

HOOIGANS, VANDALS AND THE COMMUNITY:

A STUDY OF SOCIAL REACTION TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Stanley Cohen

Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Ph.D.

University of London

1969

ABSTRACT

The thesis consists of three studies on various ways in which society reacts to juvenile delinquency. It is introduced with an account of recent developments in the sociology of deviance which have drawn attention to the nature and effect of the societal reaction to deviance. These developments, termed the "transactional perspective", are put in the context of a "sceptical" reaction against more conventional ways of conceptualizing deviance. The implications of this new perspective for theory and research are indicated.

The first study is on vandalism, and starts by attempting to unravel the different definitions of this behaviour as a form of rule-breaking and deviance. It goes on to consider the processes through which vandalism becomes defined as a social problem and then discusses the main images and stereotypes through which society tries to conceptualize this form of delinquency. It finally considers the organized approaches to the prevention and control of vandalism. The second study is a survey of the views about delinquency - its nature, causes and control - and allied topics, held by a selected sample of official and unofficial control agents in a London Borough, "Northview". The relevance of these views to understanding the social control of delinquency is considered. The final study is of various types of response to the Mods and Rockers phenomenon. Using mass media and observational sources, an analysis is made of how this form of deviance was reported and conceptualized. The emergent images of the behaviour are related to the ways in which society attempted to control it. The effects of these reactions on the form and development of the phenomenon are suggested.

PREFACE

A period of nearly five years has elapsed since the beginnings of this research and its final writing up. In an area of study such as juvenile delinquency, such a time lag has resulted not only in the normal problems of being unable to absorb fully recent developments in the literature, but also of being left behind by social changes. These changes have made much of the material - for example, the statistical data in the Vandalism section - out of date. Other changes such as the growth of student protest movements, have undermined some of the analysis, for example, on the nature of intergenerational attitudes. I have not attempted fully to take such developments into account.

A thesis which takes a relatively long time to complete (and also intentionally covers a wide range of subjects rather than concentrating on a single one) has the other result of involving its author in debts and obligations too numerous to mention. I would like, though, to especially acknowledge the help of the following individuals and organizations at various stages of the research:-

In regard to the Vandalism section:- Mr. Eric Merrill, Public Relations Officer, British Railways Board; various officials at the Headquarters and local branches of the General Post Office; Dr. John Harrington, Research Director of the Birmingham Research Group on Soccer Hooliganism; Mr. H. Burke, Press Officer, Local Government Information Office; the Birmingham Corporation, particularly Councillor J.C. Silk, Chairman of the Parks Committee and Mr. S. Pittman, General Manager of the Parks Department and other "Victim Organizations" listed in Appendix A.

In regard to the Northview section:- Mr. H., the Principal Probation Officer for "Northview"; Mr. S., the Youth Organizer; Mr. C., the Clerk to the Justices; the Education Committee and all the respondents who were interviewed.

In regard to the Mods and Rockers section:- All those interviewed in the seaside resorts, particularly "Alderman K." and Mr. "Geoffrey Blake"; Mr. Martin Ennals, the then General Secretary of the National Council for Civil Liberties.

For general help and encouragement, I would like to thank Dr. David Downes. My greatest debt is to Dr. Terence Morris who patiently supervised the thesis from beginning to end.

The Central Research Fund of the University of London provided me with a grant towards research expenses.

4.
CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	2
Preface	3
List of Tables	6

PART I: INTRODUCTION

Chapter

1. Towards a Transactional Theory of Deviance	9
The Insulation of Criminology	10
Canonical and Sceptical Theories	16
The Concept of Deviance: The Reaction against Absolutism	17
Deviance as a Process; The Reaction against Positivism	23
The Effect of the Societal Reaction	27
Critiques of Functionalism and Anomie Theory	34
The Sociology of Law and Law Enforcement	39
Social Problems: The Subjective and Objective Aspects	43
Some Problems and Qualifications	48
2. Points of Entry	51

PART II: VANDALISM

3. What is Vandalism?	59
Sources of Data	62
What is Vandalism?	
The Problem of Definition	65
Rule-Breaking and Deviance	71
Institutionalized Rule-Breaking	78
Vandalism as a Label	100
Recognized Vandalism Offences	102
Ideological Vandalism	104
4. Vandalism as a Social Problem	114
Objective and Subjective Aspects	114
The Subjective Awareness	115
The Objective Evidence	124
The Conditions for Problem Definition	151
Awareness and Visibility	153
Enterprise and Publicity	160
Favourable Beliefs	183
5. Images, Conceptions and Stereotypes	193
Vandalism as Homogeneous and Meaningless: Types and Patterns	195
The Vandal as a Yob: Social Characteristics of Vandals	221
Vandalism as Deliberate, Determined or Drift: Causal Theories	233
6. Prevention and Control	250
Defeatism: What Can You Do?	251
Deflection: Understand and Channelize	253
Utilitarian Prevention: Protect and Detect	255
Education and Publicity: Bring the Lesson Home	262
Deterrence and Retribution: Clamp Down Hard	270
Primary Prevention: Strike at the Roots	279

PART III: ATTITUDES TO DELINQUENCY: THE NORTHVIEW SURVEY

	<u>Page</u>
7. Introduction	283
The Control System	283
Controllers, Caretakers and Entrepreneurs	293
Research Design	302
8. Attitudes to Youth	311
General Orientation	311
Communication	316
Awareness of Adolescent Problems	324
Some Comments	336
9. Attitudes About Delinquency	342
Orientation	342
Causation and Images	360
The Mods and Rockers	378
Reaction to Types of Delinquency and Information Affecting Decision-Making	379
10. Control and Prevention	391
The Juvenile Court	391
Prevention	397
Prediction	409
11. Some General Trends	418
Morality and Responsibility	418
Information, Attitudes and Policy	420
Soft or Hard?	422
Unanimity or Disagreement	423

PART IV: THE MODS AND ROCKERS

12. Introduction	430
Sources of Data	433
Modes and Models of Analysis	436
13. Reaction: The Inventory Phase	442
Exaggeration and Distortion	444
Prediction	451
Symbolization	452
14. Reaction: Opinion and Attitude Themes	458
Orientation	460
Images	464
Causation	471
15. Reaction: The Rescue and Remedy Phase	476
Sensitization to Deviance	476
The Societal Control Culture	484
Common Elements	485
The Control Agents	491
The Police	491
The Courts	501
The Formation of an Exclusive Control Culture	512
The Exploitative Culture	542
16. Warning and Impact	547
The Warning Phase	547
The Impact	552
The Crowd and the Setting	552
The Audience	561
The Mass Media	564
The Control Agents	570
Summary	579

	<u>Page</u>
17. Differences, Contexts and Reasons	581
Differential Reaction	581
Contexts and Reasons	590

PART V: CONCLUSION

18. Credibility and Applicability	600
-----------------------------------	-----

APPENDICES

A. List of Victim Organizations Contacted for Information about Vandalism	606
B. Specimen List of Questions Given to Vandalism Victim Organizations	608
C. Extracts from Sermon on Vandalism Distributed by Local Government Information Office	610
D. Leaflet Issued during Birmingham "Stop Vandalism Week", 9th - 15th January, 1967.	616
E. Extracts from Proposals for an Advertising Campaign, Prepared for British Railways by "Madison" Advertising Agency	617
F. Northview Survey: Interview Schedule	621
G. Specimen Letter sent to Northview Sample	631
H. Brighton Sample: Interview Schedule	632

REFERENCES	633
------------	-----

LIST OF TABLES

1. Awareness of Football Hooliganism as a Problem	124
2. Number of "Other Malicious Injuries" Known to the Police, 1930 - 1967	126
3. Number of Persons Dealt with Summarily for "Malicious Damage to Property" Magistrates Courts, 1930 - 1967	127
4. Number of Persons Found Guilty of Malicious Injuries to Property and Malicious Damage, 1961 - 1967	128
5. Extent of Vandalism to Birmingham Corporation Property: Selected Examples for year ending 31st May, 1965	135
6. Extent of Vandalism on the Railways: 1960 - 1966	140
7. Awareness of Vandalism as a Problem by Three Building and Construction Companies	143
8. Estimated Cost of Damage from Vandalism Reported by Local Authorities, 1963	145
9. Estimated Cost of Damage from Vandalism Edinburgh Corporation Property, 1965	146
10. Extent and Cost of Vandalism in Birmingham Parks, 1962 - 1966	173
11. Malicious Injuries and Malicious Damage to Property: Number Proceeded Against According to Sex, Magistrates Courts, England and Wales, 1967	224
12. Malicious Injuries and Malicious Damage to Property: Proportions Proceeded Against According to Age, Magistrates Courts, England and Wales, 1967	225
13. Number of Prosecutions for Railway Vandalism According to Age, 1963 and 1964	226
14. Comparative Costs of Vandalism to Departments of Birmingham Corporation, 1966 and 1967	266

15.	Sentences Given to Persons Found Guilty of Vandalism Offences, 1967	271
16.	Numbers and Occupational Groups in Northview Sample	304
17.	Social Characteristics of Northview Sample	307
18.	Evaluation of Changes in Young People	312
19.	Evaluation of Changes in Young People According to Respondents' Social Mobility	315
20.	Evaluation of Changes in Young People According to Respondents' Age	316
21.	Ways in Which Young People Today are Thought to Have Changed from the Previous Generation	317
22.	Awareness of Communication as a Personal Problem and as a General Social Problem	318
23.	Awareness of Communication as a Problem According to Respondents' Occupation	322
24.	Awareness of Communication as a Problem According to Respondents' Age	324
25.	Perception of Importance of Various Adolescent Problems	325
26.	Perception of the Extent of the Delinquency Problem	343
27.	Types of Delinquency that Have Increased Most	345
28.	Types of Juvenile Behaviour About Which "Something Should Be Done"	347
29.	Ways in Which Delinquency Should be Handled	349
30.	The One Most Important Perceived Cause of Juvenile Delinquency	362
31.	Ways in Which Family Background is Thought to Cause Delinquency	363
32.	Ways in Which School/Educational Factors are thought Relevant in Causing Delinquency	366
33.	Ways in Which Economic Factors are Thought Relevant in Causing Delinquency	368
34.	Importance of Various Factors as Causes of Delinquency	371
35.	Reactions to Fifteen Types of Delinquency	381
36.	Importance of Various Factors in Affecting Decision Making	386
37.	Opinions about the Juvenile Court	392
38.	Opinions about the Type of Person Selected as Juvenile Court Magistrates	395
39.	Role of Youth Work in Preventing Delinquency	400
40.	Role of Schools in Preventing Delinquency	403
41.	Role of Psychiatry in Preventing Delinquency	406
42.	Attitudes to the Use of Prediction Methods in Delinquency Prevention	410
43.	Social Characteristics of Brighton Sample, Whitsun 1965	436
44.	Cost of Damage at Four Resorts, Easter and Whitsun 1964	450
45.	Opinion Statements on Solutions to the Mods and Rockers Problem	488
46.	Brighton Sample: Single Most Favoured Solution to the Mods and Rockers Problem	490
47.	Northview Sample: Judgments on Appropriate Punishments for the Mods and Rockers	490
48.	Police Overtime Costs: Brighton, Easter 1965-Easter 1966	492
49.	Court Action: Margate, Whitsun, 1964	503
50.	Court Action: Hastings, August, 1964	503

PART I

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1TOWARDS A TRANSACTIONAL THEORY OF DEVIANCE

The aim of this thesis is to explore a number of themes which have been converging in recent years in the "interactionist", "transactional" and "labelling" approaches to deviant behaviour and social problems. The writers who have contributed to this perspective differ from each other in many important respects; they can be said, however, to share at least one common focus of interest: the nature and effect of the societal reaction to deviance. It is this interest which provides the connecting thread between the various ideas and empirical findings discussed in the thesis.

The transactional approach (a term which I will use in preference to "interactionist" which has more general connotations in sociology and social psychology, and "labelling" which is too closely connected with one specific theory) is purposely referred to as an "approach" rather than a "theory". It has provided us with a set of concepts, insights and perspectives - some new and some re-statements of familiar sociological knowledge - to use in the traditional areas of criminology and the sociology of deviance. It does not have the status of a fully fledged theory and it would be inappropriate at this stage to talk of testing derivative hypotheses and trying to prove or disprove the theory. The language of this thesis - as explained in the next chapter - is that of description, exploration and theory generation, rather than that of verification.

Partly because the transactional approach is not a theory, it is not the aim of this opening chapter to summarize all its aspects and to argue in logico-deductive terms about all its ramifications. It is also beyond the scope of the thesis to provide an historical account of the theories on which the perspective is based: for example, Meadian symbolic interactionism. The perspective can best be understood - somewhat like underground movements in art and literature - as a reaction against

traditional ways of looking at one's subject matter. It will be in these terms that this chapter will introduce the main issues raised by transactionalism, only some of which are taken up in the thesis. Firstly, some general aspects of theories in criminology will be commented on, then the specific ways in which transactional and similar approaches differ from established theories will be indicated. In Chapter 2, the themes from this analysis, which provide points of entry for empirical research, will be discussed and the design of the thesis outlined.

The Insulation of Criminology

Two related convictions affected my choice of approach, subject matter and methods in writing this thesis. These should be made explicit as they reflect personal opinions about how sociologists should orient themselves to the study of crime, delinquency and other forms of deviant behaviour.

These convictions are, firstly, that criminology should be brought back into the mainstream of sociology from which it has become insulated and, secondly, that it is necessary and worthwhile not just to talk about particular forms of deviant behaviour, but about the concept of deviance as such. One reason for choosing the transactional perspective, as well as its intrinsic theoretical potential, is that it represents the most promising recent development in line with these two convictions.

The insulation of criminology from sociology is evidenced on the one hand by its claim to be an autonomous, multi-disciplinary field and on the other by the relative lack of knowledge and interest admitted by sociologists in the research and theories which criminologists are concerned with. No sociologist would show a comparable lack of knowledge in other subfields of sociology, such as industrial sociology and political sociology. This insulation is all the more surprising in view of the fact that the study of deviance was rooted in the central concerns of sociological theory. As Becker, among others, has noted, to theorists like Durkheim,

"problems of deviance were problems of general sociology."¹ Not only was there the obvious case of Suicide, but also in Rules of the Sociological Method, an important theme was that sociologists should formulate new criteria for distinguishing between the normal and the pathological in society. Even the most aberrant behaviour from the point of view of the psychiatrist might be normal; pathology is defined from the point of view of the group making the definition. Earlier, in The Division of Labour in Society, Durkheim referred to the positive functions of crime in drawing the community together in a common posture of anger and indignation against the criminal. All these themes, as will be shown later in this chapter, have been taken up by neo-Durkheimian theorists of deviance, such as Erikson, who have identified themselves with the transactional perspective.

The reasons for the severing of the connections between the study of deviance and the mainstream of sociology are complex and beyond my scope to discuss in detail. I will briefly outline only those which have functioned as an impetus to the development of new perspectives on deviance. These new approaches might best be understood as reactions to the insulation of criminology and the absence of any widespread interest in the general concept of deviance.

On the side of sociology, the insulation seems due firstly to the intellectual equivalent of the sort of philistine distrust which greeted the work of Durkheim and Freud. How can the phenomenon of suicide help to explain how societies work normally? How can the intrapsychic conflicts of middle-class Viennese Jews explain how the normal mind works? Many sociologists are inclined to dismiss, along more sophisticated but essentially similar lines, the study of crime and deviant behaviour as an esoteric and peripheral occupation. More important has been the way in which sociological theory has itself developed, with its stress on a

1. Howard S. Becker, Introduction to The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance, (New York: Free Press, 1964), p. 1.

consensus model of society. In this model, deviance is defined in terms of perceived departures from a central value system, or derivatives of this value system. Deviance is thus something to be explained away, rather than explained. In the more mechanistic versions of this theory, crime and deviance are simply the result of the machine going wrong. Like the rejects from a conveyor belt, they are not of particular interest. It is precisely this sort of conception which recent theorists of deviance have reacted against. Later in this chapter the criticisms of the most important consensus theory, functionalism and its derivative, anomie theory, will be discussed.

The major reasons for the insulation, though, lie on the side of criminology and the study of deviant behaviour. In the first place, these fields of study in their early stages transplanted concepts from such areas as law, medicine and psychiatry with little thought of their relevance to the sociologically significant facts about deviance. This led - as Lemert noted simply by computing the numbers of "pathological deviants" estimated in early textbooks² - to meaningless and overlapping classifications of behaviour, a confusion of sociological with other fields and to the absence of any usable distinction between normal and abnormal behaviour. Another problem which Lemert identified was the need to divest terms such as "pathological" of their moralistic and unscientific overtones.³ In one of his best-known polemics, written a few years before Lemert's paper, Mills made a similar criticism, again by analysing the textbooks in the fields of social pathology, social disorganization and social problems.⁴ He drew attention to the low level of abstraction in the field and the failure to consider the larger problems of the social

-
2. Edwin M. Lemert, "Some Aspects of a General Theory of Sociopathic Behaviour," Proceedings of the Pacific Sociological Society, (Research Studies, State College of Washington) 16, (1948), pp. 23 - 24, and Social Pathology (New York: McGraw Hill, 1951), Chapter 2.
 3. Lemert, (1948), op.cit., p. 25.
 4. C. Wright Mills, "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists," American Journal of Sociology, 49 (September 1945), pp. 165 - 180.

structure and the fact that the books were written from the perspective of small town rural society (from which all but one of his 24 textbook authors originated). In these writings there was an overt condemnation of the values of the "big city".

Clearly the field has advanced a great deal since Mills wrote 25 years ago: the moral denunciations are less obvious and the influence of ideas such as Merton's anomie theory, has led to a greater awareness of macro-sociological factors. Nevertheless, as a recent re-examination of Mills' criticisms concludes, much of the literature on social problems remains non-sociological in character.⁵

The major factor leading to the insulation was the early identification of the study of deviant behaviour with reformative, social work and other practical concerns. The problem became how to help society to deal with those it found troublesome: "Students of deviance devoted themselves to answering the questions posed by laymen and their elected and appointed officials."⁶ Such a task is, of course, not incompatible with sociology, but, if taken as the sole criterion for research, it does impose a rigid and theoretically untenable approach to the subject. In regard to criminology, Polsky has recently argued, in more extreme terms, against the identification of the subject with the official demands of social control agencies.⁷ He notes that of all subfields of sociology, criminology has been least successful in freeing itself of traditional social work concerns and contends that:

The great majority of criminologists are social scientists only up to a point - the point usually being the start of the second 'control of crime' half of the typical criminology course - and beyond that point they are really social workers in disguise or correction officers manques. For them, a central task of

5. E. Bend and M. Vogelfanger, "A New Look at Mills' Critique" in B. Rosenberg et al (Eds.), Mass Society in Crisis, (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 111 - 122.

