the hon. Gentleman to say that the Government could not care two hoots about youth unemployment. That is a ridiculous assertion. Earlier in the year, with the publication of the White Paper on education and training, the Government stated they hoped that unemployment among young people under 18 years of age would become a thing of the past. The hon. Gentleman seeks to rubbish the YTS. He forgets that the scheme was put forward by the MSC, and that the TUC, which is an effective and strong member of the MSC, supports it. He tries to rubbish the YTS, but 84 per cent. of trainees are satisfied and find the scheme to be available.

Mr. Gale: My hon. Friend will know that the Chairman British Tourist Authority has said that if the Government are prepared to put up £5 million for the promotion of tourism, he believes that he can raise a further £10 million from private industry. That £15 million would generally generate £200 million worth of new business, which would be worth about 10,000 new jobs, many of which would go to young people. Would my hon. Friend be prepared to support such a scheme?

Mr. Trippier: I am aware that Mr. Duncan Bluck, the chairman of the British Tourist Authority, has said what my hon. Friend has attributed to him. I have had the pleasure of meeting with him, and in the near future I shall have the opportunity again of meeting him and members of his board. I shall examine what he says in great detail. I hope the House will welcome the fact that tourism is now the responsibility of the Department of Employment and that there is a clear recognition not only of the wealth creation, but employment, potential of tourism.

Mr. Sheerman: Does the hon. Gentleman really care about unemployed young people? Will the government use this occasion to dissociate themselves from the statement by Jeffrey Archer on the well-known radio programme "The World This Weekend", when he insulted all young people? Will the Government also dissociate themselves from the remarks of Lord Young who said that there was no relationship between levels of 60 and 80 per cent. of black young people unemployment in our inner-city areas and recent urban disturbances?

Mr. Trippier: Let me assure him that my right hon. and noble Friend the Sec of State has gone to enormous lengths to show that the Government, and this Department in particular, are extremely concerned about the level of unemployment.

The hon. Gentleman referred to an interview of Jeffrey Archer on Radio 4. I heard that programme and I have read the transcript. I can assure the hon. Gentleman that he is distorting what was said by Mr. Archer. He actually said, "I am not saying there are not groups who are not genuinely in need".

Mr. Soames: Is my hon. Friend aware that in many place where there are jobs, as in my constituency, there is a shortage of housing? What can he do to help young people to find accommodation in a situation like that?

Mr. Trippier: It is part of the trading strategy to which I referred when answering an earlier question. We should encourage employers, wherever possible, either to bus people into work or to look favourably on housing.

V84 N172

Y.T.S. WA.

Mr. Ron Davies asked the Paymaster General what percentage of young people on youth training scheme programmes go on to full-time employment nationally and by region in England.

Mr. Trippier: The MSC conducts a regular postal survey of young people who have left the YTS. Questionnaires are sent to young people some three months after they leave the scheme.

The following results to those leaving the youth training scheme between June 1984 and March 1985 based on a 15 per cent. sample of leavers in each month:

<i>Per cent. going into full-time employment (June 1984—March 1985)</i>	
	<i>Per cent.</i>
Northern Region	43
North West Region	54
Yorkshire and Humberside Region	52
Midlands Region	56
South West Region	62
South East Region	68
London Region	64
Wales	45
Scotland	50
Total Great Britain	55

From April 1985 the follow-up survey questionnaire has been sent to all those leaving the scheme. The results for April and May 1985 are:-

<i>Per cent. going into full-time employment (April and May 1985)</i>	
	<i>Per cent.</i>
Northern Region	44
North West Region	53
Yorkshire and Humberside Region	52
Midlands Region	58
South West Region	65
South East Region	71
London Region	64
Wales	43
Scotland	49
Total Great Britain	60

Youth Training Scheme WA

Mr. Lawler asked the Sec State Social Services how many youth training scheme trainees have been recruited by the NHS.

Mr. Whitney: This information is not collected centrally on a regular basis. However, an ad hoc survey carried out in August 1983 indicated that 91 of the 127 health authorities surveyed were involved in schemes or sponsorship. In aggregate, there were 2,057 trainee places either available at that time, or in the later stages of planning.

Contraceptives (Form of Notification) WA

Mr. Nicholas Winterton asked the Sec State Social Services if he will arrange for the introduction of a form of notification to be completed by all medical practitioners upon the prescription of contraceptive drugs and devices indicating the age, marital status and geographic location of the patient and requiring the signature of the patient, or their parent or legal guardian if they are under the age of 16 years, to authorise the prescription of such drugs or devices; and if he will arrange that in the case of minors where parental consent is not obtained the practitioner is obliged to give the reasons of the failure to obtain such permission.