6. Becker, op.cit., p. 1.

7. Ned Polsky, "Research Method, Morality and Criminology," in Hustlers, Beats and Others, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967).

criminology, often the central task, is to find more effective ways to reform lawbreakers and to keep other people from becoming lawbreakers.⁸

Whether or not one accepts the radical divorce of theory from action which Polsky proposes - and it would seem, to say the least, that he very much over-simplifies the Weberian discussion of sociology and values - his proposition that the emphasis in criminology on social work and correctional interests has led to the severance of connections with sociology, seems valid. His comment on Merton's condemnation of the "slum encouraged provincialism of thinking that the primary subject matter of sociology was centred on such peripheral problems of social life as divorce and juvenile delinquency" is very relevant:

Given the perspectives within which delinquency and crime are always studied it is obvious why Merton might regard them as peripheral problems of social life rather than fundamental processes of central concern to sociology.⁹

Polsky very much caricatures the criminologists' position; the Chicago School, for example, although very much reform-oriented, were always aware of their links with sociology. Statements such as Tannenbaum's are typical: "A theory of criminology must first of all be a theory of behaviour of which criminal conduct is only a part."¹⁰ It remains true, however, that the mainstream of criminology has remained oriented towards the interests of social control and towards answering the layman's question, "Why did they do it?", and its corollary, "How can we prevent it happening again?" It is precisely the need to question rather than take for granted the public's conception of crime, deviance and social problems, that Lemert, Becker and other transactionalist writers have insisted on.

A corollary of the belief that the study of crime and deviant behaviour is an integral part of sociology, is that meaningful things can be said

8. Ibid., pp. 141 - 142.

9. Ibid., p. 142.

10. Frank Tannenbaum, Crime and the Community, (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1938), p. 218.

about the phenomenon and concept of deviance as such. Any consistently sociological approach to the field presupposes this belief and any definition of the concept should be abstract and generalizable. Cohen's Parsonian definition of deviant behaviour is such an example: "... any behaviour which violates institutionalized expectations - that is, expectations which are shared and recognized as legitimate within a social system."¹¹ In defending this definition, Cohen calls for a concentration on "... the theoretical problems inherent in the fact of deviance itself,"¹² as opposed to understanding the field as a simple summation of the sociology of drug addiction plus the sociology of suicide plus the sociology of crime, etc.

This is not to say that there are not radically different forms of deviant behaviour, nor that crime is not peculiarly different from other forms of deviance, nor that a typological approach to crime is not useful for either theory or treatment. The point is that these differences and their dimensions should be seen against the background of a theory; they are over-simplified by being taken for granted. In addition to the theoretical need for a concept of deviance, there is the empirical fact that the criteria for defining acts of deviance in particular ways - for example, as odd, criminal or mad - are vague, subjective and continually shifting. Behaviour such as homosexuality has crossed and re-crossed the boundary line between criminal and non-criminal deviance. There is another reason for alerting oneself to the generic aspects of deviance: namely, that by considering together apparently disparate forms of behaviour, new insights into a particular phenomenon may be derived. Goffman's work on stigma is an excellent example of this.¹³ In his claim

11. Albert K. Cohen, "The Study of Social Disorganization and Deviant Behaviour," in R.K. Merton et al (Eds.), Sociology Today, (New York: Basic Books, 1959), p. 462.

12. Ibid., p. 463. See also the same author's Deviance and Control, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966), especially Chapters 1 and 2.

13. Erving Goffman, Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1963).

that the papers in The Other Side bear witness to the closing of the gap between sociology and the study of deviance, Becker cites as evidence two hopeful trends: firstly, the location of phenomena of deviance in terms of similar phenomena in more conventional settings (for example, prisons are compared with schools, industries and hospitals) and, secondly, the extension of the area of study from classical deviance, such as crime, to other forms of behaviour.¹⁴

In summary, although the principles of integrating the study of crime and deviant behaviour into sociology and of considering the general notion of deviance have been stated as personal convictions rather than argued out, it could be maintained that these are precisely the sort of principles which are implicit in the new perspectives on deviance to be discussed in this chapter.

Canonical and Sceptical Theories

The transactional approach to deviance is part of a larger reaction in criminology, the sociology of deviance and sociology as a whole against the legacy of positivism and of particular sociological theories - and hence theories of deviance - such as anomie and functionalism. The direction of this revolt is to replace absolutist with relativist conceptions of deviance and social problems, and to question the dominant functionalist and positivist images of the deviant. Because of the special connotations of terms such as "absolutist" and "relativist" in philosophy and the peculiar meaning that "positivism" has to criminologists, I will use two new terms, canonical and sceptical, to refer to the older and newer traditions respectively. The newer tradition is sceptical in the sense that when it sees terms like "deviant", it asks, "Deviant to whom?", or "deviant from what?"; when it deals with social problems, it asks "problematic to whom?"; when it is told that certain actions are not functional, it asks "functional for whom?". The tradition assumes that

14. Becker, op.cit., pp. 1 - 2.

these concepts do not have a taken-for-granted status.

By characterizing the traditions as being one of these two polar types, one is of course exaggerating what are only general tendencies. This is an attempt, for analytical purposes, to identify two broad theoretical viewpoints, and to locate transactional theory as a most explicit and promising form of the reaction against canonical theories of deviance. This reaction subsumes a number of specific positions, often from very different starting-off points and from different disciplines; not all the theorists identified as sceptical are trying to do the same thing, or will even necessarily agree with each other. For example, Laing's theory of mental illness is in no sense an explicit revolt against functionalism, and Wilkins, although in some contexts presenting a sceptical view of deviance, is a defendant of prediction, which is a positivist principle. This section will identify, under six separate headings, the various types of sceptical positions, all of which, in one way or another, point to the importance of the key variable around which the thesis is built: the societal reaction to deviance.

1. The Concept of Deviance: The Reaction against Absolutism

The basic starting-off point of transactional theory - the one that gives meaning to terms such as "transactional" and "interactionist" - is a sceptical look at the concept of deviance itself. The empirical existence of forms of behaviour that are labelled as deviant, should not lead us to accept that the property of deviance is something which is given, obvious and unquestionable. Deviance is neither an intrinsic property of the act, nor a quality possessed by the actor; instead it is the product of a process of interaction. Becker's formulation on this point has been quoted verbatim so often by transactional writers, that it has virtually acquired its own canonical status:

... deviance is created by society. I do not mean this in the way that it is ordinarily understood, in which the causes of deviance are located in the social situation of the deviant or in "social factors" which prompt his action. I mean, rather,

that social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance and by applying those rules to particular persons and labelling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender". The deviant is one to whom the label has successfully been applied; deviant behaviour is behaviour that people so label.¹⁵

In this particular formulation, Becker is not saying anything particularly new or startling. He is, in fact, expressing a sociological truism intrinsic to any adequate definition of deviance: namely, that deviance lies not in the act or actor, but in the group's definitions of and reactions to any particular behaviour. To this extent Akers is correct in complaining that sociologists have always thought in these terms and that labelling theorists like Becker have devoted a lot of effort to exorcising a "non-existent fallacy" which only the most unregenerate biological or constitutional determinist would defend.¹⁶ Akers concedes, however, that of the two significant questions in the sociology of deviance - firstly, how and why certain kinds of behaviour and people get defined and labelled as deviant and, secondly, how and why some people engage in deviant acts - it is the second which has received virtually all the attention.¹⁷ What also needs to be said is that even if Becker's point is a truism - and was so in Durkheim's writings - the mainstream of criminology has proceeded as if the question of deviance is not a problematic one at all. It has taken as given that certain forms of behaviour are deviant, criminal, pathological, dysfunctional, problematic. These labels now become the problem.

The importance of Becker, and those who have followed his lead, such as

-
- 15. Howard S. Becker, Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance, (New York: Free Press, 1963), p. 9.
 - 16. Ronald L. Akers, "Problems in the Sociology of Deviance: Social Definitions and Behaviour," Social Forces, 46 (June 1968), p. 462.
 - 17. Ibid.

Kitsuse¹⁸ and Erikson¹⁹, lies not simply in stating that behaviour is only deviant because others have defined it so, but in beginning to spell out the implications of this fact for theory and research. To Becker, the implication is that deviance must be conceived as "... the product of a transaction that takes place between some social group and one that is viewed by that group as a rule-breaker."²⁰ This means one must focus on the process by which persons come to be thought of as outsiders, the people who make and enforce rules and the conditions under which rules are made and enforced. The other side of the transaction is the way outsiders react to these judgments. Becker also makes the conceptual distinction between rule-breaking behaviour and deviant behaviour; the latter being only those acts of rule-breaking labelled as deviant by some segment of society.²¹

Kitsuse spells out similar implications. For him, the emphasis should be switched from forms of deviant behaviour to "... the process by which persons come to be defined as deviant by others."²² He notes that the point of view of the definers should be incorporated into a sociological definition of deviance and identifies a series of stages by which members of a group: (i) interpret behaviour as deviant; (ii) define persons who so behave as certain kinds of deviants and (iii) treat them in a way considered appropriate to such deviants.²³

Erikson draws identical implications; because deviance is not a property inherent in but conferred upon behaviour by the audience,

-
- 18. John I. Kitsuse, "Societal Reaction to Deviant Behaviour Problems of Theory and Method," Social Problems, 9 (Winter 1962), pp. 247 - 256; also in Becker (1964), op.cit.
 - 19. Kai T. Erikson, "Notes on the Sociology of Deviance," Social Problems, 9 (Spring 1962); also in Becker (1964), op.cit.; and Wayward Puritans: A Sociological Study of Deviance, (London: John Wiley, 1966), Chapter 1.
 - 20. Becker (1963), op.cit., p. 10.
 - 21. Ibid., p. 14.
 - 22. Kitsuse (1962), op.cit., p. 248.
 - 23. Ibid.

The critical variable in the study of deviance ... is the social audience rather than the individual actor, since it is the audience which eventually determines whether or not any episode of behaviour or any class of episodes is labelled as deviant.²⁴

He goes on to conceive of social control in terms of an intricate screening or filtering device by which society selects its deviants. Law enforcement involves such a screening and it is necessary to take into account in studying its workings, not only the nature of the rule-breaking, but the properties of the actor, such as social class, amount of remorse, respect for the rule-enforcer, previous history of deviance and so on.

In the most explicit of early versions of transactionalism, that of Lemert, the implications for research were spelt out much more fully and Lemert avoided many of the ambiguities of which Becker, Erikson and Kitsuse can be accused. In his 1948 paper, he called for an abandonment of "the archaic and medicinal idea that human beings can be divided into normal and pathological" and proposed to use the notions of social and cultural differentiation, designating as "sociopathic phenomena" those forms of differentiated behaviour which are socially disapproved at a given time and place, even though the same behaviour may be approved in other contexts.²⁵ The nature of the societal awareness and reaction to the "differentiation" were thus the key variables. Although Lemert's terminology - which he retained in his later textbook - is itself somewhat archaic, he attempts specifically to formulate a theory of "sociopathic individuation", describes in detail various aspects of the societal reaction (such as the development of stereotypes and the attribution of spurious qualities to the deviant) and suggests how these affect the deviant.²⁶

The implications of Lemert's early writing were largely ignored and

24. Erikson (1964), op.cit., p. 11.

25. Lemert (1948), op.cit., pp. 24 - 25.

26. Lemert (1951), op.cit., Chapters 1 - 3.

transactionalism has been presented very much as a theory of the sixties.²⁷ As such its conception of deviance has received little systematic critical attention yet. Akers has recently expressed, though, what must be the main grounds for disquiet at the more simplistic and vulgarized use of this conception: namely, the insinuation that the labelling, or the societal reaction, creates the behaviour in the first place; that the actual behaviour is unimportant, only the reaction counts:

One sometimes gets the impression from reading this literature that people go about minding their own business and then - 'wham' - bad society comes along and slaps them with a stigmatized label. Forced into the role of deviant the individual has little choice but to be deviant.²⁸

Clearly, Akers is not just exaggerating the labelling theorists' position, as he admits, but also distorting it. Becker's distinction between rule-breaking and deviance, but more importantly and less ambiguously, Lemert's between primary and secondary deviation²⁹, makes it clear that the original behaviour is not being ignored. The behavioural question about the initial causation of the act eventually labelled as deviant, is conceptually separate from the question of how the labelling occurs and what effect it has.

It should be noted that the reactions against absolutist or canonical concepts of deviance have come from sources other than the transactional perspective. Wilkins, for example, has attempted to formulate a theory of deviance that is "value free", in the sense of not referring to the direction of the deviance.³⁰ He is clearly using a relative rather than absolutist conception of deviance in constructing a continuum of human acts, (ranging from the very good to the very bad) along which public definitions define

27. See Jack P. Gibbs, "Conceptions of Deviant Behaviour: The Old and the New," Pacific Sociological Review, 9 (Spring 1966), pp. 9 - 14.

28. Akers, op.cit., p. 463.

29. Lemert (1951), op.cit., pp. 75 - 78. Lemert's ideas on secondary deviation are further developed in "The Concept of Secondary Deviation" in his book Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1967), pp. 40 - 46.

30. Leslie T. Wilkins, Social Deviance: Social Policy, Action and Research, (London: Tavistock, 1964), Chapter 4.

cutting off points. The factors effecting the definitions are the tolerance levels for deviance and the amount of information about that class of acts. Wilkin's approach is somewhat inadequate as a "general theory" of deviance and it contains a number of absurdities: for example, the attempt to express the tolerance of deviation and its likelihood of occurrence in terms of a standard deviation measurement. The theory is of interest, however, in including "amount of knowledge" as a factor and drawing attention to the fact that the information about deviance in a complex society is second-hand. It is not derived as directly as in the hypothetical village community and is hence subject to processes such as stereotyping.

A more radically sceptical critique of the concept of deviance has come from the "anti-psychiatry" school of thought, about the nature of mental illness.³¹ Cooper, Laing and others have explicitly questioned the notion of schizophrenia as an objective fact and have suggested that the medical model along which a diagnosis of a condition or illness within the person is made, is quite inappropriate. The specific implications of this debate for theories of mental illness are beyond our scope; what is of interest is that Laing's stress on the importance of "others" (family, social workers, psychiatrists) in defining what is and what is not schizophrenia, closely parallels the transactionalist approach to deviance as a whole. Laing contrasts the "clinical positivist" criterion in defining deviance, with one that takes into account the circumstances in which the label of schizophrenia is pinned on a person.³² Schizophrenia is not - as the layman views it - a condition whose existence can be taken for granted and then diagnosed and treated:

Schizophrenia is a label affixed by some people to others in situations where an interpersonal disjunction of a particular

31. See David Cooper, Psychiatry and Anti-Psychiatry, (London: Tavistock, 1967).

32. R.D. Laing, "The Schizophrenic Experience," in The Politics of Experience and the Bird of Paradise, (London: Penguin, 1967).

kind is occurring. This is the nearest one can get at the moment to something like an "objective statement, so called."³³

Sociologists may find Laing's mode of expression an alien one, but there is no reason why his theory cannot be reformulated in more conventional sociological language. Scheff's theory of mental illness as residual rule-breaking which becomes stabilized into chronic mental illness partly because of the societal reaction it evokes,³⁴ is such an example, although it suffers from the vulgarization of transactionalism referred to earlier.

2. Deviance as a Process: The Reaction against Positivism

Although the questions about how deviant behaviour develops and how certain behaviour is defined as deviant can be distinguished analytically, sceptical views of deviance have implications for the behavioural question, as well as the definitional question. Primarily, these views have converged in the form of a reaction against the dominant positivist explanations of crime and deviance, and the positivist picture of what the criminal, delinquent or deviant looks like.

The term "positivism" has a number of specific, but overlapping, connotations in sociology. It refers to a particular approach to the subject, based on the ideas of Comte, which stresses the relevance of the models and methods of the natural sciences to understanding society. Positivism in this sense is contrasted today with schools of thought such as phenomenology. Although Laing, Scheff, Matza, Garfinkel and others who have taken sceptical views of deviance have explicitly drawn from phenomenological thought, this broader debate about the methodological limitations of sociological positivism is beyond our scope. "Positivism" is a term which has a very much more specific meaning in criminology and is intrinsically connected with the approach laid down by Lombroso. Matza has documented the common themes of Lombrosian positivism, shown how they

33. Ibid., p. 57.

34. Thomas J. Scheff, Being Mentally Ill: A Sociological Theory, (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1966).

differed from the older classical view, and convincingly argued that all contemporary theories of crime and delinquency are positivist in character.³⁵ His theory of "drift", the details of which need not concern us, is a conscious reaction against positivism: it reasserts the importance of the delinquent's relation to legal norms and presents a view of delinquency as a process, rather than a quality of the person. To paraphrase Laing's attack on the positivist notion of schizophrenia: "no one has delinquency, like having a cold."³⁶

Matza identifies three assumptions of positivism: (i) the primacy of the actor rather than the legal norms as a point of departure for theory construction; (ii) the quest for scientific status and hence the acceptance of deterministic theories of causality (an assumption related to the broader sociological meaning of positivism) and (iii) the assumption of differentiation: the delinquent is fundamentally different (for example, in terms of personality and value system) from the non-delinquent. His notion of drift questions all these three assumptions, and presents a picture of the delinquent half-way between the classical and the positivist views: neither compelled to delinquency, nor freely choosing it, neither fundamentally different, nor precisely the same as the law abiding and with a dialectical relationship to conventional tradition and the legal institution.³⁷ The drift into delinquency is:

... a gradual process of movement, unperceived by the actor, in which the first stage may be accidental or unpredictable from the point of view of any theoretic frame of reference, and deflection from the delinquent path may be similarly accidental or unpredictable.³⁸

This view moves away from specifying the invariant determinants of delinquency, to considering the conditions which make the drift possible;

35. David Matza, Delinquency and Drift, (New York: Wiley, 1964), Chapter 1.

36. R.D. Laing, The Divided Self, (London: Penguin, 1965), p. 34.

37. Matza, op.cit., p. 28.

38. Ibid., p. 29.

the focus is on the process of becoming delinquent. Because different conditions operate at different stages in this process, Matza might have added a fourth assumption of positivism which should be questioned; the assumption of constancy; namely, that it is enough to invoke one and the same factor (or set of factors) as the cause of delinquency. It is this sort of assumption which Becker questions when he notes the need for a sequential model of deviance, which takes into account the patterns of behaviour developed at various stages in the process.³⁹ In his account of the process of becoming a marijuana user, he shows that there are no invariant factors which always cause the behaviour: different explanations must be used at each stage of the process (why do some start smoking? Why do some continue?) and the variables which account for each step might not distinguish between users and non-users.

The picture of the deviant drawn by Becker, Matza and others forces us to use a sequential model of deviance, to use concepts such as "career" and "career contingencies" in describing the sequence and to move away from the obsession with trying to discover initial motivating factors and ways in which the deviant is initially different from the non-deviant. The process of commitment to a deviant role involves changes in the individual's perspective on others and himself: what is important from the transactionalist point of view, is that at each stage of the process the reaction of others effects the individual's behaviour and self-concept.

There are a number of theoretical bases from which the picture of this interaction between self and other can be derived. In Parsons' theory - as Cohen has noted⁴⁰ - deviance is conceptualized as an interactive process in which alter's response to ego's action contributes to ego's continued conformity or deviance. The more important body of theory in terms of its influence on transactionalist writers, is Meadian symbolic interactionism,

39. Becker, (1963), op.cit., Chapter 2.

40. Cohen, (1959), op.cit.

Mead's dramaturgical concept of role-playing has influenced writers such as Goffman and his views on socialization have been taken over in career studies, such as those of Hughes and Becker. Lemert noted specifically in his original (1948) paper and his textbook, that concepts such as interaction, self and role had to be used for a "processual analysis of deviance". The whole conception of primary and secondary deviation rests on the fact that secondary deviation is accompanied by a corresponding self definition and that this self definition is partially shaped by the definitions of others. Transactionalist and similar views cannot, in fact, be understood apart from their grounding in symbolic interactionism. To Mead, central significance has to be given to the interaction at the symbolic level, in which people make tentative moves and then re-adjust and re-orient their activity in the light of responses (real or imagined) that others make to their moves. Conduct is thus shaped to take into account the reactions of others.