Mr. Hayhoe: No. The effect of the decision of the House of Lords in the Gillick case is that doctors may lawfully prescribe contraceptives for young people under 16 without parental consent in certain exceptional circumstances. The Department's guidance makes it clear that only in exceptional circumstances should doctors prescribe contraceptives for young people under 16 without parental con-

sent, and as I stated this guidance is being reviewed.

Sporting Events (Crowd Control) WA

Mr. Canavan asked the Sec State Environment whether he will give an up-to-date report on the discussions he has had about crowd behaviour at sporting events.

Mr. Tracey: The government's concern has been primarily with crowd behaviour at football matches, though we are watchful for problems at other sports. Our discussions with the football authorities continue in my working group. A package of measures has been agreed; many of them, like our alcohol legislation, are in force. We continue to discuss the implementation of particular measures like membership cards and CCTV and to review needs and any fresh proposals that come forward.

Housing Accommodation (Young Tenants) WA

Mr. Fried asked the Sec State Environment what action he will take to stimulate the availability of low-cost related accommodation for young tenants.

Sir George Young: We have encouraged local authorities to concentrate their resources on those in special need, a category which includes homeless young people or risk of sexual or financial exploitation. In addition, the Housing Corporation's programme for 1985-86 includes £550 million for expenditure on providing fair rent and hostel accommodation, and many young people will be among those benefiting from that expenditure.

Youth Training Scheme WA

Mr. Baldry asked the Paymaster General if he will make a statement on progress being made towards the implementation of a two-year YTS.

Mr. Trippier: Following consultations with interested parties, the MSC has recently finalised and published details of the main funding and administrative arrangements for the two-year YTS, including transitional provision for ex-mode B1 schemes. During the next few months guidance about the design and content and other aspects of two-year training courses will be issued; and staff in the MSC's area offices will be discussing with potential providers how they might be involved in the two-year scheme.

Mr. Baldry asked the Paymaster General if he will make a statement about the proposed funding arrangements for YTS which hitherto have been designated as mode B training schemes.

Mr. Trippier: Under the new two-year youth training scheme, existing mode B1 providers will generally be eligible for the premium rate of funding and so receive £270 per trainee per month, in addition to the managing agent's fee. The provider will continue to get this higher level of funding for as long as the young person remains on his scheme, including those periods when the young person is receiving work experience on an employer's premises. Many current mode B1 providers will also receive transitional funding for 1986-87 and 1987-88.

V86 N3

Lunch-time Supervision WA

Mr. Greenway asked the Sec State Education how much he is proposing to spend on lunch-time supervision in schools during the current year; what he is proposing to spend in 1986-87.

Sir Keith Joseph: Nine out of 10 teachers are now refusing to supervise at midday, a duty which they deem to be voluntary, very few schools are unaffected by the disruption. That disruption hits directly at parents and their children and is virtually cost-free to teachers. I have previously made clear to the House the Government's willingness to set aside extra money from within the envelope of £1,250 million conditionally available for a new pay structure to help the employers with the cost of supervising pupils at midday. The Government have now decided that resources should be made available to support expenditure of up to £10 million in this financial year and £40 million in 1986-87 on new arrangements for midday supervision in England and Wales. Our purpose in making this new money available is to put local education authorities in a position to secure and pay for effective supervision at midday. It will also remove a long-standing grievance of the teachers.

To that end I intend to lay before the House amending regulations which will enable us to use our powers under the Education (Grants and Awards) Act 1984 to pay education support grants (ESGs) in respect of approved expenditure by local education authorities on provision for the supervision of school pupils at midday. My right hon. Friends the Secretaries of State for the Environment and for Wales will be willing to consider sympathetically representations from authorities seeking disregards of such expenditure in 1985-86 approved for ESG for the purposes of calculating the abatement of block grant.

The 1984 Act provides that expenditure approved for ESG should not exceed 0.5 per cent. of total planned expenditure on education by local authorities. In 1985-86 expenditure already approved for ESG and planned support for midday supervision will not exceed that figure, but the addition of £40 million to the programmes already approved for 1986-87 would cause it to be exceeded next year. The Government therefore intend to introduce a Bill to raise the limit to 1 per cent. We also intend however, pending the outcome of the present review of local government finance, to keep expenditure approved for ESG in respect of activities other than midday supervision within 0.5 per cent. of the planned total.

We shall consult with representatives of the local education authorities as a matter of urgency on the details of the new arrangements. I hope that they will be willing to take action swiftly in the interests of pupils and their parents.

V86 N4

Homeless Families WA

Mr. Pavitt asked the Sec State Environment if he will publish the number of homeless families living in bed and breakfast accommodation on 30 September from the London borough of Brent together with the current cost of this maintenance.

Sir George Young: The latest information made available to the Department is that 675 homeless households were living in bed and breakfast accommodation in June 1985. From other council papers, I understand the annual net cost to the council of placing a family in this type of accommodation is approximately £2,000.

Community Care WA

Mr. Ralph Howell asked the Sec State Social Services what was the total number of nurses involved only in community care for each of the years 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983 and 1984.

Mr. Hayhoe: The figures are shown in the table:

Primary Health Care Nursing Staff*—England

As at 30 September	Whole time† equivalent
1980	33,770
1981	36,280
1982	37,140
1983	37,470
1984	37,460

* Excludes midwifery staff and agency staff. Includes health visitor students and district nurse students.

† Figures are whole time equivalent rounded to nearest 10.

International Youth Year WA

Mr. Patrick Thompson asked the Sec State for Education how much grant has been paid by his Department towards International Youth Year 1985.

Mr. Dunn: The Department has given the following sums to International Youth Year 1985 in the form of grant aid to the IYY National Co-ordinating Committee for England.

	£
1982-83	1,350
1983-84	25,000
1984-85	107,500
1985-86	115,000

V86 N5

Contraception OA

Mr. Greenway asked the Sec State for Social Services if he will now issue fresh guidelines to doctors regarding the prescription of oral contraceptives to girls below the age of consent.

The Minister for Health (Mr. Barney Hayhoe): The existing guidance is being reviewed, taking into account the detail of the House of Lords judgment and the wide range of views expressed on this issue.

Mr. Greenway: Is my right hon. Friend aware that the recent narrow Law Lords decision is highly damaging to family relationships and that it has virtually abolished the age of consent? It means that a few doctors will shell out the pill like jelly babies to very young girls. Will he issue guidelines seeking to restore the status quo ante the Law Lords decision?

Mr. Hayhoe: I do not accept the exaggerated comments of my hon. Friend. His comment about jelly babies is a slur upon the medical profession and upon others involved. As I have said, the existing guidance is being reviewed, taking account of the Law Lords judgment and of other views that have been expressed.

Mrs. Renée Short: Is the minister aware that the BMA has already issued careful guidance on this matter to all its members? We have no reason to doubt that the members of the BMA are adhering to that guidance. Bearing in mind that the overwhelming majority of girls who seek help from their general practitioner are already in a relationship, is it not better that they should get advice about how to avoid unwanted pregnancies rather than to bring into the world children that they do not want and with whom they cannot cope?

Mr. Hayhoe: The fact that the existing guidance stresses the quite exceptional circumstances in which doctors or family planning clinics should act in the way described underlines the importance of obtaining parental consent whenever possible. I found considerable support for the five Fraser points, if I may so describe them, contained in the House of Lords judgment. I hope that they will be reflected in the revised guidance that will follow the review.

Dame Jill Knight: Will my right hon. Friend resist what some may see as an automatic next step following the Law Lords decision - namely, lowering of the age of consent? Will he bear in mind that young girls are just as much, if not more, in danger today than they were in Victorian times when the law came into effect?

Mr. Hayhoe: Questions about the age of consent are for my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary. I know of no proposal whatever to seek changes in the law to that effect. Hon. Members on both sides of the House will be concerned to see that the figures show that there were more than 4,000 abortions for girls under 16 in 1984, and equally concerned to see from the figures of the family planning clinics that 17,000 girls received advice and help without parental consent. Both those figures should generate concern on both side of the House.

Drug Abuse WA

Mr. Rathbone asked the Prime Minister if she has any plans to establish a national drug abuse agency to co-ordinate all efforts to combat the drugs problem.

The Prime Minister: We have no present plans to do so. At national level Government action to tackle drug misuse is co-ordinated and energetically carried forward by the inter-departmental ministerial group on the misuse of drugs, chaired by my hon. Friend the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department. This work is accorded very high priority.

Mr. Silvester: Is it not depressing that students at Manchester university should have attacked and abused the Minister of State, Home Office, (Mr. Waddington)? Will my right hon. Friend agree that it is about time that people inside and outside universities stood up to be counted on whether they are prepared to defend the right of free speech?

The Prime Minister: Yes, I agree with my hon. Friend. Universities are places where above all, free speech should be honoured, not prevented.

Expenditure Plans S

Mrs. Virginia Bottomley asked the Sec State Educ Science if he will make a statement about the Government's plans for expenditure on education and science in the period 1986-87 to 1988-89.

Sir Keith Joseph: As my right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced in his statement today, provision for education and science in 1986-87 will be increased by £300 million to £14,320 million from the figures in Cmnd 9428.

There is an increase of £88 million in vote expenditure: within this, additional provision has been made for science through the science budget and the universities vote, for additional places in higher education in science engineering and technology, and for the expected higher cost of student awards. Provision for vote expenditure in 1987-88 and 1988-89 has been increased by £84.5 million and £69 million respectively.