The use of concepts such as meaning, mind and self, moves us far away from the tenets of positivism: it alerts us not only to seeing the reactions of others - these can be accommodated within a positivist framework - but also to seeing the interaction process from the point of view of the deviant. This is one point of departure for writers such as Laing's even more radical break with positivism. For him, the positivist version of the deviant is merely a specialized form of the general tendency to reification and depersonalization in the social sciences. The difference between studying an organism and studying a person, is the need to see how the person's world looks to him: just seeing his "symptoms" is incompatible with seeing him as a person.

The implications of these - and similar viewpoints from other directions - on research, have yet to be clearly enunciated. In Deutscher's remarks on delinquency research in a volume on symbolic interactionism, one central implication is pointed to:

the shift from factors to process.⁴¹ The bulk of research in the fields of criminology (and social deviance, social disorganization and social problems) is directed towards the taxonomic tabulation of the delinquents' traits, in order to see how they differ from non-delinquents (the positivist assumption of differentiation). On this basis causal factors are identified and theories of constraint are built up. The interactionist view directs our attention to the need for studying the dynamics of public reactions to adolescence and delinquency and the ways in which self concept is affected by these reactions. Even apart from interactionist theory, there is a case for directing attention to the subjective meanings and experiences of the deviant, as well as his behaviour. Becker has recently made this point in the context of arguing for a renewal of interest in the use of the life-history method in studying delinquency.⁴²

3. The Effect of the Societal Reaction

In describing the effect of the societal reaction on the individual deviant, or the development of a type of deviance, the concepts of labelling and stigmatization are the most frequently used. Erroneously, transactional theory has been thought to be synonymous with "labelling": as the previous two sections indicated, the theory has implications other than simply drawing attention to the effect of the attachment of a deviant label to an act or actor.

To Becker, labelling was simply one - but one of the most important - contingencies in the development of a deviant career. In terms of symbolic interactionism, being caught and publicly labelled is a crucial step in stabilizing a deviant career and sustaining it over time. The

41. Irwin Deutscher, "Some Relevant Directions for Research on Juvenile Delinquency," in Arnold M. Rose (Ed.) Human Behaviour and Social Processes, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962), pp. 468 - 481.

42. In his Introduction to the New Edition of Clifford R. Shaw's The Jack-Roller: A Delinquent Boy's Own Story, (University of Chicago, 1966).

label may affect the person's self-image, his public identity is changed, he is accorded a new status: "He has been revealed as a different kind of person from the kind he was supposed to be. He is labelled a 'fairy', 'dope fiend', 'nut' or 'lunatic' and treated accordingly."⁴³ The label has other consequences, such as setting up self-fulfilling processes whereby, for example, the deviant is cut off from participation in conventional groups. He might, as a consequence, be drawn into a deviant group or subculture, this being another contingency in stabilizing the role and increasing its resemblance to the type-cast role which has been assigned to him. Much of the work of Lemert, Becker, Matza, Scheff, Schur and others has been concerned with elaborating various aspects of these processes. Each has tried to show what elements of the deviant's role-behaviour, self-concept, subcultural and other organization can be understood as responses to societal labelling and intervention.

The potential effects of public definitions on the development, for example, of delinquency, were recognized well before the formulation of the labelling perspective. The Chicago School was very much aware of the emergence of delinquency in the context of a clash between the juvenile and adult community. The play group might become a solidified gang through opposition from community agencies; minor acts of deviance, such as playing in the streets, may be redefined by the community as delinquency. Tannenbaum's description in 1938 of the "dramatization of evil" in the conflict of values and definitions between the delinquent and the community, reads very much like some versions of contemporary labelling theory.⁴⁴ He outlines a sequence in which the child's definition of behaviour such as vandalism, truancy and petty theft, may be in terms of "play", "adventure" or "excitement"; to the community these are nuisances; evils which demand punitive intervention; the community's action might harden, and move away

43. Becker, (1963), op.cit., p. 31.

44. Tannenbaum, op.cit., pp. 18 - 22.

from defining specific acts as evil, to looking upon the actor's whole character as potentially evil. (A parallel formulation of this later stage in more modern terminology would be: "Possession of one deviant trait may have a generalized symbolic value, so that people automatically assume that its bearer possesses other undesirable traits allegedly associated with it").⁴⁵

Tannenbaum then went on to describe the changes in the individual consequent upon his being singled out for special treatment, and the concomitant sense of injustice this produced. Tannenbaum's formulation of this process is worth quoting at length, as it anticipates so many later developments:

The first dramatization of evil which separates the child out of his group for specialized treatment plays a greater role in making the criminal than perhaps any other experience ... for the child, the whole situation has become different. He now lives in a different world. He has been tagged ... The process of making the criminal, therefore, is a process of tagging, defining, emphasizing, making conscious and self-conscious; it becomes a way of stimulating, suggesting, emphasizing and evoking the very traits that are complained of ... The person becomes the thing he is described as being.⁴⁶

Such formulations thus suggest - although, of course, do not prove - in the community context, and in terms of a version of culture conflict theory, the same processes which symbolic interactionists have drawn attention to. Again, with reference to delinquency, a different line of theory, ego-psychology, points to the operation of similar factors: official action might confirm a faltering adolescent identity towards the incorporation of a more certain self-concept.⁴⁷

By far the most unequivocal and precise attempt to understand the nature and effect of the societal reaction to deviance, is to be found in the writings of Lemert, particularly in his notion of secondary deviation.

45. Becker, (1963), op.cit., p. 33.

46. Tannenbaum, op.cit., p. 20.

47. Erik H. Erikson and Kai T. Erikson, "The Confirmation of the Delinquent", Chicago Review, 10 (Winter 1957), pp. 15 - 23.

The distinction between primary and secondary deviation was made in his early paper and textbook and recently refined in a later paper.⁴⁸ Primary deviation - which may arise from a variety of causes - refers to behaviour which, although it may be troublesome to the individual, does not produce symbolic reorganization at the level of self conception. Secondary deviation occurs when the individual employs his deviance, or a role based upon it, as a means of defence, attack or adjustment to the problems created by the societal reaction to it. The societal reaction is thus conceived as the "effective" rather than "original" cause of deviance: deviance becomes significant when it is subjectively shaped into an active role which becomes the basis for assigning social status. Primary deviation has only marginal implications for social status and self-conception as long as it remains symptomatic, situational, rationalized or in some way "normalized" as an acceptable and normal variation.

Lemert was very much aware that the transition from primary to secondary deviation, was a complicated process. Why the societal reaction occurs and what form it takes are dependent on factors such as the amount and visibility of the deviance, while the effect of the reaction is dependent on numerous contingencies and is itself only one contingency in the development of a deviant career.

Temporary exposure, for example to a punitive reaction, will not necessarily result in secondary deviation and, on the other hand, the person's self discovery might not necessarily be preceded or precipitated by punitive reaction, labelling or stigmatization. Throughout, Lemert's stress is on the symbolic and unintended consequences of social control and he insists that stigmatization and other subjective social reactions, be viewed in the context of organized social control. There is a struggle between the deviant seeking to normalize his actions and thoughts, and

48. Lemert, (1948), op.cit., pp. 27 - 29; (1951), op.cit., pp. 75 - 78; (1967), op.cit.

social control agencies - whose ideologies and stereotypes of the deviant Lemert urges us to study - who are seeking the opposite. Deviance emerges and is stabilized as an artefact of social control and, thus, Lemert regards the equation "social control leads to deviation" as tenable and potentially useful a perspective as the traditional "deviation leads to social control".

The notion of secondary deviation rests - as do so many elements of the sceptical viewpoint - on the Meadian theory of the reciprocal relationship between the definitions of self and others, that emerge in a symbolic process of interaction. Lemert is aware - more than recent popularizers of this view - that the equation "I see myself as you see me" has infinite complications. The response to the societal reaction might not be the incorporation of a deviant self identity: the person, for example, might resist or only pretend to comply. This depends on factors such as the amount and quality of the exposure to the societal reaction, previous experience, reference group membership, the relationship to the agent of social control and so on. Some of Lemert's ideas have been taken up more fully than others: the application of the interactionist equation to deviance has been used by Becker in regard to marijuana smoking, but has not been fully explored; the simple descriptive task of characterizing the societal reaction - the main focus of this thesis - remains unfinished for most types of deviance. An increasing amount of attention, though, has been devoted to analysing the symbolic consequences of the official societal reaction: that is, through agents and agencies of social control: the work of Garfinkel, Matza, Scheff, Schur, Goffman and others all fall under this heading.

Garfinkel, for example, has outlined the theoretical pre-requisites of successful degradation ceremonies: a paradigm of moral indignation is observed in the public denunciation of the deviant which ritually destroys him by transforming his social identity from one object to

another.⁴⁹ Goffman describes a particular type of ceremonial in the process by which prospective and actual mental hospital patients become defined in certain ways - for example, as non-responsible objects - and eventually begin to regard themselves in this light. The role career of the patient is not understandable apart from the official reaction that his behaviour evokes.⁵⁰ This analysis is also extended to face-to-face interactional situations in the open community, where the person tries to manage his "spoiled identity" and mitigate its consequences.⁵¹ Matza, in regard to another type of deviance, argues that the delinquent's relationship to the control system is crucial, and specifically, that he obtains his rationalizations for continuing his career, from the very personnel and system designed to stop him.⁵² The effect of the societal reaction has also been looked at from a more structural perspective in terms of its role in creating deviant subcultures.⁵³

More ambitious - and somewhat less successful - attempts have been made to incorporate the societal reaction variable into general theories of deviance. One such example is Wilkins' use of a cybernetic framework in his theory of deviation amplification.⁵⁴ He starts off with a system model with informational feedback loops. Small initial stimuli generate responses, some of which might become further stimuli, and in order that the system tends towards stability, a negative feedback loop is created. Certain reactions occur (relating to the information, cultural experience and tolerance of the definers) which result in more acts being defined as

-
49. Harold Garfinkel, "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies," American Journal of Sociology, LXI (March 1956), pp. 420 - 424.
50. Erving Goffman, Asylums. Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and other Inmates, (New York: Doubleday & Co. Inc. 1961).
51. Goffman, (1963), op.cit.
52. Matza, op.cit.
53. See, for example, in regard to drug addiction, abortion and homosexuality: Edwin M. Schur, Crimes Without Victims: Deviant Behaviour and Public Policy, (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965).
54. Wilkins, op.cit.

deviant and more action being taken against deviants. The individuals so defined become cut off or alienated and perceive themselves as deviant. This isolation, alienation and development of a deviant self-perception, combines with the creation of deviant groups or subcultures to lead to more deviance which in turn leads to more forceful action by the conformists. The new information leads to more acts being defined as deviant or more stringent action being taken against the deviant, and the whole system goes round again.

Some of the problems in using this model will be commented on later; at this stage one need only mention the need to take into account the nature of the initial deviation from valued norms or visible diversity (for example in dress or speech), which creates the potential for the punitive sanction and to specify the structural conditions for each stage to occur. The alienation or isolation effect, for example, is by no means automatic. There is also the problem of why the amplification process ever ends; a problem which Goffman identifies in the micro or inter-personal context when he writes about "... the infinite regress of mutual consideration that Meadian social psychology tells us how to begin, but not how to terminate."⁵⁵

A final example of a similarly ambitious use of the societal reaction variable, may be found in Scheff's model of the process of becoming mentally ill.⁵⁶ Claiming to supplement, rather than replace individualistic explanations of mental illness, Scheff presents a model in which deviance becomes stabilized in a system of self-maintaining properties, made up of the deviant and those reacting to him. He suggests that psychiatric symptoms begin as "residual rule breaking": violations of unstated but commonly agreed-upon social norms. This rule-breaking (corresponding to Lemert's primary deviation) has unlimited causal sources and is highly prevalent, but most of it is unrecognized, ignored or normalized. Some

55. Goffman, (1963), op.cit., p. 16.

56. Scheff, op.cit.

rule-breaking becomes stabilized if it is defined by the societal reaction as evidence of mental illness. Here the social institution of sanity plays an important role: traditional stereotypes of mental illness learned in early childhood and reinforced by the mass media, provide a set of definitions for both the labeller and the labelled. The deviant role may be used as a means of adjustment (secondary deviation) because, for example, in a crisis the deviant may be highly suggestible and the proffered sick role may be the only way out of a problem. Thus a system is set up in which rule-breaking acts, the response of others, and the rule-breakers' response to these responses, constitute a system with definite boundaries and self-maintaining properties.⁵⁷ Although Scheff does not mention this, the system is almost identical to Wilkins' deviation amplification model.

This is not the place to embark on a full-scale criticism of these and similar models: they all have the virtue of showing, more or less convincingly, that the societal reaction to deviance must be taken into account in any approach to deviance. The precise nature and effect of the societal reaction remains for students in the sceptical tradition to explore.

4. Critiques of Functionalism and Anomie Theory

Current sociological theories of deviance and crime are predominantly derived from a functionalist position in which deviance is conceptualized as a departure from a central value system. Values of a high degree of generality are postulated at an abstract level, from these are derived differentiated norms which apply to each subsystem and then to roles within the collectivity via the normative culture of the collectivity. A deviant act is contrary to the central value system and its derivatives and is a disturbance to the equilibrium.

Even more than for any of the other six sceptical positions, it is beyond my scope to deal fully with the objections to the functionalist view

57. Ibid., pp. 97 - 101 and Appendix: "A Methodological Note" by Walter Buckley, pp. 201 - 205.

of deviance, which is par excellence a canonical position. These objections are part of a long debate in sociology, which is more complicated than simply dismissing, as for example Horowitz does, the grounding of the concept of deviance on the faith that "... consensus is in every situation observable and functionally relevant" as "... a statement which cannot pass inspection".⁵⁸ Although Lemert might be right in saying that in contemporary pluralistic urban society, the notion that there is a common value hierarchy, "strains credulity",⁵⁹ the credibility of the functionalist position needs far more attention than this. In order simply to outline the sceptical reaction, there are two objections to the equation "deviance is dysfunctional" which have to be made.

The major objection is that the question of what is and what is not functional must be related to the normative standpoint of a particular group. This means, as Becker and Laing among sceptical writers have pointed out, that the question is a political one. Decisions are made about what is good (functional) or bad (dysfunctional) for a group, rules may be made enshrining these decisions, and these rules have to be enforced in regard to certain acts and actors. These decisions and the creation and enforcement of rules, are subject to disagreement, conflict, political manouvres and cross-pressures. They occur in a context of power. It is precisely these normal political processes and situations which should be paid attention to, rather than taking the judgment of "functional" as canonical and unquestionable.

The second point of interest is less a critique of the functional position, than a revision of it: namely, the resuscitation of the

58. Irving Louis Horowitz, "Consensus, Conflict and Co-operation: A Sociological Inventory," Social Forces, 41 (December 1962), p. 183.

59. Lemert, "Social Structure, Social Control and Deviation," in M.B. Clinard (Ed.), Anomie and Deviant Behaviour (New York: Free Press 1964), p. 66. Also reprinted in Lemert, (1967), op.cit., pp. 3 - 30.

Durkheimian view of the positive functions of deviance. In The Division of Labour in Society Durkheim wrote about the function of crime in bringing together "upright consciences"; the indignation aroused by a crime serves to maintain community sentiments. The same theme was repeated by Mead⁶⁰ and more recently taken up by Coser in the context of a general argument about the functions of deviance.⁶¹ He discusses how the community in the process of uniting itself against deviance, revives and maintains its sentiments and creates moral rules by redefining what is normal. Morality is given its content through contrast with the non-moral. Coser also (drawing on the observations of Dentler and Erikson on work groups⁶²) notes the case of deviance being induced, tolerated and sustained, strengthening the group in the process.

These themes have recently been most explicitly taken up by Erikson, a sociologist closely identified with the transactional approach.⁶³ Starting off with a conception of deviance as conduct which a group considers dangerous, embarrassing or irritating enough to bring sanctions against the actor, he takes as problematic the way in which society filters out and codes behaviour which becomes defined as deviant or criminal. In answering this basic question about deviance - why is one form of behaviour rather than another assigned to the deviant class? - he draws upon Durkheim's notion of the positive functions of deviance. Each time the community censures deviance and arranges a ceremony to dispose of the offender, the authority of the norm being violated is restated and sharpened. This means that "... deviant behaviour is not a simple kind of leakage which occurs when the machinery of society is in poor working order, but may be, in controlled quantities, an important condition for preserving the stability of social life."⁶⁴ Deviance

60. G.H. Mead, "The Psychology of Punitive Justice", American Journal of Sociology, XXIII (1928), pp. 557 - 602.

61. Lewis A. Coser, "Some Functions of Deviant Behaviour and Normative Flexibility," American Journal of Sociology, 68 (September 1962), pp. 172 - 182.

62. R. Dentler and K. Erikson, "The Function of Deviance in Groups," Social Problems, 7 (Fall 1959), pp. 98 - 107.

63. Erikson, (1966), op.cit.

64. Ibid., p. 13.

thus has a boundary maintaining function.

Erikson's attempt to prove his argument (with reference to the Puritan settlement in 17th century Massachusetts) is problematic⁶⁵ and raises the crucial defect of applying the "positive-functions-of-deviance" formula to whole societies as opposed to relatively homogeneous small groups: it is axiomatic from the sceptical view to focus on the audience's definition of deviance and the functions of deviance in defining norms and boundaries, but one must specify who does the defining and whose norms and boundaries are being defined. Not everyone has the same power to define and there are conflicting norms to be defined or clarified. We return to the political questions of power and conflict.

Mertonian anomie theory is a derivative of the functionalist model which needs to be considered separately; as Cohen notes in his important recent critique, this theory has been the most influential formulation in the sociology of deviance in the last 20 years.⁶⁶ The formulation has been criticized from a number of positions, ranging from its use in explaining specific types of deviance⁶⁷ to its ideological basis in a consensus model of society.⁶⁸ Again, the criticisms we will briefly note, are only those which relate most explicitly to the transactionalist view: anomie theory's neglect of societal reaction and social control, and its static as opposed to processual view of deviance.

Cohen specifically uses the interactionist and role-playing perspectives to criticize the theory, which although he concedes is radically sociological, is also in certain respects "atomistic and individualistic".⁶⁹

65. See my review, British Journal of Criminology, 7 (July 1967), pp. 346 - 348.

66. Albert K. Cohen, "The Sociology of the Deviant Act: Anomie Theory and Beyond," American Sociological Review, 30 (February 1965), pp. 5 - 14.

67. See, for example, various papers in Clinard, op.cit.

68. See, for example, John Horton, "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems as Competing Ideologies," American Journal of Sociology, 71 (May 1966), pp. 701 - 713.

69. Cohen, (1965), op.cit., p. 6.

Deviance is conceptualized as if each individual, "in a box by himself", assesses goals, experiences strains and then selects solutions. What this picture leaves out is that alter's actions - that is, how he responds to the deviance - effect the outcome of ego's actions. The theory also assumes discontinuity: an abrupt leap from the initial state (anomie) to the eventual outcome (deviance).⁷⁰ Deviance, however, is a groping tentative process, a series of involvements and disinvolvements. The reaction against the positivist image of the deviant involves looking at deviant acts and the transformation from the deviant act to the deviant actor, in terms of an interactive process. Prior to the commitment to a deviant social role, there is a history of mutual involvement and perception between ego and alter. The way ego perceives alter's response to his deviance, may determine whether, for example, he yields to control or is driven to secondary deviation. The whole conception in anomie theory of the genesis of deviance must necessarily be modified to take these processes into account.

A similar point is made on the macro level by Erikson.⁷¹ He notes that Mertonian theory is concerned with initial aetiology rather than ongoing social history. Deviance, however, generates momentum and organization which remain intact long after the strains which produced them, have disappeared. A theory must ask not just how the structure creates fresh deviant potential, but how this potential is absorbed and shaped into durable persistent patterns.

Lemert's criticism of the theory is even more explicitly concerned with Merton's neglect of social control and reaction. He contrasts Merton's structural or "substantive" notion of deviance with his own social control or "process" conception;⁷² social control is taken as an independent rather than constant or merely reciprocal variable, and the extent or form

70. Ibid., pp. 8 - 9. In these respects Parsons (in his section on deviance in The Social System) is much more satisfactory from an interactionist position than Merton.

71. Kai T. Erikson in Becker, (1964), op.cit.

72. Lemert, (1964), op.cit., pp. 57 - 97.

of deviance might be a consequence of social control.

Looking, for example, at the effects of control policies on drug use, it becomes clear that the retreatist formulation does not do justice to the meanings assigned to the behaviour - both by the actor and society - and the way in which the behaviour is transformed under the impact of defining and controlling agencies.

Such criticisms of anomie theory as those by Cohen, Erikson and Lemert, should be taken as correcting the theory's original all-embracing claims. Drawing attention to dimensions such as control and reaction, does not take away the need to understand the type of social structure which generates initial strains to deviance at different points and with different intensities.

5. The Sociology of Law and Law Enforcement

Transactional theorists who imply that all criminologists hitherto have looked upon the nature and content of the criminal law as canonical and beyond question, are being unfair and disingenuous. Numerous accounts of the historical evolution of criminal laws have been written and standard criminological text books invariably contain an opening chapter about the problematic relationship between the criminal law and the concept of crime. Sutherland and Cressey, for example, differentiate the following three elements in the concept of crime:

... a value which is appreciated by a group or part of a group which is politically important; isolation of or cultural conflict in another part of this group so that its members do not appreciate the value or appreciate it less highly and consequently try to endanger it; and a pugnacious resort to coercion decently applied by those who appreciate the value to those who disregard the value.⁷³

Although the terminology is at first sight strange, this formulation - or variations of it - contains most of the elements required for posing the major sceptical questions in the sociology of the criminal law: how and

73. Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, Principles of Criminology, (Chicago: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1960), p. 15.

why is certain behaviour defined as legal or illegal and how are these definitions implemented? In fact, for many years some of the very questions which transactional theorists have asked of deviance, have been asked by orthodox criminologists about crime. The point, however, is that these questions have tended to remain in abstract definitions or opening chapters of textbooks. Research and theory then proceed as if the questions never existed. Only relatively recently has the sociology of law emerged as a serious speciality and empirical studies of law enforcement and social control begun to make sense from a transactional perspective.

It has also been true that some criminologists - particularly those of the "conflict school" - have been more aware of the implications of Sutherland and Cressey's type of formulation than others. The clearest statement of this perspective is by Vold, who actually anticipates the behavioural-definitional distinction:

There is ... always a dual problem of explanation, that of accounting for the behaviour as behaviour and equally important accounting for the definitions by which specific behaviour comes to be considered crime or non-crime.⁷⁴

To Vold, the definitions have to be explained in terms of a relatively straightforward conflict or power model; crime was "... an aspect of the collision of and struggle for dominance among the groups and organizations of power in the community".⁷⁵ A similar perspective was used by Tannenbaum, who saw the labelling process as being the outgrowth of community value conflicts. He saw the proliferation of laws following industrialization, in terms of the creation of new group interests and therefore conflicts between producer and consumer, for example, in food laws. Each technological change would produce groups seeking to protect their interest via legislation.⁷⁶ Tannenbaum saw these conflicts and those produced by culture conflict, in terms of the traditional Chicago School emphasis on cultural transmission

74. George Vold, Theoretical Criminology, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. vi.

75. Ibid., p. 13.

76. Tannenbaum, op.cit., especially p. 31.

within unstable city areas.

There have been other versions of conflict theory which have been in the more orthodox Marxist tradition, for example, by Bonger, and Rusche and Kirchheimer. The details of such theories need not concern us, except to note how many important issues they leave untouched and especially that much behaviour labelled as crime clearly cannot be seen in terms of economic conflict. Homosexuality and drug taking, for example, stem from a plurality of non-economic interests and values. The questions traditionally posed by these few conflict theorists, though, taken together with criminologists' interest in white-collar crime and the emerging field of the sociology of law, have focused attention on the definitional question posed by Vold.⁷⁷ Indeed, some criminologists have in recent years over-stated the case, arguing, for example like Turk,⁷⁸ that the problem of "criminality" - why certain acts or actors are labelled as criminal in the first place - is the only legitimate issue for criminologists to deal with. The behavioural question is out of their province, because crime is a definition, not a form of behaviour. Such statements imply that all criminology should be the sociology of law and law enforcement.

This debate has been given substance by recent research on the processes whereby new laws are created. One fruitful such approach is illustrated by Becker's notion of "moral enterprise".⁷⁹ Taking the case of the Marijuana Tax Act, he shows how enterprise combines with personal interest, publicity and the character of certain organizations, to create "a new fabric of the moral constitution of society".⁸⁰ This sort of approach has not been fully developed, though, and sociologists of law have

77. Relevant contributions to this field have been made recently by writers such as Jerome Hall, Quinney, Newman and Jeffrey.

78. Austin R. Turk, "Prospects for Theories of Criminal Behaviour", Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 55 (December 1964), pp. 454 - 461.

79. Becker, (1963), op.cit.

80. Ibid., p. 145. See also in regard to prohibition, Joseph Gusfield, Symbolic Crusade; Status Politics and the American Temperance Movement. (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1963).

paid little attention to the general factors behind rule creation, or the specific aspects of, say, pressure group politics in creating new rules or changing existing ones.

More attention has been paid to rule enforcement, both by transactional theorists and other criminologists. Becker has used the analogy of the blowing of a whistle to refer to rule enforcement: that is the signalling to society that there has been an infringement.⁸¹ This signalling, though, is a much more complex process than this analogy implies and involves a sequence of identification, labelling and placement decisions, the bases of which are by no means clear. The analogy is also unfortunate in that an essential requirement of a referee is impartiality; but rule creators and rule enforcers are hardly impartial: in the game of social control, society is the referee and the other side at the same time.

Transactional theorists have not only focused on influences on law enforcement, but, as we saw in the last section, have emphasized the symbolic impact of specific law enforcement policies on social problems and deviance. Schur, for example, urges sociologists to study not so much the detailed consequences of the laws, but "... the important ways in which specific legal actions and law enforcement policies influence the development of such problems".⁸² He does this himself by viewing "criminalization" as an extreme form of stigmatization and using such notions as secondary deviation, career contingencies and the symbolic effects of labelling on self-identity. Although Schur may be criticized for oversimplifying the issues - for example, in his formula "repression breeds subculture"⁸³ - he does show in each case how enforcement policies crucially effect the shape the behaviour takes and how the policies and the broader societal reaction are based on some vital misconceptions about

81. Becker, (1963), op.cit., p. 122.

82. Schur, op.cit., p. 1.

83. Ibid., pp. 141 - 145.

the nature of the deviance.

Criminologists who have not necessarily been influenced by either conflict or transactional theories, have increasingly become interested in the processes and stages of rule-enforcement. Many studies of the police, courts and components of the penal system have focused - sometimes in rather mechanical terms - on the ways in which criminals are processed and the factors influencing decision-making at various stages. Studies of police discretion and sentencing are particularly relevant to the sceptical interest in the way in which deviance is reacted to and increasing attention is being paid to the way in which dispositions by agents of social control are based on criteria other than the nature of the specific offence. Such studies have thrown some light on how deviance is assigned by various bureaucratic control agencies⁸⁴ and are converging on the core interests of transactionalism. A recent study of the interaction between gang members and the police, for example, sets out to analyse "... the way patrolmen and gang boys first perceive or construct their respective worlds then respond to the situations created for them by the actions and expectations of others".⁸⁵

6. Social Problems: The Subjective and Objective Aspects

The study of crime and delinquency has traditionally been located not in the field of social deviance - a term which is of relatively recent currency - but under headings such as "social pathology", "social disorganization" or - most frequently - "social problems". Social problems textbooks conventionally include conditions which are not forms of deviance - such as air pollution, war, traffic congestion, over-population and natural disasters - as well as the more conspicuous forms of deviance such as crime,

84. See, for example, Jerome H. Skolnick, Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966).

85. Carl Werthman and Irving Piliavin: "Gang Members and the Police" in D. Bordua (Ed.) The Police: Six Sociological Essays, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967), p. 57.

delinquency, prostitution, alcoholism and drug addiction. The sceptical focus in this field has been on two sets of issues: firstly, why sociologists should concentrate on some conditions as problematic rather than others, and moreover why they should appear to have a value commitment in regard to these problems;⁸⁶ secondly - a more important issue - the need to distinguish between the nature of the condition and the awareness (or labelling) of it as a social problem.

Again, questions from these directions have been asked for some time, especially in the writings of Fuller and Myers.⁸⁷ They attempted to develop a framework in which social problems could be understood in terms of a conflict of values and in terms of two sets of conditions: objective, which were verifiable facts (such as the number of unmarried mothers) and subjective, that is, the awareness by certain people that the situation is inimical to their interests and that something should be done about it. A social problem, then, is a condition defined by a considerable number of people as a deviation from some social norm which they cherish. The objective condition is a necessary, but not a sufficient element and one's focus should be on the value judgments which cause some people to define the condition as problematic and decided that certain means are appropriate to deal with it. Fuller and Myers then suggest that social problems have a "natural history": a temporal course of development in which three main stages can be distinguished: awareness, policy determination (in which conflicting interests become apparent) and reform. Social problems thus emerge as complementary to approved social values and not as forms of pathology.

86. This is parallel to the attempt to distinguish between functional and dysfunctional. See Melvin Tumin, "The Functionalist Approach to Social Problems," Social Problems, 12 (Spring 1965), pp. 379 - 388.

87. Richard R. Fuller and Richard R. Myers, "Some Aspects of a Theory of Social Problems," American Sociological Review, 6 (February 1941), pp. 24 - 32 and "The Natural History of a Social Problem," American Sociological Review, 6 (June 1941), pp. 320 - 329.

It was this sort of sceptical outlook on social problems - if not the specific content of the theory - which critics like Mills pointed to as the missing element in the conventional social problem textbooks. This sort of criticism also gave Lemert his original point of departure. Although he retained the term "Social Pathology" for his textbook, he devoted his first chapter to understanding how social problems become defined, and identified the new emphasis in the field as

... the tendency to look upon problem defining behaviour as an integral part of the data to be studied as well as the objective conditions which strike reformers as being 'problems'.⁸⁸

He went on to define a social problem in terms very similar to Fuller and Myers ("... a social situation about which a large number of people feel disturbed and unhappy - this and nothing more"⁸⁹) although rejecting their idea of a fixed sequence in the societal reaction (the natural history approach). He pointed out that there were a number of other possible reactions, including acceptance of the condition, an uneasy tolerance and complete repression.⁹⁰

Although Lemert correctly anticipated new tendencies in the field, his sceptical position has by no means become orthodox, and many textbooks and courses are still subject to his and Mills' criticisms. They are made up by a random collection of subjects, whose status as social problems are taken for granted. Two recent books of readings on social problems may be taken as evidence of the increasing use of the sceptical framework, although in both cases this is more explicit in the editor's introduction than in the substantive contributions.⁹¹ They both add to the debate in

88. Lemert, (1951), op.cit., p. 4.

89. Ibid., p. 7.

90. Ibid., p. 59. See also his paper, "Is There a Natural History of Social Problems?" American Sociological Review, 16 (1951), pp. 217 - 223. Reprinted in Lemert, (1967), op.cit.

91. Howard S. Becker (Ed.), Social Problems: A Modern Approach, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966) and Robert A. Dentler, Major American Social Problems, (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1967).

the sense that they attempt to deal with the obvious difficulties in the over-simplistic formulation "social problems are what people think they are". To (apparently) ignore the role of objective conditions is to move towards a position which Lemert called "uncomfortably agnostic".⁹² An extreme relativism might be too sceptical. In both books there is an awareness of what Becker calls the "ambiguities" and Dentler the "absurd conclusions" of extreme subjectivism; in neither case, however, are these difficulties fully explored.

Becker notes how difficult it is to specify precisely how objective conditions are defined as problematic. He arrives at a conclusion similar to Fuller and Myers: although the objective condition itself does not produce a problem (even non-existent conditions can be defined as problematic and therefore anything can be so defined) the definition must contain some factual basis. The major question Becker poses is, who are the "people" in the formula "social problems are what people think they are"? This is again parallel to the question that must be asked about attributions of deviance and dysfunction: "Says who?" There need not be a consensus about what constitutes a problem, and people will adopt different definitions in regard to, say, "the racial problem" according to their perspectives and interests. Definitions are thus of a political nature.

In regard to the natural history formulation, Becker again differs very little from Fuller and Myers. He notes that without having to accept the stages they postulated, we must accept their basic idea: that to understand a social problem we must understand how it became to be defined as such. This means looking at how certain conditions are brought to people's attention, how concern becomes widespread, how tactics are used to win support for the cause, what role the mass media play;

92. Lemert, (1951), op.cit., p. 6.

... every social problem has a history and develops through a series of stages, each stage reflecting a change in who defines the problem, the kind of definition it is given, and the resulting actions taken in an attempt to solve the problem.⁹³

To Becker, an important task of the social scientist is to sort out the different definitions people use of social problems and not to take for granted (for research, teaching or theory) the lay definition of what constitutes the problem.

Dentler adopts a similar position,⁹⁴ distinguishing between the objective origins of social problems and the socially subjective labelling by vocal groups. Some significant group in society must recognize a condition as a deviation from or a breakdown of some standard, or a threat to certain cherished values. Like Becker, he is aware of the problem of specifying precisely whose recognition is determinative and of asking whether it makes sense to say that if most of the public is unaware of a threatening or damaging condition, there is no social problem. Does reality depend entirely on definition? Recognition in terms of some consensus of public opinion clearly does not provide a sound guide for social policy. These difficulties, however, do not mean that we can define social problems objectively: perhaps only in limiting cases (such as natural disasters) where physical survival is at stake, could one find some more universal basis of definition. In most cases, even if knowledge of what is necessary, functional, good, unharmed for society were complete, one could not eliminate standards, values and hence competing subjective definitions.

Both Becker and Dentler, then, are forced to conclude that despite the ambiguities and absurdities that extreme subjectivism may lead to, one cannot return to some canonical or absolutist view of social problems. It remains for the sociologist to unravel the role of objective and subjective factors in problem definition and to describe the creation of certain

93. Becker, (1966), op.cit., p. 13.

94. Dentler, op.cit., pp. 3 - 17.

problems in terms of a sequential model.

Some Problems and Qualifications

This chapter has done little more than identify and document a number of tendencies in sociology and criminology which have been converging under such headings as "transactional", "interactionist" and "labelling" theories. This convergence, illustrated in terms of six sceptical themes, is producing a picture of deviance as an interactive process and has drawn attention to the nature and effect of the societal reaction to deviance. The material in the rest of the thesis will draw from and elaborate these themes; it will not attempt to deal systematically with all their implications. In order, however, to anticipate the more elementary criticisms of the sceptical position at its current stage of development, I would like, briefly, to indicate some of the major problems it will have to cope with. Most of these problems and limitations will become more explicit in the body of the thesis.

(i) The new perspective remains less a theory of deviance than a conceptual treatment of it. It is insufficient - and in some senses misleading - to talk about social groups creating deviance unless one separates out the behavioural and definitional questions. One cannot provide a causal explanation of any substantive type of deviance by talking only about variations in societal definitions or the processes of assigning a deviant identity. The need for a "traditional" sociological account of why behaviour eventually labelled as deviance occurs in the first place, has not been removed.

(ii) Allied to this first point is the danger endemic in all theoretical perspectives that emerge as correctives to established truths: the perspective becomes vulgarized and oversimplified. This danger can be avoided by stating clearly what the transactional model can and cannot usefully be expected to achieve.

(iii) A particular type of vulgarization to be wary of among sceptical

writers, is the characterization of the deviant as the innocent victim of an organized societal conspiracy to endow him with a deviant identity or to wilfully inflate "harmless" conditions into social problem status. At the extreme these views may lead to a romanticizing of deviance and an adoption of a value commitment which may be no less misleading than earlier ones.⁹⁵ This view might ignore "real" problems of the deviant - guilt, anxiety, unhappiness, pain - and does no justice at all to the complexity of the transactional process.

(iv) Clear and specific limitations are inherent in formulations such as "deviance is in the eyes of the beholder" and "social problems are what people think they are". Although these statements make sense on one level, they are inadequate unless one asks "which beholders?" and "which people?" Sceptical theorists must integrate their position into a structural view which understands conflict and the differential distribution of power in society; some people have greater power than others to "create" deviance and problems. Whenever we see terms such as "deviant", "dysfunctional" and "problematic" we must understand - as the sociology of knowledge attempts to do - the implications of the sceptical question "says who?"

(v) A crucial link in transactional theory is between the societal reaction and the individual's incorporation of this reaction into his self-identity. It is quite evident that this link is not an inevitable one; the deviant label, in other words, does not always "take". The examples that transactional theorists are fond of quoting to illustrate the link between label, identity and action - Malinowski's description of a boy's suicide as a consequence of being publicly denounced for committing clan endogamy and Sarte's account of Genet's transformation to a thief after being caught and

95. The debate about the value commitment of the new perspective is a complex one; two differing views are stated in H.S. Becker, "Whose Side Are We On?", Social Problems, 14 (Winter 1967), pp. 239 - 247 and A.W. Gouldner, "The Sociologist as Partisan: Sociology and the Welfare State," American Sociologist, 3 (May 1968), pp. 103 - 116.

identified after one deviant act - must be taken as parables rather than models. There are at least three qualifications to the label-identity-action equation: firstly, the label may not lead to any significant change in self-concept or behaviour (the individual may be able to ignore or rationalize the reaction, or may only pretend compliance); secondly, deviance may continue for some time - whether publicly labelled or not - without the incorporation of a new self-identity (one has the secret deviant or the deviant who is unaware of any reaction to him); thirdly, a deviant self-identity may be absorbed by an individual without his actions having been reacted to by others; in other words, through self-realization. One line for the theory to develop, is to spell out the conditions under which the transactional equation does and does not apply.

(vi) Although the new perspective is rich in conceptualization, it is poor in empirical research. What research has been done has been on forms of deviance which are marginal and subject to fairly widespread conflicting definitions: certain forms of mental illness, homosexuality, drug taking, etc. It is necessary to apply the perspective to the more conventional areas of crime and delinquency.

POINTS OF ENTRY

Clearly not all, or even most of the themes from the transactional approach can be taken up in the course of the thesis. Certain decisions have to be made on the points at which one is going to enter the field, the appropriate substantive areas of deviance to explore and the appropriate research methods to use. This chapter will outline the basis for these decisions and indicate the plan of the thesis.