The total allocated to local authority current expenditure on education in Government's plans is £10,815 million, £210 million more than the plans in Cmnd 9428 as adjusted for Budget changes and so on. The total includes provision of up to £37 million in England for schemes of mid-day supervision (see paragraph 12 below). This represents an increase of around 5.8 per cent. in cash over the sum allocated to the service in 1985-86 after allowing for the transfer to the Manpower Services Commission of funding for some work-related non-advanced further education. It is, however, for local authorities to decide the balance between services within total relevant planned current expenditure in England of £22,250 million, taking into account their statutory obligations and Government policies.

The Government have not yet taken decisions about their provision for total local authority current expenditure in 1987-88 and 1988-89. In the meantime the 1986-87 total and its distribution, including the figures for local authority education, have been rolled forward for a further two years. However, in setting the level of the reserve, account has been taken of the possibility that local authority expenditure in 1986-87 and later years may exceed the Government's plans. The provision to be made within the 1987-88 rate support grant settlement will be considered next year in the light of authorities' budget for 1986-87 and other factors.

Schools

Overall, school rolls will continue to fall, and the plans assume that authorities will secure a further reductions in the number of school-teachers they employ. Provided that the cost of employing staff can be contained, there should be scope for a continuing modest improvement in overall pupil:teacher ratios, compared with January 1985. The situation will vary between authorities in the light of local circumstances and the speed at which teachers can be redeployed in response to changing needs. The Government remain willing to make an addition of up to £160 million to the 1986-87 plans, and further sums in later years, if a satisfactory agreement is reached on schoolteachers' duties and salary structure.

I look to local education authorities to review those aspects of their provision which offer the prospect of savings. Authorities continue to make good progress with the removal of surplus school places. I expect them to achieve the target of 1,125,000 places removed by March 1987; and am now consulting the local authority associations on the targets which I intend to set for later years. There

is ample scope for reducing net expenditure on school meals, as is shown by the savings achieved by certain authorities in a variety of ways. The Audit Commission has drawn attention to the opportunities for greater efficiency in the caretaking and cleaning of schools. If local education authorities succeed in making the further savings for which there is scope, and contain their costs, the plans afford them the opportunity to redeploy resources in the light of local priorities and in the support of policies which give the most direct educational benefit to pupils.

Non-advanced further education

The overall level of resources proposed should enable authorities to respond to the growing demand for NAFE provision of many kinds. There are uncertainties about student numbers, particularly the effect of participation of the addition of a second year to the youth training scheme, but the plans assume increases in the participation rates of 16 and 17-year-olds.

The overall student:staff ratio for NAFE remained stable between 1983-84 and 1984-85 at 8.5:1. In the light of the Audit Commission's report on further education and other evidence, I believe tighter academic staffing in this sector to be desirable. The expenditure plans assume that the SSR figure will be raised by around 6 per cent. between 1984-85 and 1986-87. Provided that authorities make such staffing economies and contain their costs generally. The plans should allow some scope for redeployment to the benefit of the quality of education. The Government and the local education authorities are now engaged in a joint study of ways of improving efficiency in NAFE.

The plans for net expenditure on NAFE assume the transfer of £105 million in the financial year 1986-87 to the Manpower Services Commission to enable it to purchase a proportion of work-related non-advanced further education on the basis of development plans and annual programmes prepared by local education authorities.

In-service training

Both the Government and the local authorities attach importance to in-service training as a means of further developing the skills of teachers in schools and in further education. I have agreed with leaders of the local authority associations that the scheme of in-service training grants should be further enlarged in 1986-87. Grant of £22 million will be available in the 1986-87 financial year and three new priority areas will be included in the scheme: training to assist school teachers to respond to ethnic diversity, micro-electronics in schools and management training for FE teachers. In addition, the scheme will provide for a special programme to support the introduction of the general certificate of secondary education.

For the future the Government will introduce this Session legislation to extend the powers of the holder of my office to grant aid in-service training. Expenditure to be supported by this grant, which will be implemented from the 1987-88 financial year, will be determined each year.

Education Support Grants (ESGs)

The Education support grants programme enters its second year in 1986-87. I have already invited local education authorities to bid for a programme of 16 activities of national priority in 1986-87 at a cost of £40 million to be supported by grant of £28 million. All local education authorities have accepted the invitation to bid. Additionally, the Government will now invite local education authorities to bid for resources under the programme to support schemes for the supervision of school pupils at mid-day. Subject to the approval by Parliament of legislation to raise the ceiling on expenditure assisted by education support grant from 0.5 per cent. to 1 per cent. of local authority current expenditure on education, up to £37 million will be available under this programme for mid-day supervision schemes in England in 1986-87. They come from the £1,250 million over four years which the Government have conditionally set aside for the reform of teachers' salary structure associated with an agreement on their duties within this total is also being made available for mid-day supervision in 1985-86.