It should be made clear from the outset that although the research was carried out with a particular theoretical position in mind, it was not intended to verify systematically any particular set of hypotheses. In this respect the research strategy is close to that recently suggested by Glaser and Strauss.¹ They argue for generating "grounded theory"; that is, theory which is discovered from data, rather than testing or verifying logico-deductive theory derived on a priori grounds. Generation is the best way of being sure that the theory "fits" (that is, the categories are readily applicable to and indicated by the data) and that it "works", (that is, the categories are meaningfully relevant to and able to explain the behaviour under study). The criteria for judging the credibility of the theory are not necessarily those derived from the language and tools of verification: sampling, reliability, statistical significance and so forth. This argument stresses qualitative rather than quantitative methods, or implies moving qualitative techniques from the defensive position they have assumed in sociology, and removing from them pejorative images such as "unsystematic", "impressionistic" and "exploratory". The thesis does not conform exactly to Glaser and Strauss's principles, as it was originally conceived to explore a specific theoretical development. What is derived from it is an elaboration of this development rather than the generation

1. Barney G. Glaser and Anselm L. Strauss, The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1968).

of something entirely new.²

By definition, the sceptical approach has asked more questions than it has answered and it offers, therefore, numerous research possibilities. The two most important questions, however, which run through all the sceptical positions, concern firstly the nature and secondly the effect of the societal reaction to deviance. The thesis will concentrate on the first of these questions. The task of exploring the effect of the reaction is a separate one which cannot wholly be accommodated within the same research strategy. When the data, however, indicate categories and concepts relevant to this question, it will be considered.

The first task - describing the reaction - is logically the one that should receive priority and the research aims to deal with as many aspects of this category as possible, rather than intensively explore any one hypothesis or subject. This strategy is consistent with Glaser and Strauss's notion of "sampling" an area on theoretical (rather than statistically representative) grounds. No one kind of data or technique is necessarily appropriate: one must look for what they call "slices of data"; that is, different views on the same category.³

Before entering the very broad research area "reactions to deviance" we can formulate some of the more specific questions that should be considered; other concepts and categories cannot be known in advance, they can only emerge from the material itself. These questions include:- how do society and particular groups within society, react to various forms of rule breaking, deviance and problems? What, in Lemert's terms, are the various "... mythologies, stigma, stereotypes, patterns of exploitation, accommodation, segregation and methods of control (which)

2. It is interesting to note that Glaser and Strauss cite Becker's theory of deviation and social control as a good example of a "grounded theory", Ibid., p. 94.

3. Ibid., pp. 65 - 69.

spring up and crystallize in the interaction between the deviants and the rest of society"?⁴ How are labels established and applied? What stages or processes does the reaction go through? Why does the reaction take a particular form in regard to any one type of deviance?

These are some of the questions which have been posed by the few empirical studies which have so far been carried out in the area. On the basis of these studies - some of which have already been mentioned - and a consideration of the more obvious possibilities that have been neglected, the following are the major research strategies which could be employed; these could all be seen as yielding different slices of data on the same subjects:-

(i) straightforward public-opinion-type surveys on the attitudes and conceptions that exist about various types of deviance. Surprisingly little is known, at even this most elementary level, about public attitudes to major types of deviant behaviour or social problems such as crime, delinquency, mental illness, drug-taking or homosexuality. Two small-scale pieces of research, which have been explicitly influenced by the transactional approach, have been reported recently. The one deals with the public consensus about what is deviant simply by asking a sample to list things or persons they regard as deviant.⁵ This is not a particularly useful technique, firstly because the question is open-ended (and therefore for the fact that only 13% of the sample regard juvenile delinquents as deviant does not mean that the rest would not see delinquents as deviants) and secondly, the term "deviant" is a sociological classification which might have little meaning to the layman. The second part of this research, more profitably, uses techniques derived from the study of racial stereotypes, to discover stereotyped conceptions of homosexuals, beatniks,

4. Lemert (1952), op.cit., p. 55.

5. J.L. Simmons, "Public Stereotypes of Deviants," Social Problems, 13 (Fall 1965), pp. 223 - 232.

adulterers, marijuana smokers and political rebels. The other research⁶ similarly deals with the public misconceptions and stereotypes about homosexuality, drug-taking and abortion. The sample's level of tolerance towards these forms of behaviour was then measured and correlated with social indices such as age and education.

(ii) studies of face-to-face situations in which deviance is interpreted and reacted to. Small-group research by social psychologists has often dealt with the ways in which group members react to individuals who deviate from the group norms. Such research has usually been carried out in a laboratory situation and has not dealt with labelled types of deviance relevant to society at large. Closer to our concerns, are Dentler and Erikson's study of Quaker work groups⁷ and Goffman's interactional studies - specifically in Stigma - on the ways in which socially discredited individuals are reacted to and, more generally, on the control factors inherent in any behavioural setting.⁸ An attempt to get round the obvious difficulties of actually observing reactions to deviance, has been Kitsuse's technique of asking a sample to retrospectively report on the way they imputed, interpreted and labelled a particular type of deviance, in this case, homosexuality.⁹

(iii) studies - using particularly documentary sources - of the way in which specific forms of behaviour are reacted to. The method of using public pronouncements, mass media reports and similar sources to build up a picture of how society copes with and absorbs various sorts of deviance, is particularly appropriate in studying individual incidents of deviance (for example, a sensational crime) or innovatory form of behaviour. This

6. Elizabeth A. Rooney and Don C. Gibbons, "Social Reactions to 'Crime Without Victims'," Social Problems, 13 (Spring 1966), pp. 400 - 410.

7. Dentler and Erikson, op.cit.

8. See also Erving Goffman, Behaviour in Public Places, (New York: Free Press, 1963).

9. Kitsuse, op.cit.

method has been used historically by Erikson in regard to various "crime waves", by Wilkins in illustrating deviation amplification in the case of drug addiction,¹⁰ and in a similar way by Cohen and Rock in regard to the Teddy Boy phenomenon.¹¹

(iv) more specifically, studies may focus on the ways in which social and legal policy is made in regard to deviance and social problems. Such studies - for example, Becker's on the Marijuana Tax Act and Chambliss's on the laws of vagrancy¹² - usually use documentary sources such as legal and political records.

(v) studies of the operation of social control agencies. This heading covers the vast range of methods used to study what Lemert calls the societal control culture: "... the laws, procedures, programs and organizations which in the name of a collectivity help, rehabilitate, punish or otherwise manipulate deviants."¹³ These methods may include documentary studies of agency policy, questionnaire, interview, or observational studies of the attitudes and ideologies of control agents or observation of the ways in which control decisions are made (for example, in studies of police discretion, sentencing, or psychiatric screening).

Each of these approaches will be used to some extent, the method eventually chosen depending on practical limitations of resources and time, and on what seems most appropriate for the substantive area under question. Clearly one has to choose a particular type of deviance to study: terms such as "deviance", "deviant" or "outsiders" are sociological constructs. In the same way as one cannot see a norm or a role, one cannot see deviance;

-
10. Leslie T. Wilkins, "Some Sociological Factors in Drug Addiction Control in England and Wales" in Rosenberg et al, op.cit., pp. 645 - 663.
 11. S. Cohen and P. Rock, "The Teddy Boy: Evolution of a Social Type" in V. Bogdamor and B. Skidelski (Eds.) Britain in the Fifties, (London: Macmillan, Forthcoming).
 12. William J. Chambliss, "A Sociological Analysis of the Law of Vagrancy", Social Problems, 12 (Summer 1964), pp. 67 - 77.
 13. Lemert (1952), op.cit., p. 447.

it represents a real category, but for research purposes one has to specify a type of behaviour. The type of deviant behaviour I chose to concentrate on was juvenile delinquency, and in particular, two forms of delinquency; vandalism and the Mods and Rockers phenomenon. The criteria for this choice - which are spelt out more fully in each substantive section of the thesis - include the need to carry out sceptical-type research on areas other than "crimes without victims" or the more peripheral, ambiguous and esoteric areas that have so far been most explored. In addition, these were types of behaviour of intrinsic criminological interest and, in the case of vandalism and the Mods and Rockers, subjects which, at the time of starting the research, had considerable topical value. This last factor also made these subjects peculiarly appropriate for examining the nature of the societal reaction: there was no question of one having to artificially "create" one's research topic.

The research was conceived, carried out and is presented in the form of three separate studies. Although each could stand alone as an individual study, they are meant to interlock with each other: they deal with the same themes, and are different samples, or slices of data, from the same area of interest. The first study, that on vandalism, covers the widest range of material. Using mainly documentary and interviewing methods, it attempts to unravel the societal definitions of vandalism as rule-breaking and deviance; it then goes on to consider the way vandalism becomes defined as a social problem and then discusses the main images and stereotypes of vandalism. It finally deals with "reaction" in the sense of the organized social response to control or prevent vandalism. The second study concentrates specifically on the views held about delinquency and related topics by a selected group of control agents. This study uses conventional survey and interviewing techniques. The final study, on the Mods and Rockers, uses interviewing, documentary and observational techniques to trace the stages in which this particular form of deviance was reacted to and absorbed into society. It pays particular attention to the images that

developed in this process and speculates, within an amplification type of model, on the relationship between the societal reaction and the development of the phenomenon.

PART II

VANDALISM

WHAT IS VANDALISM?

Ever since Lombroso conceded that there were types of criminals other than the born criminal (the insane criminal, the criminal by passion and the occasional criminal), criminologists have been concerned - at times obsessed - with the development of various classifications and typologies. These have included classifications like Lombroso's based on the individual characteristics of the offender, classifications based on the legal definition of the offence and, more recently, typologies based on social behaviour-systems and processes, which take into account the social context of the offender and the act.¹ Typologies have been justified in terms of their role in general theory construction, their utility for treatment, and on sheer common sense grounds: the fact that the phenomena of crime and delinquency can be better understood by building up knowledge of specific offence types or career patterns.

Many of the general arguments for the typological approach in criminology could be used to justify the present study of vandalism. Clinard and Wade, for example, use such a justification in their discussion of the subject: "A typological approach permits concentration upon problems of limited scope and enables one to deal with manageable groups characterized by relatively homogeneous behaviour."² Other implications of the typological argument are less acceptable, particularly the idea that Linnaeus-type classifications are a necessary first step in theory construction. Such taxonomic approaches might, in fact, blur the real issues involved in trying to construct a general theory of deviance. It is outside

-
1. These classifications and typologies have recently been reviewed by Clinard and Quinney who also provide a justification for the typological approach in criminology. See M.B. Clinard and R. Quinney, Criminal Behaviour Systems: A Typology, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967), Chapter 1.
 2. M.B. Clinard and A.L. Wade, "Toward the Delineation of Vandalism as a Subtype in Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Political Science, 48 (1958), p. 493.

my terms of reference, however, to justify the study of vandalism as a subtype of delinquency. Vandalism is merely being used as an example or case-study to illustrate the general themes of the thesis. One needs such an example because "juvenile delinquency" is not a type of behaviour but a legal and organizational category: in order to study the societal reaction to deviant behaviour, it is necessary to choose a type of behaviour which embodies recognizable characteristics other than legal or organizational labels.

Why choose vandalism? In the first place, vandalism is a subtype of delinquency which is of considerable intrinsic importance and interest. If the transactional viewpoint is to be of any use at all, it should not only provide a starting point for conceptualizing deviance, but should also throw light on particular substantive problems. In terms of the conventional social problems perspective, vandalism is certainly a problem of some significance: the evidence for its objective status (extent, cost, etc.) and subjective meaning (anxiety, concern, etc.), will be reviewed. Vandalism is also a sociological problem; it is not "just another" subtype of delinquency, but one that presents peculiarly significant theoretical problems. On the surface, at least, it fits exactly into Cohen's description of subcultural delinquency as being malicious, negativistic and non-utilitarian. Cohen, in fact, remarks - in a footnote - that vandalism "... highlights all of the characteristics we have imputed to the delinquent subculture."³ Whether this imputation is correct or not, explanations of delinquency, which have traditionally focused on personal violence and various forms of property offences such as theft, have to contend with the phenomenon of property destruction.

Despite the widespread recognition of vandalism as a social problem and the substantive and theoretical issues it raises, very little attention has

3. A.K. Cohen, Delinquent Boys, The Culture of the Gang, (New York: Free Press, 1955), p. 184.

been paid by criminologists to the phenomenon. Cohen was content merely to point out that vandalism highlighted his characterization of the delinquent subculture. Cloward and Ohlin do not mention vandalism at all and it is not clear how they would explain it. Few textbooks in criminology pay any attention to the phenomenon. The only extended discussions of vandalism in the criminological literature are to be found in a symposium published in Federal Probation⁴ two articles⁵ and one book⁶. The only type of vandalism which has been the subject of extensive empirical research, is vandalism in connection with religious and racial conflict.⁷ A few studies on social class differences in the distribution of vandalism have also been reported,⁸ and further data on this aspect of the subject may be extracted from general studies (particularly those on unrecorded delinquency) which distinguish offence types.

In summary then, the case for studying vandalism can be made in terms of some of the general arguments used to justify typologies in criminology and because vandalism represents an important social and sociological problem. In none of these respects is there research and theory of any substance. While this section is primarily focused on using vandalism to illustrate the transactional approach and generating substantive theory along these lines, it is hoped that it will also answer some of the questions posed by vandalism as a type of behaviour, if only in the negative sense of counteracting some public and professional stereotypes. This means that, while the analytical

-
4. Federal Probation XVIII, 1 (1954), pp. 3 - 16.
 5. Clinard and Wade, op.cit., and A.L. Wade: "Social Processes in the Act of Juvenile Vandalism," in Clinard and Quinney, op.cit., pp. 94 - 109.
 6. John M. Martin, Juvenile Vandalism: A Study of its Nature and Prevention, (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1961).
 7. For example: Herman D. Stein et al, The Swastika Daubings and Related Incidents of Winter, 1960, (Mimeograph, Research Centre, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, 1961). Other research on the 1960 swastika incidents will be referred to later.
 8. William Bates, "Caste, Class and Vandalism," Social Problems, 9 (Spring 1962), pp. 349 - 353; William Bates and Thomas McJunkins, "Vandalism and Status Differences," Pacific Sociological Review, 2 (Fall 1962), pp. 89 - 92.

categories used will be those discussed in the first chapters (the problem of defining deviance, stereotyping, the societal reaction, the control culture, etc.⁹), the conventional categories used in positivist research will also be considered: extent, cost, description, causal theories, characteristics of offenders, methods of prevention and control.

Sources of Data

Leaving aside the secondary analysis of the few studies which exist, the following main sources of data on vandalism can be distinguished:-

- (i) Official statistics;
- (ii) Individual studies of apprehended offenders;
- (iii) Studies of unrecorded delinquency;
- (iv) Mass media reports of vandalism incidents and
- (v) Information obtained directly from organizations or individuals affected by vandalism.

The first of these sources shares the same limitations which would be encountered in the use of official statistics in studying any type of delinquency. These limitations, which relate particularly to the way in which the data is collected and categorized, will be discussed when considering the extent of vandalism, the social characteristics of offenders and the way they are processed. Although it will be suggested that the generic limitations of official statistics on crime and delinquency are compounded in special ways in regard to vandalism, this is, of course, a source of data which cannot be ignored.

The second source is the one most frequently used in published research on vandalism. The offenders are studied at various stages of the control system, for example when they are referred to various community agencies¹⁰

9. See particularly Lemert's "Suggested Outline to be followed in Studying and Writing the Life History of a Deviant", Lemert, (1951), op.cit., Appendix, pp. 445 - 446.

10. In the major published research on vandalism (Martin, op.cit.), data was obtained from 291 juveniles enumerated in the Juvenile Delinquency Index of the New York City Youth Board. This Index consists of cases reported to agencies such as police and childrens court.

or when they appear in penal institutions or mental hospitals. The usual problems of the selectivity of the population arise from this method. It was not used in this study, partly for lack of resources, but primarily because the focus of the research was on reactions to vandalism and not on the description of the offender's characteristics. Published research from this source will be used where relevant, as will be the third source - studies of unreported or "hidden" delinquency - which go some way in resolving the problems of the unrepresentativeness of populations of known offenders.

The vast bulk of the material discussed in this chapter was obtained from the last two sources. The reasons for concentrating on this type of information are obvious. Mass media reports, in addition to providing some information - even if selective and distorted - about the nature of vandalism, also present the image of the phenomenon to society. This image both reflects the societal reaction and - more particularly - provides the basis for it. An examination of media reports can help to understand societal definitions, attitudes, stereotypes, folklore and mythology about the deviant. Similar findings can be obtained from direct contact with individuals and organizations affected by vandalism. Such contact also brings one closer to the control culture and to the behaviour as it occurs in its original context before being processed.

The main type of mass medium covered was the press. From September 1964 to August 1965, reports were collected unsystematically from a number of national newspapers¹¹ mainly to obtain a preliminary orientation to the field and ideas about potentially useful contacts. For the next two years (September 1965 to August 1967) items about vandalism were obtained from a press cutting agency. The agency was instructed to cover all national newspapers, including daily papers, weeklies, trade journals and various specialist journals (for example, Justice of the Peace and Local

11. Mainly: Times; Guardian; Daily Mirror; Observer; Evening Standard.

Reports were also collected from the local papers in "Northview."

Government Review, Local Government Chronicle, etc.). Items sent had to include the words "vandalism" or "hooliganism" (the terms are often used interchangeably), or refer to incidents which could be so classified. This method has obvious limitations as a source of total or even representative coverage of press reports, in that it is dependant on inaccuracies and biases in selection. The biases, when they could be checked (e.g. by independant scanning of some newspapers), were often of intrinsic interest: for example, items connected with racial or political conflict were often omitted from the weekly batch of cuttings. In the event, without double-counting reports about identical incidents, some 1,500 cuttings were collected and classified.

Some coverage of radio and television was obtained from a list of all programmes or items about hooliganism and vandalism between October 1965 and August 1966: 42 items on radio and 39 on B.B.C. television.

Organizations and individuals affected by vandalism - to be referred to in this chapter as "victims" or "targets" - were located in three main ways:-

(i) On the basis of information derived from other sources about organizations known to be the most frequently chosen targets of vandalism. These included organizations with which the most intensive contact was eventually made: British Railways, the General Post Office, the Local Government Information Office and various local government authorities.

(ii) Direct follow-up of press reports where the victim (or in some cases an individual) expressing views about vandalism could be identified and traced. This method led to the location of a number of organizations whose potential for supplying information could not have been anticipated, for example, the Imperial War Graves Commission, The Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, etc.

(iii) Miscellaneous contacts obtained, for example, as a result of

interviews given on the radio and articles in journals.¹²

These contacts took the form of personal interviews, letters, mailed questionnaires or attendance at conferences. In each case attempts were made to secure material such as annual reports, statistics, recommendations by sub-committees, etc. A list of all the organizations from whom information was obtained is to be found in Appendix A and a specimen list of questions - which, of course, had to be varied according to the type of organization - is given in Appendix B.

One of the most important potential sources of data, which has not yet been mentioned, would be a full-scale public opinion survey on vandalism. In an exploratory study such as this, lack of resources and time prevented such a method being used; it would be essential for any future research in this area. In the present study, statements about public opinion are only derived indirectly and selectively from the mass media, published sources, the Northview interviews, and contacts with victim organizations and individuals.

What is Vandalism?

The Problem of Definition

The student of any type of deviance finds that he has to limit the type of behaviour he will include in his study. This setting of limits involves the adoption of certain definitions of what constitutes the phenomenon. The student of sexual deviance, for example, will exclude certain practices from his definition because they are widely tolerated or are not defined as illegal. Definitions are accepted as necessary for theory construction and operational definitions as necessary for carrying out empirical research. This very setting of limits, however, should alert us to two of the most elementary starting-off points of transactional theory: firstly, that deviant behaviour is not deviant per se, but has to be defined

12. For example, S. Cohen, "Vandalism", New Education, 2 (October 1966), pp. 10 - 15.

and labelled as such by others, and secondly, that the social scientist has to question and not accept the lay definitions (the definitions by various "others") of what constitutes deviant behaviour, and, further, the labelling of certain forms of the behaviour as constituting "social problems".

To say that one must question and not take for granted the societal definitions and labels, does not, of course, mean that there is any way of defining the "essence" of a phenomenon such as vandalism. The definitions themselves constitute the essence, they are the data one has to work with. What one must do is examine these definitions, and the contexts in which they are used, and try to discover how they hinder or help an understanding of the behaviour. Other ways of setting about research and theory generation, lead one into the ambiguities and contradictions of positivism.

One might begin with the historical and etymological meanings of the term "vandalism". The Vandals were members of an East Germanic tribe who invaded Western Europe in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries and eventually sacked Rome in 455 A.D. They were traditionally regarded as the great destroyers of Roman art, civilization and literature and their actions were associated with a general barbaric ignorance, lack of taste and sensibility. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the term "vandal" was used in 1663 to refer to a "wilful or ignorant destroyer of anything beautiful, venerable or worthy of preservation" and was broadened to include any reckless, uncultured or ruthlessly destructive behaviour - particularly in connection with works of art. Martin quotes a source which suggests that the noun "vandalism" was coined in 1794 by an apologist for the French Revolution who, attempting to cast blame for the destruction of works of art during the Revolution to its enemies, likened this destruction to the behaviour of the original Vandals.¹³ The connection between vandalism and aesthetic destruction was retained in the Nineteenth Century when the term was used,

13. Martin, op.cit., p. 4.

for example, to refer to the pulling down of medieval buildings to make room for new ones of Churchwarden Gothic. The contemporary meaning of vandalism is still given in the dictionary as "ruthless destruction or spoiling of anything beautiful or venerable", or, in the weakened sense: "barbarous, ignorant or inartistic treatment".

It is not clear when the term "vandalism" became used to describe destruction of property in general. Its etymological connection with the destruction of aesthetic objects is obviously too restrictive to cover the range of behaviour that criminologists are interested in when studying the phenomenon conventionally described as vandalism. Nevertheless, the original connotations of the term should not be lost sight of. Dryden's image of the Vandals encapsulates this historical legacy:

Till Goths and Vandals, a rude Northern Race
Did all the matchless monuments deface

The adjectives connected with aesthetic vandalism - barbarous, wilful, ignorant, reckless, ruthless - remain as part of the contemporary stereotype of vandalism, even if the behaviour occurs in completely different contexts. The term "vandalism" is, in fact, an emotive label which used to be, and still can be, used as a general term of abuse.

It should be noted in this context that the term "vandal" is often used synonymously with the term "hooligan". According to most dictionaries, "hooligan" is a slang term originating in 1898: it was originally applied to the name of an Irish family in South-East London, the Houlihanes, who were conspicuous for their ruffianism.¹⁴ As such, it refers to young street rowdies or ruffians and is similar to the American term "hoodlum". Strictly speaking, hooliganism describes behaviour such as that of a noisy, boisterous group of youths causing a disturbance in a

14. In his "Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English", Eric Partridge prefers another derivation referring to the "Hooley Gang" - "a name given by police in Islington to a gang of rough youths led by one Hooley".

street, pub, cafe or some other public place. Property destruction - the central component of vandalism - is not necessarily involved. Nevertheless, the terms are used virtually synonymously, both as descriptions of behaviour and terms of abuse.

The other usage of the term vandalism that concerns us, is in its legal context. In fact, the term "vandalism" has no formal legal meaning at all. Vandalism as such is unknown as a distinct offence in the criminal law and does not appear as such in the official statistics of either the United States or this country. It also does not appear in insurance policies or other administrative and quasi-legal records. The American system designates delinquent vandalism with such terms as "malicious mischief", "acts of carelessness or mischief", "wilful and wanton misconduct", "destructiveness", "disorderly conduct", "incorrigibility" or even "assault".¹⁵

There are two major corresponding categories in the legal system and Official Statistics of England and Wales. The one - an indictable offence - appears under the heading of Malicious Injuries to Property, which includes Arson (Classification No. 56) and Other Malicious Injuries (Classification No. 57). The other - a non-indictable offence - is Malicious Damage (Classification No. 149). The major Acts which these classifications cover are the Malicious Damage Act, 1861, the Criminal Justice Administration Act, 1914 and the Malicious Damage Act, 1964 (which changes certain provisions of the previous Acts).

From an examination of the offences which these various Acts and Classifications include, it is clear that the legal definition encompasses a heterogenous range of behaviour. The classification Malicious Damage, includes offences under the Malicious Damage Act, 1861; such as the killing or maiming of dogs, the breaking of fences and walls and the "cutting,

15. Clinard and Wade, op.cit., p. 494. It is interesting to note that while many of these legal designations emphasize the "mischievous" and "careless" elements in vandalism, society tends to emphasize the original connotations of the term: malice, wilfulness, etc.

rooting up, or destroying, damaging trees, shrubs to the amount of one shilling". It also includes the injuring of post letter boxes or their contents (Post Office Act, 1953); offences against the Ancient Monuments Consolidation and Amendment Act, 1914, as well as the broad category "Any wilful damage to property for which punishment is provided under Local or other General Acts". Most offences are dealt with summarily under the new (1964) Malicious Damage Act as any wilful damage to property to an amount not exceeding £100 (instead of £20 under the 1861 Act and the Criminal Justice Administration Act, 1914). There are a number of other non-indictable classifications which might involve acts of vandalism, for example:

Classification 56 which refers to various enactments relating to parks, commons and open spaces, including a vast range of bye-laws, and Classifications 162 and 164 referring to disorderly behaviour and various other police regulations. The main classification governing indictable offences -

Other Malicious Injuries - includes setting fire to crops and plantations; killing cattle; sending letters threatening to burn or destroy property; damaging goods in the process of manufacture; flooding mines; cutting electric lines and various other injuries to property: Destroying ships; obstructing railway engines and carriages; damaging harbours, docks, canals, sea walls.¹⁶

In addition, there is a separate classification, included as an Offence Against the Person, rather than Malicious Injuries to Property, which is headed "Endangering Railway Passengers" (placing anything on the railway or throwing anything at railway carriages). Other relevant indictable offences are those included under Offences Against the State and Public Order, such as Riotously Demolishing Buildings and Machinery. Such offences are dealt with under the Riot Act and various Common Law provisions. There is a further category of offences which are usually dealt with summarily but in special circumstances tried on indictment.

16. These three groups of offences all carry a maximum penalty of life imprisonment.

I shall refer to these legal categories again when discussing the ways in which vandalism is processed and recorded. In the present context it is sufficient to note that legal definitions provide a confusing reflection of the behavioural category of vandalism, which, provisionally, may be described in terms of its lowest common denominator: the illegal destruction of property belonging to others. In the first place, some of the legal categories cover behaviour in which, strictly speaking, no damage is done (e.g. sending letters threatening damage); secondly, many of the categories are too vague to indicate precisely the nature of the damage and the context in which it took place; thirdly, there are types of property damage which are not classified as such when they take place under certain circumstances (e.g. in the course of mob action, "riots", political protests, etc.); fourthly, there is the problem as to whether arson, which is not usually referred to as vandalism, should be dealt with separately or included with property destruction by other methods and finally, there is the exclusion of those forms of vandalism which are never, or seldom, officially reported or processed. Again, though, while the sociologist might find legal definitions as unhelpful as historical and etymological ones, they are crucial for answering the important questions about how vandalism is officially processed and statistically recorded.

One can now turn to the definitions of vandalism used by criminologists and other social scientists. Martin seems to be satisfied with a modified legal definition: "In the present study vandalism was defined as the offence 'malicious mischief' specifically the wilful destruction, damage or defacement of property".¹⁷ Clinard and Wade attempt a purely behavioural definition: "By vandalism is meant the deliberate defacement, mutilation or destruction of private or public property by a juvenile or group of juveniles not having immediate or direct ownership in the property so abused."¹⁸

17. Martin, op.cit., p. 4.

18. Clinard and Wade, op.cit., p. 494.

This definition will serve as well as any other as a point of departure. It raises only two minor objections: firstly, although understandable in terms of Clinard and Wade's discussion of vandalism as a subtype of juvenile delinquency, there is no particular reason why the term "vandalism" should be applied only to juveniles. Although in the public mind vandalism is thought to be the sole province of juveniles, criminologists should question rather than accept this stereotype; in fact, it will be shown that much vandalism is committed by adults. The other objection to the definition is that the terms "defacement", "mutilation" and "destruction" do not cover actions which are intended to destroy property, such as the placing of obstacles on a railway line. Such acts are publicly regarded as vandalism, and might be thought to resemble vandalism behaviourally. In addition, they are legally processed in the same way as other acts of vandalism.

Rule-Breaking and Deviance

Having now arrived at a rough picture of the type of phenomenon under consideration, we are able to turn to Becker's crucial distinction between rule-breaking and deviance. The type of rules which vandalism breaks are obvious: in our society, public and private property are given high material and symbolic value. There is a whole range of written and unwritten rules which explicitly forbid the deliberate destruction or defacement of property. Property has an intrinsic financial value as well as symbolically representing success, prestige and achievement. To the extent that the property destroyed is rendered useless and has to be replaced, the same rules that govern other property offences, such as theft, apply. If the property is defaced rather than destroyed, aesthetic as well as financial considerations apply. There are specialized forms of vandalism, for example, connected with religious, racial or political conflict, where other values are threatened and rules governing the orderly resolution of conflict are broken.

The existence of these rules, however, is only part of the picture:

it is clear that not all the rules that forbid deliberate property destruction are enforced; not all this rule-breaking behaviour is regarded as deviant or as problematic or is labelled as vandalism. If we are to do justice to the central proposition of the transactional view of deviance - that "deviance is not a quality that lies in behaviour itself, but in the interaction between the person who commits an act and those who respond to it"¹⁹ - we must:-

- (i) examine the various contexts in which rule-breaking occurs;
in this case the deliberate defacement, mutilation or
destruction of property by people who do not own that property;
- (ii) identify the responses which the rule-breaking evokes and on
this basis classify the various ways in which the behaviour
is identified and labelled;
- (iii) account for these differential responses and labels.

In addition, we have to bear in mind throughout that the content of the rule itself might not be agreed upon by either or both the actor and the audience. This issue was previously over-simplified by assuming that the rules governing property destruction were part of some general value consensus. This is by no means the case and we shall observe situations in which there is conflict over the content of the rules and political processes operating to determine whether and how the rule is to be applied. As Cohen points out:

... as consensus on the rules declines, we must become increasingly careful to specify whose conception of the rules we are, at the moment, working with ... since deviance depends as much on the existence of a rule as on the occurrence of an act, deviance may be created or expunged by changes in rules. Therefore, the explanation of deviance must be as much concerned with origins and changes in rules as with the behaviour that the rules forbid.²⁰

These themes will be returned to in other chapters: in examining the causes of vandalism, the various contexts in which it occurs, the ways in which it is defined as problematic, and the type of solutions thought to be

19. Becker, (1963), op.cit., p. 14.

20. A.K. Cohen, (1966), op.cit., p. 21.

appropriate. The task now, using as a point of departure the distinction between rule-breaking and deviance, is to develop a preliminary typology, based not on types of offenders or motives behind the offence, but on the reaction that this particular form of rule-breaking evokes. This task is made more complicated by the fact that "vandalism" is not a precise behavioural description nor a recognizable legal category, but a label attached to certain types of behaviour under certain conditions. This means that it is not enough to distinguish between, say, certain types of adolescent rule-breaking that are recognized and processed as delinquent and those that are not. It is also more complicated than distinguishing, as Scheff did, between residual rule-breaking that is denied, and residual rule-breaking that is stabilized (in the form of mental illness). If we take our original behavioural definition, "deliberate defacement, mutilation or destruction of property by people who do not own that property", there are at least four dimensions of the societal reaction which can be used to construct a typology:-

- (i) is the behaviour usually labelled as vandalism?
- (ii) is the behaviour usually regarded as deviant?
- (iii) is the behaviour usually processed as illegal (i.e. delinquent or criminal)?
- (iv) is the behaviour usually regarded as constituting a social problem?

Even setting out the alternatives in this form over-simplifies the issues. Firstly, the use of terms such as "usually" (and synonymous terms such as "widely" or "by most people" or "by society") is highly problematic: what is objectively and even contextually the same behaviour, will be labelled differently by different groups and at different points in time. Secondly, within each dimension, there are differences of degree: some forms of vandalism are more problematic than others, some are legally processed as if they were more serious. Even taking these four dimensions alone, however, there are logically ten possible combinations of reactions.

Most of these permutations, however, are of marginal interest only and need not concern us. The most significant distinction is simply between, on the one hand, those forms of behaviour falling under our definition, which are usually labelled as vandalism, regarded as deviant and processed as illegal, and, on the other hand, behaviour which usually does not result in any of these consequences. These are not two water-tight categories but form something like a continuum and we shall be very much concerned with how changes in the societal reaction (and other factors) result in a movement of the behaviour from one point on the continuum to the other. In order to make the distinction clear, however, the two points on the continuum will be labelled in ideal typical terms: I will call behaviour on the one side institutionalized rule-breaking and on the other, recognized vandalism offences.

This distinction corresponds fairly closely to Becker's original distinction between rule-breaking and deviance. This distinction, however, is not as easy to maintain as Becker tends to suggest. For one thing, it pays little attention to the sociological truism that rule-breaking may be ignored or sanctioned by one group and not by society as a whole. Becker, in fact, acknowledges this complication in a footnote referring to his classification of types of deviant behaviour; (this is essentially the same point made by Cohen):

It should be remembered that this classification must always be used from the perspective of a given set of rules; it does not take into account the complexities ... that appear when there is more than one set of rules available for use by the same people in defining the same act.²¹

It is precisely these complexities that we cannot afford to ignore. There are not only situations where rule-breaking is tolerated in a restricted setting or subculture yet labelled as deviant by society, but also situations where the opposite is true: behaviour might exceed limits in one setting, so that people in authority deal with the rule breaker as

21. Becker, (1963), op.cit., p. 20.

a deviant, but the rule-breaking remains invisible to the wider society. We will note, for example, cases of vandalism which are organizationally sanctioned, but never get formally processed as "conventional" offences. All this forces us to visualize that between the two points of the continuum provisionally described - and somewhere nearer the institutionalized rule-breaking side - there are situations in which the behaviour is regarded (by some) as deviant and labelled (by some) as vandalism. I will call this behaviour invisible vandalism or invisible deviance to indicate that it is somewhat more likely than other forms of institutionalized rule-breaking to be defined as deviant but does not usually enter our picture of recognized vandalism offences.

There is another complication if we introduce our fourth dimension: whether the behaviour or condition is regarded as constituting a social problem. On the whole, if the label "social problem" is used at all with reference to vandalism, it is used to cover some, or all, recognized vandalism offences. The question of how certain forms of vandalism become defined as social problems, will be dealt with separately in the next chapter. It should be remembered, though, that because of the fluidity of the continuum, the same conditions which allow certain forms of property damage to be institutionalized rather than processed as vandalism offences, might also allow certain forms of vandalism never to be regarded as problematic. To summarize the discussion so far, what we have to visualize is a continuum something like this:

Institutionalized Rule-Breaking	Recognized Vandalism Offences
Invisible Vandalism	Vandalism a Social Problem

I would now like to clarify the concept of institutionalized rule-breaking: this refers to those forms of deliberate property destruction which society is somehow able to accommodate itself to, or absorb, without necessarily or invariably regarding them as vandalism or processing them as delinquent (or criminal) offences. This does not mean that some of

the actors who break the rules or some of the audience who observe or know about this rule-breaking, never label the behaviour as deviant, vandalism, problematic, or pathological and that it never gets processed as such. The point is simply that the behaviour is usually not reacted to in these terms, despite its objective similarity to ordinary vandalism offences or the fact that the subjective meaning to the actor is the same.

This use of the term institutionalized rule-breaking is similar to Lemert's concept of "normalization".²² His use seems to be more restricted to interactional settings where a constitutive rule (Garfinkel's term) is breached, and there is an interim interaction resulting in the mutual acceptance of new constitutive rules. Lemert thus concentrates on normalization which takes place in face-to-face situations, for example, in family interaction where "... a wide variety of idiosyncratic behaviour becomes acceptable by virtue of esoteric rules which evolve out of social interaction."²³ There seems to be no reason why this normalization should only take place in face-to-face situations and I will draw attention to vandalism which becomes institutionalized or normalized in organizational and other impersonal settings, where, if the rules are not exactly "esoteric", the consequences of the behaviour are the same.

One of the most important consequences of institutionalized rule-breaking is that it rarely gets reacted to in such a way that it becomes stabilized into secondary deviation. This might lead some sociologists to say that such behaviour is, therefore, unimportant or even irrelevant to the student of deviance: he must accept as his data that behaviour which is defined and processed as deviant. I have already stated the objections to this view and argued in favour of questioning, rather than accepting the dominant societal definitions. This is not to say that deviance as conventionally defined is not the most significant material

22. Lemert, (1964), op.cit., pp. 84 - 88.

23. Ibid., p. 86.

and is not different from behaviour unexposed to legal sanctions. Nor does it mean that the sociologist is free to impose his own arbitrary definitions of the subject. He cannot simply say, "This behaviour is vandalism (or delinquency, or crime), whatever anybody else thinks and however society deals with it".

This is the point of Lemert's objection, in the context of the debate about white-collar crime: "From the standpoint of strict scientific description and analysis, it is a fallacy to designate forms of behaviour as criminal if, in effect, they are not symbolized and treated as such by members of the society in which they occur."²⁴ The same point is reinforced in Lemert's original discussion of primary and secondary deviation, where he insists that "from a narrower sociological viewpoint the (primary) deviations are not significant until they are organized subjectively and transformed into active roles and become the social criteria for assigning status."²⁵ While seeing Lemert's point, one must note, however, his limiting qualifications "from the standpoint of strict scientific description and analysis" and "from a narrower sociological viewpoint". If one takes a broader perspective, these limitations might be restrictive. Firstly, if rule-breaking which does not become defined as deviant is in many important respects similar to that which does get so defined, then a consideration of it might help understand at least some of the sources, contexts and meanings of the behavioural phenomenon as a whole. Secondly - and far more important - rule-breaking and deviance are not immutable categories frozen in time and space like the inanimate objects of a natural scientist's taxonomy. If we believe that some aspects of deviance can be illuminated by understanding the ways in which behaviour becomes defined as deviant, then part of our task is to look at the conditions under which some types of rule-breaking do not get defined as deviant. Yesterday's rule-breaking is today's deviance; today's rule-breaking may be tomorrow's deviance.

24. Lemert, (1951), op.cit., p. 284.

25. Ibid., p. 75.

Under the next heading, I would like to give various examples of the ways in which vandalism becomes institutionalized or normalized. This is not so much a list of categories of behaviour as a list of conditions which might exist separately, but more often coincide and overlap with each other. These conditions may be visualized as constantly changing weights which might tip the scale one way or the other in determining which forms of vandalism - according to a strictly behavioural definition - result in being labelled and processed as vandalism offences. The rest of this chapter will examine other issues in defining vandalism, and the next chapter will consider the processes whereby vandalism is seen as a social problem.