Local Authority and Voluntary School Capital Expenditure

For 1986-87, £294 million will be available for allocation to local education authorities for capital expenditure on schools and colleges. When account is taken of education authorities' ability to make use of in-year and accumulated receipts and other flexibilities this should enable them to make progress with the removal of surplus school places. The department will be writing in dues course to local education authorities to inform them of the allocations within the education block. A further £2.7 million will be allocated to projects to provide additional places in science and technology in local authority provided higher education as part of the engineering and technology programme. Provision for grant to voluntary aided and special agreement schools has been increased by £6 million in each year in recognition of the increased pressure on the governors of these schools to undertake repairs in accordance with their duties under the Education Acts.

A revised system of control of local authority capital spending is under consideration for later years: the totals available for allocation in 1987-88 and 1988-89 will be considered in the light of the outcome of this consideration and other factors.

Higher Education

The cash available for each sector is set out in the following paragraphs. The figures allow for a tuition fee of £536 for home full-time and sandwich course students on courses designated for mandatory awards. The UGC and MAB plans for students admissions in 1986-87, together with admissions to other grant-aided institutions, are likely to satisfy the level of demand indicated by the revised variant Y projection shown in the Green Paper "The Development of Higher Education into the 1990's" (Cmd 9524).

Provision has been made in each year to meet higher costs arising from increased student numbers and a higher proportion of mandatory award-holders within those numbers. Details of new rates of award and revised contribution scales will be announced later.

Engineering and Technology Programme

I am providing within my programme for the continuation in 1988-89 and later years of the engineering and technology programme announced in March, the costs of which up to 1987-88 have been met in part by transfers to my programme from those of other Government Departments. The programme is expected when fully operational to provide an extra 5,000 university and polytechnic places in engineering, information technology and related disciplines.

Advanced further education

Following consultation with the local authority associations I have determined under regulations made under the Local Government Planning and Land Act 1980 the quantum of advanced further education expenditure within the predetermined pool in 1986-87 at £661 million. This includes provision of some £1 million for recurrent expenditure by local authority institutions taking part in the Engineering and Technology Programme; and otherwise represents an increase of 6 per cent. compared to the quantum for 1985-86, after taking into account the transfer to full local authority funding from 1986-87 of two institutions which are now funded in part by my Department.

I expect authorities to take the measures necessary to achieve in 1986-87 an average student:academic staff ratio of 12:1, in line with the target set by the national Advisory Body. The plans assume that authorities will look for further efficiency savings in non-teaching costs, compared to existing levels of expenditure and bearing in mind the recommendations on efficiency throughout further education made by the Audit Commission. The plans also include provisions for public sector institutions to take part in the Engineering and Technology Programme.

The National Advisory Body is considering how the quantum should be distributed between authorities. I shall decide each authority's share later in the year in the light of the NAB's advice.

Following consultations with the Voluntary Sector Consultative Council I have determined the quantum of AFE expenditure at voluntary colleges grant-aided solely by my Department at £45.4 million. I shall decide its distribution between the colleges later this year in the light of NAB's advice.

Universities

Subject to parliamentary approval, the total of recurrent grant for universities in the UGC list for the 1986-87 academic year will be £1,342 million. To the extent that the academic year falls partly in the 1987-88 Financial year the grant is subject to review in the normal way.

Recurrent grant for the 1986-87 academic year will remain at £1,309 million.

I intend to increase the amount available to the UGC for the improvement of equipment in selected centres of research from £7 million to £10 million in each of the financial years 1986-87 and 1987-88 and to make the same provision in 1988-89. In addition, I am making £1 million in 1986-87 and £2 million in each of the following years available to the Computer Board for the enhancement of the joint academic computing network (JANET). Together these two developments should significantly improve the facilities available in universities to the best of our research workers. General equipment grant for the universities for the academic year 1986-87 will be £95 million, which is a cash increase of 5.2 per cent. over the previous year. These figures do not include the separate provision being made over the academic year 1985-86 and 1986-87 for the equipment costs of the engineering and technology programme.

The Science Budget

The Science Budget, from which the research councils receive their grants in aid, will be £614 million in 1986-87, an increase in cash of £15 million over previous published plans for that year. £15 million additional cash provision compared with previous plans will be available in each following year. These sums will be distributed following advice from the ABRC, and should assist the councils to follow up promising new developments in a variety of scientific fields and so provide more opportunities for talented scientists to pursue research in this country.

General Certificate of Secondary Education WA

Mr. Madel asked the Sec State Education whether he will make a statement about the programme of preparation of teachers for the general certificate of secondary education.

Sir Keith Joseph: Preparations for the introduction of the GCSE, including the special programme of in-service training for GCSE teachers, are on course and proceeding to the timetable set for the introduction of the new examinations.