Institutionalized Rule-Breaking

Six conditions under which institutionalization occurs, to a greater or lesser extent, may be distinguished. For the purposes of convenience I will categorize these as types of vandalism, although it must be remembered that they are not simply categories of behaviour and that they are only sometimes referred to as "vandalism". The conditions are: ritual vandalism; protected-group vandalism; vandalism as play; incidental vandalism; organizational vandalism and licenced vandalism.

(1) Ritual Vandalism: although no contemporary industrialized society has the exact equivalent of the potlatch ceremony in which certain types of property were ritually destroyed, there are certain ritual occasions on which property destruction is expected, condoned or even encouraged.

Examples in our society would be November 5th (Guy Fawkes) night or ritual joy occasions, such as Armistice Day. Certain rules are also relaxed on New Year's Eve, during which, ceremonies such as those taking place in London's Trafalgar Square, might result in a considerable amount of property destruction. A clearer example in America is Halloween, during which various forms of vandalism, usually referred to as "pranks", are formalized and ritualized to a considerable degree.

This is one form of rule-breaking which is highly susceptible to changing levels of social tolerance. November 5th celebrations, for example, are increasingly likely to result in police action and prosecution: in 1964, some 98 people were arrested in Trafalgar Square, and in 1967, some 136. They were charged with offences such as paddling in the fountains, or lighting and throwing firecrackers. Clinard and Wade note in regard to Halloween, that while certain forms of vandalism are still overlooked, "... even within this institutionalized setting the norms are undergoing change and less destructive behaviour is approved than formerly."²⁶

Despite evidence of increasing public impatience and ⁱⁿtolerance about this sort of behaviour, much of it is still not regarded as deviant. The press-cutting agency, for example, did not classify this behaviour as hooliganism or vandalism, and even when arrests were made after November 5th celebrations, and this was widely reported, the relevant cuttings were never sent. My own observations in London courts after these occasions²⁷ suggest that such behaviour is still not seen as "ordinary" crime and delinquency. The police and magistrates regarded the processing of these offences as a tiresome chore and the offenders viewed the whole proceedings with mild amusement. There is little chance of such behaviour being stabilized into one or other form of secondary deviation.

These are only extreme types of ritualization. There are other occasions and settings - for example, certain sporting fixtures, festivals and fetes, private parties, such as weddings, farewell parties and bachelor parties, sporting club dinners and so on - where property destruction is to some degree normalized. When the condition of ritual is combined with some of the other conditions to be discussed, the degree of institutionalization is increased.

26. Clinard and Wade, op.cit., p. 497.

27. In Hampstead Magistrates Court in 1964 (for offenders arrested on Hampstead Heath) and Bow Street Court in 1966 and 1967.

(2) Protected-Group Vandalism: closely allied to the first category, is the behaviour by certain groups who are given, as it were, a collective licence by the community to engage in vandalism.

Notable among these groups have been students of various types, especially when the behaviour takes place during ritual occasions such as rags, initiation ceremonies and sporting fixtures. Routine destruction might also take place at parties - especially end-of-term parties - and in the course of practices such as "climbing in". While this sort of behaviour has traditionally been associated in this country with students from Oxford and Cambridge, similar traditions have developed in other universities and in colleges of higher education. Equivalent phenomena in American universities have been incidents of vandalism during various inter-fraternity rivalries and in college towns before and after football games. Hartung sarcastically remarks, for example, that streets in Ann Arbor and Madison "... have in the past been the victims of such good, clean and expensive destruction by the students of the two universities."²⁸ He also described "hazing" ceremonies, which, although not so brutal as they used to be, might still involve considerable violence.

Commentators such as Hartung invariably point out that such behaviour is regarded as "good clean fun". The offenders are not sanctioned at all or, if they are, only by unofficial bodies, for example disciplinary committees of universities or colleges. Even if the offence is processed formally, the punishments are seldom as severe as those that would be given to members of an unprotected group. Mays makes this point in connection with public school boys:

... the party of public schoolboys who damage property during the course of a 'rag' are behaving very differently from a street corner gang who smash street lamps or shop windows just for the fun of it or to work off their aggression. The mores of the public school community allow and even encourage such explosively expressive behaviour in its restricted setting whereas the casual destructiveness of promiscuous gangs has no such approval to

28. F.E. Hartung, Crime, Law and Society, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1965), p. 73.

sustain it.²⁹

It is fairly obvious in these cases that a social class differential operates in determining membership of a protected group; in fact, the notion that all middle class delinquency is of a protected-group nature, is one that runs through much of the criminological literature. The source of the protection, however, - in the case of students at least - involves more subtle factors in addition to any crude social class bias. Among the reasons that operate are: a romantic nostalgia among adults for the exuberance of youth; the notion of a university as a surrogate parental authority with the right to handle and if necessary insulate its own members; the reluctance, in the case of charity rags, to deal with behaviour which, after all, is "all for a good cause", and so on.

What is somewhat problematic is just how much protected group vandalism of this sort takes place and how much is part of a public myth of how students behave. A full-scale survey would be needed to answer this question with any accuracy. From press reports alone it is clear that some protected-group vandalism does take place. In November, 1964, for example, University of Southampton students broke into Parkhurst Prison on the Isle of Wight and painted an eight feet slogan - "SO'TAN RAG" - on the wall. Details of how the exploit was carried out were openly given to the press by the Rag Committee. At the Hospitals' Cup Rugby Final in March, 1966, one student lorry demolished a wall, the rugby ground and neighbouring streets were strewn with flour, paint, dye and rubbish and the goal posts were daubed with paint. In June, 1966, male undergraduates left a series of black footprints on the white dome of the dining hall of New Hall College, Cambridge. They used high gloss enamel paint which is

29. J.B. Mays, Growing Up in the City, (Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 1954), p. 18. Mays' use of the term "gang" is interesting: like the term "youth" its usage is invariably reserved for lower-class adolescents. A group of students is never called "a gang of youths".

difficult to remove.³⁰ In June, 1968, students of Keble College, Oxford, burnt a boat worth £600 during a "bump supper" celebration. The fire was supplemented by furniture and various property, such as books, taken from students who did not want to take part in the celebration. This incident was not reported in the national newspapers. My scrutiny of certain local papers in the course of looking for material about the Mods and Rockers, revealed a number of other similar incidents - not reported in the national press - which took place at local technical colleges, agricultural colleges or teacher training colleges.

There is little doubt, however, that the incidence of such vandalism is declining. Fewer than fifteen examples were reported in the national press during the main two-year research period, and the very fact that they were reported, and often condemned in accompanying comment, indicates some breaking down of the traditional insulation which students have enjoyed. This impression was corroborated in a series of exploratory interviews I carried out in two universities in 1966. In one, "Redbridge", a large provincial university, I discussed the subject of students' hooliganism and vandalism with the Tutor in charge of a Hall of Residence, the President of the students union and the local Chief Constable; in "St. Edwin's College", Cambridge, I covered the same subject with the Senior Proctor, the Bursar and the Head Porter. From these various sources, three generalizations can be made:- firstly, the overall amount of destructiveness during the course of what have been looked upon as the traditional outlets for student "exuberance" (bump suppers, rags, parties, etc.), is declining; secondly, students indulging in vandalism and allied activities outside the walls of the university are losing some of their protected status, and are more likely to be processed as conventional offenders, even though the punishments they receive are, on the whole, less severe; and thirdly,

30. The comment of the College President on this incident is significant in the light of what I will say later about how tolerated rule-breaking can be defined as "going too far" and constituting a problem: "If they had used a paint which we could have removed, then one might have considered it an amusing end-of-term prank."

insulation and protection does occur in regard to activities within the walls of the institutions. In regard to most acts of vandalism, petty theft, etc., the university is looked upon, in the words of the "St. Edwin's College" Head Porter, as a "world of its own".

There is an element - as Osborough notes in regard to police discretionary powers - of "... recognition of some public disquiet over students enjoying an immunity that other youths not at university or college do not."³¹ This disquiet can be shown in incidents such as the refusal of some Oxford boat owners, after the May Day celebration in 1967, to hire out punts and boats for the next year on account of the vandalism that occurred. A newspaper comment on this is instructive: "Some of the hooligans posing at public expense as Oxford University Undergraduates are helping strike another traditional date out of the city's calendar by their loutishness" (Daily Sketch 5/5/67). The point is not that there was a sudden outbreak of "hooliganism" or "loutishness", but that there was a decrease in tolerance for such behaviour.

The reasons for this decrease are complex and beyond the scope of this chapter to deal with in any detail. The main factors, briefly, seem to be: a perception that universities are decreasingly the reserve of a feudal aristocracy, whose actions need not be questioned; an increased association between student life and deviant activities - particularly drug taking - which are more threatening to the wider society; and finally - perhaps the most important factor in recent years - the increase of militant student politics and such ideologies as student power on a national and international level. The increased hostility to students which this last development has produced, has carried over to their

31. N. Osborough, "Police Discretion Not to Prosecute Students: A British Problem," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Political Science, 56 (June 1965), pp. 244 - 245.

previously acceptable traditional types of rule-breaking.³²

This type of carry-over, however, has not been complete and, despite the gradual withdrawal in the degree of licence given to students, the notion of "protected-group vandalism" seems a viable one, and the existence of such behaviour, undeniable. Society is still more tolerant of the old style of rule-breaking than rule-breaking in the course of political demonstrations, sit-ins, and so on. As the following editorial comment on "violence by union pickets and hooligan youths" indicates, some people at least are prepared to carry on tolerating property destruction by protected groups as long as it is done for the "right" reasons:

... while we disapprove strongly of such incidents as stealing an eagle from the London Zoo as an incident of what is called a student rag, it is at least to be said that this and similar incidents, while ill-judged, have a genuine purpose somewhere behind them and we have been spared in this country the violent scenes promoted in other less civilized countries by students or so-called students who so far as their mental capacities permit, disapprove of the way in which they are governed.
(Justice of the Peace and Local Government Review (23/3/66)).

The decision, in cases like these, to label some types of rule-breaking as merely "ill-judged" and others as hooliganism, clearly involved political criteria - in the broader and narrower meanings of the term - which I will return to under the heading of "ideological vandalism".

Students are by no means the only possible protected group, although they occupy a special position in the mythology about hooliganism. Another group which is given less publicity is the armed forces. Reminiscences of most servicemen will contain stories of "orgies of destruction" in barracks, officers' messes and similar settings. This behaviour is invariably handled within the organization: incidents of

32. A recent commentary on the American youth culture describes the changes from the "informal hell-raising tradition" of beer drinking, petty thieving, vandalism, fighting, and mild sexual forays which was part of growing up and confined to certain times and places, away from the official goings on of society. Now happenings are "neither so ethnocentric nor so cloistered." J.I. Simmons and B. Winograd: It's Happening: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today, (Santa Barbara: Marc-laird, 1967), pp. 55 - 56.

ritual window smashing during parties in R.A.F. officers' messes, for example, are usually dealt with by token fines and no mark is made against the record of the officer concerned. Other more interesting examples occur in ordinary public settings, such as small towns near airforce or army bases, and ports where naval forces land for short periods. In these instances it is less a question of civil authorities turning a blind eye on any damage (usually done in the course of a drunken spree) than of the existence of a clear demarcation between civil and military authorities. Such behaviour would be dealt with by naval patrols, military police or their equivalents, often resulting in harsher penalties than would be imposed by the civil authorities. Naval officers in training are impressed upon with the cardinal principle of never letting their men fall into the hands of the civil authorities: this, of course, applies to drunkenness, violence, theft and a whole range of rule-breaking other than hooliganism. In this respect at least, members of the forces constitute more of a protected group than students.

(3) Vandalism as Play: There are many important contexts in which rule-breaking never gets labelled as vandalism because it forms part of play activity. In certain areas, window breaking by small children during the course of a game (usually a competition to see who can break the most windows) is a highly institutionalized form of rule-breaking. Derelict houses or houses under construction are usually chosen and other frequent targets are empty milk bottles and beer bottles. Such activity is usually not regarded as deviant, simply because it is part of local tradition, or because the targets are regarded as "fair game". In the case of very young children, the damage might be accidental or the actors not thought to be old enough to understand the value of property. In any event, the behaviour is seen as adventure, play or exuberance by both the actor and the audience, although neither, of course, need be totally unaware that what is being done might be looked upon as wrong or illegal.

Merely to document the existence and extent of such rule-breaking is not enough for the student of deviance: a large part of children's play activity involves behaviour (such as personal violence) which breaks some rules but is never labelled or processed as deviant. What is significant about destructive play, is that it is highly susceptible to being redefined from institutionalized rule-breaking to recognized vandalism. Its very extent and the fact that it is so easily rationalized and routinized, lays it open to change. Such change might occur if the rule-breaking exceeds some level of tolerance, perhaps because it becomes too visible or results in too much damage. Referring to property destruction by young children, Clinard and Wade remark:

... most of this vandalism seems to grow out of random play activity. In the beginning stages this activity is inherently neither recreational nor delinquent. Later it may be defined as one or the other, depending on whether the culmination of the activity is acceptable or unacceptable to the community.³³

The conflict with the community, which results when such behaviour is declared "unacceptable", is precisely the type of confrontation that Tannenbaum had in mind in describing the "dramatization of evil". The writings of the Chicago School contain many examples of such confrontations. The factors determining whether the behaviour is acceptable or not are extremely complex. In some cases they can be virtually fortuitous: for example, an empty house is bought by a private owner, taken over by the local council or made subject to a preservation order. The nature of the destruction then somehow changes, the rule-breaking cannot be tolerated, the play becomes vandalism.

The labelling of the act as play or vandalism is affected by the two dimensions of rule-breaking already mentioned: if the act takes place on a ritual occasion or is carried out by a protected group, it is more easily definable as play. Even the season of the year allows for such re-definition: snowballs are sometimes more tolerated than stones for breaking

33. Clinard and Wade, op.cit., p. 497.

windows, because "you can't blame the kids, it only snows for such a short time." The type of environment is also of importance: in rural areas, for example, certain types of property destruction are more likely to be permissible and institutionalized. Hartung quotes a study of rural delinquency in which the offenders engaged in a considerable amount of property destruction which was not regarded as vandalism even by the author of the study, who referred to it as "what may be called 'destructive' play."³⁴ Again, such play is subject to changing definitions: damage to hay ricks before the war was thought to be unimportant but during the war this was brought to court under Defence Regulations.

(4) Incidental Vandalism: there are certain types of rule-breaking which, although they are often referred to as vandalism, differ from conventional vandalism offences in that they are so rarely formally reported and processed, that they contribute virtually nothing to the public image of vandalism or its reflection in the official statistics. Like much play vandalism, they are invisible. These are types of rule-breaking which the victim organizations I interviewed were aware of, but, for all practical purposes, ignored or wrote off. They could, in fact, be called "written-off vandalism".

Examples include the vast amount of minor property defacement: graffiti on lavatory walls, hoardings or posters; names scratched on the walls of ancient monuments, buildings or statues; chewing gum stuck under cinema seats, etc. Such damage or defacement is institutionalized in the sense that it is expected: one would be surprised if one did not see scribblings on the walls of the lavatories in a public house. The damage is regarded by those who own the property in much the same way as, say, a large supermarket will write off a certain amount of loss from shoplifting and theft by employees. Firms often have a name for such a loss: "stock

34. Hartung, op.cit., p. 109. Hartung's whole chapter on "Rural and Hinterland Delinquency" contains valuable material on the differential labelling of delinquency in non-urban settings.

shrinkage". The damage becomes normalized and routinized: lavatory attendants and caretakers of public buildings regard the cleaning of walls as part of their daily routine. Many advertising agencies routinely supply large contractors - such as London Transport - with a number of extra copies of posters to paste over any copies which have been defaced. The damage is not usually reported and no attempt is made to trace the offender.

The central reason for non-enforcement is that which applies to vandalism as a whole: the fact that this is one of the most safe and anonymous of offences. There is no personal complainant, there is no property to carry or dispose of. Consequently, detection rates are low and much incidental vandalism is thought not worth bothering about. Although the cumulative cost of such damage might be considerable, each individual act is too trivial to respond to in any other way than to ignore it.

The form of incidental vandalism known as graffiti - drawings or writings on walls and other surfaces - is a particularly interesting one.³⁵ While the rule-breaker himself might be looked upon as deviant or pathological, this is because of the sort of person he is thought to be or the sort of views he is thought to hold, rather than because of his act of writing about himself or his views on a public wall. Thus, the person who indicates on the wall of a public toilet his desire for an obscure sexual fetish, is regarded as a "pervert" and not as a vandal.³⁶ The person who daubs racist slogans on walls is condemned for being a racist, (i.e. for the content of the message, and not for writing the message). It is even thought legitimate to reply to such slogans or to change them. Thus "NO BLACKS HERE" becomes "MORE BLACKS HERE", etc.

35. Few serious studies of the subject exist. Richard Freeman has recently compiled an anthology of graffiti (mainly found in London) which he intersperses with some speculations about patterns behind the writing and the motives of the artists: Richard Freeman, Graffiti, (London: Hutchinson, 1966).

36. See, for example, J. Housden, "The Relative Frequency of the Sexual Paraphilias as Demonstrated by 159 Graffiti," British Journal of Criminology, 3 (January 1963), pp. 290 - 293.

Society's ambiguity towards this type of rule-breaking is shown by the fact that, although there are detailed legal prescriptions against it,³⁷ it is widely regarded with tolerance and even amusement. Graffiti are hailed as legitimate and amusing forms of self-expression and Freeman quotes an article from a students' magazine in which the (named) author gave helpful advice on scrawling in underground tubes: the best writing instruments to use, which stations are dangerous and which are the best for a beginner to "gain confidence".³⁸ A recent article in a literary journal produced by students at the University of Keele, describes graffiti as "the last urban folk art"; the author goes on: "The artists are completely anonymous. I've never seen one and never been seen ..."³⁹

The writing of graffiti - the term originally applied to the wall scrawlings of Pompeii - is a form of behaviour with a long history of institutionalization.⁴⁰ The slogans on the Pompeii walls, such as "VIBIUS RESTITUS SLEPT HERE ..." are echoed in the more contemporary versions, such as "KILROY WAS HERE", which are virtually part of the national heritage. Few national monuments are free of the names of visitors, scratched on the wall for immortality.

An interesting category of incidental vandalism is the type of damage that gets done in the course of some other activity which does not involve rule-breaking. An example of this is the damage done to the countryside - breaking of fences, plants, fields - in the course of various hunts. Such damage is regarded as an unfortunate, but unavoidable part of the hunt. A recent legal comment on a case, in which a member of the Hunt Saboteurs

37. See, for example, London Transport Board, Railways Byelaws, Numbers 17 and 21.

38. Freeman, op.cit., pp. 41 - 42.

39. Marshall Coleman, "Graffiti: The Moving Finger Writes," Unit No. 10, (February 1968), pp. 17 - 21.

40. For a scholarly study of the original graffiti at Pompeii see: Jack Lindsay, The Writing on the Wall, (London: Muller 1960). See also Violet Pritchard, Medieval English Graffiti, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1967).

Association was tried for attempting to obstruct a hunt, nicely illustrates the political processes involved in labelling who is and who is not a "hooligan".⁴¹ The members of the Hunt Saboteurs Association who threw meat and aniseed to the dogs were described as "young hooligans" and the journal commented that, while it was not its policy to take sides for or against fox hunting, it was concerned with the methods used by the protesters: "In this country, sabotage of this or any other type cannot be tolerated." These comments were made in the context of general remarks calling for more severe punishments for vandals.