Under phase 1 of the special programme, the GCSE examining groups and the LEAs are currently making preparations for the later phases of the programmes: the in-service training seminars that will be conducted throughout 1986, beginning in January. Teacher's guides, prepared under the auspices of the Secondary Examination Council, will be distributed at the beginning of January to all GCSE teachers in readiness for these seminars; supporting videos will also be available for all schools and colleges.

The local authority associations have, however, made representations about the funding available to LEAs to meet the costs of the later phases of the special programme, during which first subject representatives (phase 2) and then all teachers (phase 3) will receive in-service training. At their request, and subject to the consent of Parliament, I have agreed to increase from 70 per cent. to 90 per cent. the rate of grant payable to LEAs towards the cost of providing cover for subject representatives attending phase 2 seminars. I have also considered their view that, whilst it is neither desirable nor practicable to provide cover for all the remaining teachers attending phase 3 seminars, it would be of help to LEAs in the organisation of these seminars if some resources were available to provide a limited amount of cover. Again, subject to the consent of Parliament, I am prepared to bring phase 3 seminars within the scope of the in-service teacher training grants scheme and thus to support expenditure of up to £2 million for teachers released to attend these seminars.

These changes, requested by the local authority associations, will I am sure be widely welcomed by LEAs and will be of help to them in their planning of the GCSE training programme.

The Department is issuing today a circular letter to LEAs informing them of these revised arrangements and giving advance notice of other elements for inclusion within the in-service teacher training grants scheme for the academic year 1986-87. It is my intention to lay new regulations before Parliament as soon as possible.

V86 N7

Youth Custody Sentences WA

Mr. Irving asked the Sec State Home Department how many juveniles and young adults, respectively, were serving youth custody sentences in (a) prisons and (b) remand centres on the most recent convenient date.

Mr. Mellor: The latest readily available information is given in the following table. Of the trainees shown, all the juveniles and some 40 per cent. of the young adults were being held for allocation or transfer to a youth custody centre, or for other temporary purposes, or had a net sentence of less than 21 days.

Youth custody trainees held in prisons and remand centres in England and Wales on 31 August 1983 by age and type of establishment.

Types of establishment	Number	
	Under 17	17 and over
Remand centres	25	155
Chelmsford prison†	—	255
Other prisons	25	815
All prisons and remand centres	50	1,225

* Based on central records which are approximate

† A prison for young offenders

V86 N8

General Certificate of Secondary Education WA

Mr. Patrick Thompson asked the Sec State for Educa if he will make a statement on his proposals to introduce distinction and merit certificates within the general certificate of secondary education examinations.

Sir Keith Joseph: In the light of the earlier consultations, I intend shortly to bring forward for further consultation revised proposals, which will accommodate some of the points made by those consulted while seeking to promote the Government's objective of encouraging all pupils, including the ablest, to follow broad and balanced curricula. The need for further consultation means that it will not be practicable for these revised proposals for distinction and merit certificates to be introduced as soon as 1988, the first year in which GCSE certificates will be awarded.

Heysel Football Stadium WA

Mr. Alton asked the Attorney-General whether action is to be taken to institute proceedings against anyone involved in the riot at the Heysel football stadium.

The Solicitor-General: Any offence of murder or manslaughter committed by a British subject abroad is triable in this country under English law. The English courts would not have jurisdiction to try any other criminal offences arising out of the events at the Heysel stadium on 29 May 1985. It is however open to the Belgian authorities to request the extradition to Belgium of British subjects for offences of murder, manslaughter or other offences of violence committed on their territory. There has, as yet, been no request by the Belgian authorities for the extradition of any British subjects. The Director of Public Prosecutions has considered evidence obtained by the Merseyside police in relation to 34 British subjects who were present at the Heysel stadium. Five of those persons have been informed that they will not be prosecuted in this country for murder or manslaughter, but it remains open to the Belgian authorities to decide whether to make a request for their extradition. The Director of Public Prosecutions is still considering the position of the other 29 British subjects interviewed by the Merseyside police and is taking the advice of leading counsel.

benefits

'Benefits' is a regular feature on current levels of benefit and prospective changes in rate or procedure. It is compiled by Rod Crawford, Welfare Rights Worker at the East End Citizens Rights Centre, Moor Terrace, Sunderland, Tyne & Wear, to whom suggestions or enquiries should be made.

As the Social Security Bill enters its Committee stage in the House of Commons, some of its less publicised plans are ominously coming to light. In response to D.H.S.S. releases before Xmas, University Chancellors and Rectors have united with students and their leaders to express their concern about proposals to severely curtail the right of students to claim Social Security and Housing Benefits.

The Vice-Chancellor of Durham University has said that, "financial difficulties are driving students out of Higher Education". Glasgow University Rector, Dr. Kelly is quoted as saying, "the real value of the student grant has fallen by some £320 since 1979...the fall...moderated by entitlement to welfare and housing benefits...but Government plans to cut these could cost students up to £800 a year". Dr. John Elsworth, Vice-Chancellor of East Anglia University has taken the unprecedented step of writing to parents of students urging them to lobby their MP's to oppose the Government plans for grants and benefits.

The Government rationale for the changes is that students should be helped, "through the awards system by their families and their own vacation earnings, rather than through the Benefit System". This is argued in conjunction with the point that students have in fact taken themselves out of the labour market in the interests of their own self and career development.

It is clear though that this argument ignores the reduction in the real value of the grant pointed to by Dr. Kelly and the increasing difficulty in finding any vacation work in a period where 4 million are unemployed. We are witnessing a regressive move back to education being a choice only for the sons and daughters of the rich.

Students will be unable to claim Unemployment Benefit during Xmas and Easter Vacations and if a student grant covers a whole year they will be unable to claim Unemployment Benefit or Supplementary Benefit throughout the year. Full time students will be deemed to be attending their courses during the short vacations and will be unable to claim Supplementary Benefit because they are "unavailable for work".

In relation to Housing Benefit, students in Halls of Residence will be unable to claim Housing Benefit and there will be a restriction on claims during the long vacation if the student is absent from their term-time

address. Indeed the proposal here states that students paying rent and rates to an "educational establishment" will be unable to claim. This has far reaching implications as many educational establishments act as managing agents for private landlords.

In this column I have already mentioned the plans now to be enshrined in the Soc. Sec. Bill to end all additional payments and all Grants as of right to recipients of Supplementary Benefit, Supplementary Pension or Housing Benefit Supplement. This will not happen at some future date in 1988. On the same day as his announcement of paltry 1½% increases in Benefits for July this Year, Norman Fowler announced plans for severe cut-backs in the value and range of single payment grants paid presently. These changes, to take place in July have had little or no publicity.

The justification by the Minister is that the number of claims for these items has increased 4 fold in the last 4 years. This, as a rationale for cutting back, is the philosophy of "blaming the victim" taken to its logical extreme. It is surely obvious that claims will increase as unemployment rises. The Government are also ignoring their own evidence. The official Government estimate of the non take-up of Benefit in 1981 was £760m, while the Policy Studies Institute last year in research commissioned by the D.H.S.S. estimated non take-up at £1000m.

Claimants are massively underclaiming their rights and entitlements to the tune of £1000m, the Government's response is not to try and ensure that people should be informed of their rights but to remove them.

The plans for July include the decision to severely limit the items classified as essential in relation to furniture and household goods. To be removed from this classification are floorcovering, curtains, towels, wardrobes, chest of drawers, kitchen cabinets, light fittings, hot water bottles and minor items. Recent tenants (only up to 28 days) will receive an inadequate payment of £75 instead. No payments will be made for items awarded within the previous 3 years, unless the claimant is chronically sick or disabled or a pensioner.

The grants made for maternity needs, clothing, footwear and re-decoration are all to be severely cut back. Bedding, for example, is paid presently to all those in receipt of Supplementary Benefit with a need, from July it will only be paid to Pensioners, the Chronically Sick and those with a good reason to move. Reg. 28 of the Single Payments Regs. which allows claimants to claim for benefit missed out on in the past if money has been spent on an item that could have been claimed is to be deleted.

Clearly then if anybody was labouring under the misapprehension that the Cut-Backs will come in 1988 after the next General Election it is time to think again.

YOUTH QUESTIONS

Series Editors: Phil Cohen and Angela McRobbie

With the continuing recession of the 1980s, high unemployment and government legislation, the position of young people in our society has changed radically. The **Youth Questions** series is based on current research examining the wide-ranging issues which directly concern today's youth.

Each book examines a particular aspect of the youth question in depth and makes the connections with the major political and intellectual debates that are now taking place about the present crisis and future shape of our society.

SCHOOLING FOR THE DOLE?

The New Vocationalism

Inge Bates, John Clarke, Philip Cohen, Dan Finn, Robert Moore and Paul Willis

The State's response to the increase in youth unemployment is to introduce training schemes and increase the content of work-related matter in the school curriculum. However, students and teachers argue should schools produce 'ideal workers' to help solve the economic crisis or independent people who can develop their own capacities to the full. This book charts an alternative approach which takes into account economic, political and educational factors, without rejecting the concept of a vocational curriculum.

216 x 138 mm
240 pp

£6.95 0 333 367294 paperback
£18.00 0 333 36728 6 hardback

GENDER AND GENERATION

Edited by Angela McRobbie and Mica Nava

Gender and Generation is a series of essays showing the gender and generational relations of young people in the spheres of leisure, sexuality, media and consumption. Its substantive themes - the contradictory discourses of adolescence and femininity, youth provision for girls, intergenerational sexual relations, pre-teen girls' comics, boy's sex talk, dance and fantasy, photographic work with young women, and the development of consumerism since the Second World War - provide a new basis for future work.

216 x 138 mm
240 pp

£5.95 0 333 33252 0 paperback
£15.00 0 333 33251 2 hardback

Forthcoming titles include

Multi-Racist Britain

Edited by Philip Cohen and Harwant Bains

The Making of the Youth Question

Edited by Philip Cohen and Graham Murdock

Youth and Photography

Andrew Dewdney and Martin Lister

Training Without Jobs: New Deals and Broken Promises

Dan Finn

For further information on this new Series, please contact Liz Digby Firth, Macmillan, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hants, RG21 2XS.

M MACMILLAN

contributors

John Astley teaches sociology at Oxford College of further education.

Peter Beresford works at Battersea Community Action.

David Byrne lectures in social work at Durham University.

Suzy Croft works at Battersea Community Action.

Chris Crossley is a youth worker in Berkshire.

Bob Franklin is a research officer at the Centre for T.V. Research University of Leeds.

Diana Gower lectures in social policy at Durham University.

Peter Kent-Baguley teaches youth and community work at Crewe and Alsager College.

Sue Lees teaches at the Women's Studies Unit, Polytechnic of North London. The research was carried out in three London Comprehensive schools in the early 1980's. A hundred 15 to 16 year old girls from varied social class and ethnic groups were interviewed singly, in pairs and in group discussion. The research will be published in May 1986 by Hutchinson, entitled **Learning to Love**.

Ruth Levitas lectures in sociology at the University of Bristol, and has recently edited the *Ideology of the New Right* (Polity Press 1985).

Tony Marron teaches social work at Newcastle Polytechnic.

Mike Nellis was Chair Person of the RAP Young Offenders Group (1978-80) and has been involved in IT work for nine years. He is currently a research student at the Institute of Criminology, Cambridge.

John Pitts is a senior lecturer in social work at West London Institute of Higher Education.

Beverley Skeggs is a lecturer and researcher at Crewe and Alsager College of Higher Education.

Mark Smith teaches youth and community work at the YMCA National College, London.

Caroline Thomas works for the Community Arts Project, Sunderland.

Terry Thomas teaches in the School of Social Studies, Leeds Polytechnic.

Harry Torrance is a Research Fellow in the Assessment & Examinations Unit at Southampton University and is currently engaged in a study of Records of Achievement.

YOUTH the journal of critical analysis AND POLICY

SUBMISSION

Material for the journal, including correspondence is welcomed within the stated editorial aims of relevance to the analysis and debate of issues surrounding youth in society from a perspective of the serious appraisal and critical evaluation of policy. Articles, papers and reports may be of any length up to 10,000 words, though in normal circumstances only one extended feature may be included in each issue. For reasons of space editing may be necessary without consultation, but where possible extensive alterations will be returned to the contributor for approval. All submissions should be typed in double spacing on white paper (for photocopying). Additional material such as diagrams, tables and charts should be clearly marked and included in the relevant place. Material not published will be returned if possible, but contributors should note that this cannot be guaranteed and are advised to keep copies. All materials should be sent to the relevant editor.

ARTICLES

Editor: Tony Jeffs, 'Burnbrae', Black Lane, Blaydon Burn, Blaydon, Tyne & Wear NE21 6DS.

REVIEWS

Editor: John Carr, Pallion Residents Enterprise, Roper Road, Pallion Industrial Estate, Sunderland.

Suggestions for future review material and names of possible contributors are invited from the readership.

WORKING SPACE

Editor: Malcolm Jackson, Gateshead Community Education Team, 13 Gladstone Terrace, Gateshead, Tyne & Wear.

INSERTS

Details and rates of advertising and circulation from: Youth and Policy, 13 Hunstanton Court, Ravenswood Estate, Low Fell, Gateshead NE9 6LA.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Youth and Policy, 13 Hunstanton Court, Ravenswood Estate, Low Fell, Gateshead NE9 6LA.

Annual Subscription (4 issues): £14.00

Students and unwaged £11.00

Individual copies: £4.00

Back issues (if available): At cover price

Overseas rate: £15 sterling

(includes postage at 'printed paper' rate)

Special terms for orders of ten or more, on request.

There is no special rate for institutions.

contents

NO.16 SPRING 1986

Ruth Levitas Tory Students and the New Right	1
Chris Crossley Police Involvement in Youth and Community Work	10
Bob Franklin The Youth and Policy Interview	14
Sue Lees A New Approach to the Study of Girls	20
Mike Nellis Death of an I.T. Programme	28
Harry Torrance Reforming the Secondary Examination System	34
Terry Thomas Juvenile Bureaux	39
Working Space	42
Reviews	43
Analysis	50
Monitor	51
Contributors	Inside back cover

YOUTH AND POLICY

the journal of
critical analysis