Another setting in which much incidental vandalism occurs is that of large commercial exhibitions. At the Motor Show in Earls Court, for example, damage estimated at several thousand pounds occurs regularly. Although some firms take security measures, such as roping off the area around the car, it is generally thought that damage to the cars cannot be prevented. As one newspaper described it: "Dents, scratches, cigarette burns to the upholstery and carpets, and bent doors are all part of the accepted risks of putting the latest models on show to the public" (News of the World 24/10/65).⁴² Some firms, indeed, regard the show as a test of strength: if various handles, switches and accessories have not been ripped off the car by the end of the show, the car is regarded as a durable model.

Incidental property destruction can easily become converted into conventional vandalism offences. The same amount of incidental, trivial damage is magnified if the target is of a particular kind: defacement of religious property and other symbolically sacred property, such as war memorials, is more likely to be processed as vandalism. Then the damage might accumulate to such an extent that it becomes impossible to write it off: it gets defined as "going too far" or "getting beyond control". Fortuitous technological factors might increase the seriousness with which the offence

41. "Sabotage", Justice of the Peace and Local Government Review, Vol. LXXVIII, (April 11th, 1964), p. 235.

42. See also M. Boyd, "Vandals' Day at the Motor Show," Sunday Times 24/11/65.

is defined: the use of felt tipped pens, for example, which makes the writing more difficult to remove, lowers the tolerance threshold. Often, also, if the defacement involves some disapproved ideological message, it is defined as unacceptable. An interesting example was the redefinition of a type of routine defacement of advertising posters. In September, 1965, there was a series of incidents in which posters advertising cigarettes and tobacco were daubed in red paint with the word "CANCER". While ordinary damage to such posters - for example, painting moustaches on female faces - was tolerable, this new type of defacement was threatening to the tobacco companies and advertising agencies and was labelled by the press as a "war by vandals" and by the sales manager of the poster advertising contractors "... serious wilful damage."

The factor, however, that usually makes such vandalism more visible is a simple increase in the amount or seriousness of the damage, or a perception that this increase has taken place.

(5) Organizational Vandalism: This refers to the type of property destruction which occurs within the confines of a fairly closed setting such as a factory or a school. The act of rule-breaking is rarely processed as a vandalism offence for much the same reasons that apply to incidental vandalism: the damage is too trivial or occurs too routinely to be taken much notice of. When the rule-breaking is paid attention to - and this is the chief characteristic of organizational vandalism - it is sanctioned within the framework of the organization. The more "total" the organization or institution, the less likely it is that the rule-breaking will ever be legally processed. The vandalism is thus invisible: it is rarely defined as deviant by the wider society, because it is unknown to all but the rule-breaker and other members of the organization. Both the rule-breaking and the informal (although at times highly intricate and ritualistic) sanctions it sometimes evokes, are institutionalized. They form part of the unwritten folklore of the organization, and, from one perspective, can be seen as functional to the organization.

Coser's and Erikson's ideas about the positive functions of deviance are, in fact, readily applicable to organizational vandalism, particularly those forms which occur in industrial settings. One study of rule-breaking in an airplane factory, provides an example of this perspective.⁴³ The rule-breaking described involves a particular instrument, the tap, the use of which is the most serious crime of workmanship in the plant: it destroys the effectiveness of vital parts of the construction and is an illegal means of concealing a structural defect. A worker can be dismissed for merely possessing a tap. Yet half the workforce owns one and there is a mass violation of the serious rules governing its use. Bensman and Gerver ingeniously describe the various ways in which the laws are unenforced, or else pseudo-enforced, through a public ritual. Because of the plurality of ends involved in the system, any analysis of deviance based on a Mertonian means/ends model or the idea of dysfunction, misses the point:

... a large part of behaviour which is visible to an insider or to a sophisticated observer is 'criminal', that is, violates publicly stated norms. But since such behaviour is accepted - in fact often stimulated, aided and abetted by the effective on-the-spot authorities - the criminality of such behaviour has limited consequences.⁴⁴

The use of the tap could be seen as a form of vandalism: one of its possible consequences was damage or even destruction of the airplane. I draw attention to this example, however, more for the theoretical interest of Bensman and Gerver's analysis. There are many more literal forms of vandalism in industrial organizations; these entail the direct destruction or damage of plant and machinery, and are often referred to as "sabotage". This is a form of behaviour with highly complex origins and motivations, not easily reducible to a functional analysis.

The immediate historical example which springs to mind is the phenomenon of Luddism, which I will deal with specifically later. Much contemporary

43. J. Bensman and I. Gerver, "Crime and Punishment in the Factory: A Functional Analysis" in B. Rosenberg et al (Eds.), op.cit., pp. 141 - 152.

44. Ibid., p. 150.

machine-destruction seems to consist of deliberate techniques of restricting output, ensuring extra rest periods or alleviating boredom. The literature in industrial sociology contains virtually no reference to such behaviour, yet reminiscences from students and colleagues who have studied or worked in factories, clearly suggest that such behaviour occurs with considerable frequency and regularity. Examples I have collected include:- in a biscuit factory: kicking in every fifth biscuit tin marked "fragile" (this was done "for fun"); in a custard powder factory: placing a wrist watch under a machine designed to detect metal, this would immediately stop the machine; during hop-picking: deliberately smashing items of equipment. Some observers who have noted the prevalence of industrial sabotage (but not provided any data about its incidence), have interpreted such behaviour as evidence of violent protest against the frustrations of factory life. Commenting on a worker who had deliberately smashed the belt on the gear-head of a coal face, Coates writes:

The boy was registering his protest against boredom, he was getting some of his own back on the machine which dominated him, and he was demonstrating his indispensability to the colliers down the face who normally took his efforts for granted.⁴⁵

Whether or not we accept such interpretations of sabotage, the point in the present context is that such behaviour is often normalized: management workers and unions accept that this sort of thing "happens". Nothing is done about the rule-breaking unless it is perceived as having gone too far and its effect is too disruptive to be contained. Industrial sabotage can be observed in extreme forms in more total institutions such as ships, where other avenues of protest for the worker are limited and he does not always have the escape route of walking out of the job, or even temporarily absenting himself from work. One observer, writing from many years' experience at sea, ranging from deckhand to chief officer, considers that "the most blatant private expressions of hostility at sea took the form of

45. K. Coates, "Wage Slaves" in R. Blackburn and A. Cockburn (Eds.), The Incompatibles: Trade Union Militancy and the Consensus, (London: Penguin, 1967), p. 62.

outright acts of sabotage such as fouling up the tanks while tank-cleaning. This type of act was by no means uncommon."⁴⁶ Other examples mentioned by Ramsay include: buckets being thrown over the side of a ship which had no running water for washing; members of the catering staff heaving a pile of dirty dishes through the port-hole instead of washing them; stewards doing personal laundry making a "mistake" by burning a hole through a shirt with the iron. Other routine examples cited by Peter Fricke include throwing tools overboard and painting slogans and signs on the hulls of ships belonging to rival lines.⁴⁷ As in many other cases of organizational vandalism, there are sanctions against such activity which are difficult to enforce. Enforcement takes place when, for example, the behaviour goes "too far"; it then becomes problematic, although it is rarely processed as a conventional vandalism offence. The following extract from a Master's report to his shipping company, illustrates the point:

... The conduct of the crew at this port has just about reached its lowest ever standard, and the deck ratings can no longer be considered an efficient working force ... the deck ratings under the insidious influence of X are doing everything possible to prevent the efficient working of the ship by such actions as dropping their working tools, chipping hammers, paint brushes, over the side. All of which is very difficult to prove ... unless firmer disciplinary actions are taken we just cannot hope to run our vessels efficiently.

Moving away from work situations, a number of other examples of organizational vandalism may be cited, each case again involving complex motivational patterns. Much school vandalism is of this kind: only the more spectacular incidents (such as mass breaking of windows, full scale destruction of classrooms or - more usually - the headmaster's study) are

46. R.A. Ramsay, Managers and Men: Adventures in Industry, (Sidney: Ure Smith, 1966), p. 123. I am indebted to Peter Fricke, who is carrying out a study of the merchant navy, for drawing my attention to this source, and for giving me other material from his research and his own experience in the navy.

47. A more unusual incident he recollects took place after deck hands, who had already thrown their rubber gloves overboard because they were fed up with the job, refused the mate's order to paint the deck with creosote (Deckol); a painful job which burns the hands unless one uses gloves or grease. The men proceeded to paint the creosote on the testicles of fifteen bulls in the hold. The bulls had to be destroyed when the ship docked.

processed as offences. The personal reminiscences of virtually anybody who has been to school, as well as more formal evidence gathered from interviews with the twenty three Northview Head Teachers, indicated that such destruction of property is routinely carried out within the confines of the school and is never formally reported.⁴⁸ Examples are legion and part of the unwritten folklore of the school: graffiti on the lavatory walls; scratching names and slogans on desks; flooding the changing rooms or cloakrooms by plugging the sinks and turning the taps on; defacing textbooks; breaking various items of sports equipment; tearing off coat hooks from cloakroom walls, etc. Such rule breaking may be institutionalized because of some of the other conditions we have distinguished: it is usually rationalized as play activity, it is incidental in the sense that it is just put up with and accepted as normal, and the damage often occurs on ritual occasions, especially the end of term when there are school leavers.

A final example of rule-breaking in the confines of an organization, is the type of destruction carried out by inmates of institutions such as mental hospitals and prisons. As in the case of industrial sabotage, such damage - which usually takes the form of breaking windows, furniture, equipment and eating utensils - is often motivated by impotent rage and hostility against authority. It might also be a way to relieve boredom or a conscious tactic to draw attention to a particular grievance. A psychiatrist has drawn attention to the complex motivation behind the damage and destruction carried out in children's residential institutions.⁴⁹ He suggests that the damage done by aggressive children - window breaking, destroying flower-beds, breaking dishes, defacing walls - is related to a need to vent one's feelings on the immediate surroundings: this might serve as a safety valve in that the institution is able to wait and allow for the damage and the child can

48. For some observations on school vandalism by a teacher, see A. Barton: "A Smashing Time: Vandalism in Schools," The Tablet (25th June, 1966), pp. 725 - 726. I am indebted to Mr. Barton for answering in writing further queries on the subject.

49. P. Dockar-Drysdale, "Some Aspects of Damage and Restitution," British Journal of Delinquency, 4 (July 1963), pp. 4 - 13.

search for a means of restitution.

In some therapeutic establishments, such damage is not only normalized but welcomed as a sign that an inhibited person is learning to express himself. Although there are often institutional rules against such behaviour, the staff are trained to tolerate the rule-breaking under certain conditions, and to blandly sit back, for example, while the patient (usually a child) smashes various items of furniture and equipment. In one of the classic accounts of the treatment of disturbed delinquents, Aichhorn wrote:

As a direct result of our attitude, their aggressive acts became more frequent and more violent until practically all the furniture in the building was destroyed, the window panes broken, the doors nearly kicked to pieces ... The building looked as if it harboured a crowd of madmen. In spite of this, I continued to insist that the boys should be allowed to work out their aggression, that there should be no intervention except where necessary to prevent physical injury ...⁵⁰

In more conventional therapeutic and penal establishments, such tolerance of vandalism rarely exists. Nevertheless, as with most other forms of rule-breaking, the behaviour is contained, and sanctioned if necessary, within the walls of the institution. In their study of Pentonville, the Morris's note that, apart from assaults, "smashing up" is the most frequent type of acting out disorder in the prison.⁵¹ They also note that such behaviour is not tolerated: damage to prison property is invariably made the subject of a Governor's Report and the prisoner who smashes up his cell is likely to be handled with force by the officers.

One might note finally, in connection with organizational vandalism, that one of the conditions under which it becomes redefined, is when it is associated with other rule-breaking within the same setting. For example, if there is a spectacular incident of window-breaking in a school, the

50. August Aichhorn, Wayward Youth, (London: Image Publishing Co. Ltd., 1951), pp. 173 - 174.

51. Terence and Pauline Morris, Pentonville: A Sociological Study of an English Prison, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963), pp. 201 - 202 and p. 260. For a psychiatric view on "smashing up" see: B.M. Cormier et al, "Cell Breakage and Gate Fever: A Study of Two Syndromes Found in the Deprivation of Liberty," British Journal of Criminology, 7 (July 1967), pp. 317 - 324.

school authorities or mass media might draw attention to the incidence of the more routine types of vandalism. Similarly, if there is a scandal about, say, drug taking, sexual promiscuity, or general indiscipline in a school, then the ordinary organizational vandalism might become more visible in the ensuing "exposure". I will pay some attention later to the crucial significance of visibility in the societal reaction to deviance.

(6) Licensed Vandalism: this is a condition which overlaps most of the other categories I have distinguished; it could be said to summarize or extract certain features common to these other categories. It refers to the way in which vandalism, in various situations, is benevolently tolerated or allowed for. It might be regarded as a nuisance and somewhat troublesome, but seldom more than that. Despite the fact that - unlike organizational vandalism - it may occur in a highly public setting and - unlike incidental vandalism - its manifestations might be spectacular - the damage is rarely officially reported, processed or regarded as socially problematic. The reason for this, might be that a protected group is involved, or that the damage takes place on a ritual occasion or in the context of play or that the actors are under the influence of alcohol - or a combination of all these factors. The end result is that the vandalism is "chartered" or insured against, in the sense that even before the damage takes place, some informal arrangement is made whereby the rule-breakers can be ritualistically sanctioned. The sanction often takes the form of financial reparation and, in some cases, an insurance fee will be paid before the event to cover any possible costs.

An example of such vandalism is the type of damage done to hotels by resident sporting teams, especially during sports festivals. Rugby and men's hockey teams are particularly notorious for this type of behaviour. Some hotels extract "danger money" from the team before it arrives to cover the cost of such damage as smashing glasses and bottles, emptying sand buckets or turning on fire extinguishers in the corridors and breaking furniture. Other hotel managements will unobtrusively add the cost of damage to the team's bill; in the case of professional teams, such cost will usually be

subtracted from wages or fees. When this behaviour takes place in small towns - as, for example, in coastal resorts in the South of England - it is well-known to virtually the whole population and even reported in the local press: yet nothing is done about it. The charter for this type of rule-breaking is easily lifted. Hotels discover, for example, that the profits from the stay of a few rugby teams do not compensate for the cost of the damage, and decide to ban a particularly offensive team. Such a sequence, however, very rarely occurs; on the whole, it is commercially sound to allow for this type of rule-breaking.

Vandalism by various protected groups might also be licenced in certain settings. Colleges or Halls of Residence of some universities in this country have, for example, evolved schemes whereby students have to pay danger money (usually about £25) when they enrol. This money would be used to cover any damage or petty pilfering. Public schoolboys coming home on trains at the end of term were made to pay for any damage themselves; this would not be reported to the police. Some degree of licence or charter is also given to armed forces, particularly on occasions such as the first night in port after a voyage, or the last night prior to embarkation.

This whole section might be illustrated by a type of vandalism which combines the dimensions of licence, protected-group and ritual-occasion, and also illustrates the selectivity in the public response to deviance. This is the behaviour by British holiday makers on day trips or weekend excursions to such European coastal towns as Calais and Ostend. For some years, these holidays have been occasions for behaviour (mainly, but not entirely, by young people) variously described as "vandalism", "hooliganism" or "rowdyism". In Ostend, there is a period of the year at Whitsun, which is referred to as "the English season". During this period, the town is filled with amateur footballers and other clubs arriving for weekend matches and outings in Belgium and Holland. These, and other groups, arrive, having consumed a great deal of duty free liquor on the ferry. In the evenings, beer is drunk by the quart, and in the course of the weekend a

vast amount of damage can take place: washstands and plumbing have been torn from hotel rooms, windows smashed in the streets, furniture and crockery smashed in dance halls.

This behaviour is usually treated with a fair amount of indulgence by the Ostend police, although each year since 1962 (from which I have followed the reports), the authorities have threatened to "get tougher next year". Towns, such as Ostend, are dependant on the tourist trade and make enormous efforts to attract British tourists. In fact, few of the threats to "get tough" ever materialized: the most frequent procedure for dealing with vandalism was to give a nominal penalty, such as a night in jail, or, in a number of cases, for the police to escort the offender to the plane after his friends had clubbed together to pay the cost of the damage. Only severe cases, such as assault, were dealt with more formally and even this behaviour would be seen as excusable: in October, 1965, a Belgian lawyer, defending seven British youths who appealed against sentences for wrecking a dance hall and causing injuries to the proprietor, resulting in the loss of one ear and severe eye damage, said to the court: "These seven youths are not Mods and Rockers who destroyed something for the sheer pleasure of destruction." In the following year, commenting on the fact that no arrests were made after twenty Britons started an argument at a dance hall resulting in damage worth £2,000, a police spokesman was quoted as saying: "We are trying to avoid making arrests. We don't want any Britons in goal when Queen Elizabeth comes here during her State visit to Belgium at the beginning of May." (Times and Daily Telegraph 11/4/66).

The comparison made by the Belgian lawyer between this behaviour and that of the Mods and Rockers, which was occurring at the same time, is highly significant. Although a certain amount of rowdiness is licenced in British resorts at bank holidays as well, this licence, as Section IV will show, was certainly withdrawn in the case of the Mods and Rockers. They were not a protected group; their behaviour could not be normalized in the ritual of the bank holiday, none of the conditions and excuses which applied to the

young British footballers in Ostend applied to them. As one journalist wrote from Ostend, trying carefully to extract what he called the "significant difference between the trouble here and now and the warfare between mods and rockers in British seaside resorts":

Many of the young people who come here are not hooligans by nature. In nearly all cases, the trouble seems to arise when they are confused by a foreign language and fuddled by uncontrolled drinking (Sunday Times 14/11/68).

In other words, this type of rule-breaking in Ostend or Calais is not "really" hooliganism or vandalism, while the identical behaviour in Margate or Brighton is, and should be labelled as such.

Vandalism as an Emotive Label

The combinations of the various societal reactions to vandalism dealt with so far revolve around those forms of illegal property destruction least likely to be labelled and processed as conventional vandalism offences. The combinations I would briefly like to note now, are those which are, in a sense, the polar opposite: the situations in which behaviour is labelled as vandalism, despite the fact that illegal property destruction is not its primary characteristic. These situations are of interest if only to emphasize the way in which the term "vandalism" can be used as an emotive label; there are two major contexts in which this occurs.

The first is when the behaviour involves property destruction, but this is not illegal; either because the property belongs to the actor, or because he has been given explicit instructions to destroy it. One type would be property destruction carried out in the course of an artistic performance or justified for some other aesthetic reasons: examples include "vandalisable sculpture" devised by such sculptors as William Turnbull; Auto-Destructive Art⁵² and the breaking up of musical instruments on stage by pop groups (such as "The Who" and "Move"). The other type of legal property destruction

52. For details of Gustav Metzger's Auto-Destructive Art see Architectural Association Journal, (March, April, May and June, 1965).

referred to as "vandalism" comes closer to the etymological origins of the term. This is the destruction by public bodies or private developers of buildings and natural amenities in the name of "redevelopment", "modernization" and so on. The term is particularly applied to the destruction of buildings of historic or aesthetic value. In the mass media during the past few years the following behaviour has also been described as vandalism: dumping cars and other litter in the countryside; designing and building certain types of mass housing estates, particularly those with tower blocks;⁵³ mutilating trees and - this can be seen in the pages of Country Life and similar publications - all sorts of destruction in the countryside; breaking walls, burning fields and hedges and the indiscriminate use of pesticides.

The second context in which "vandalism" is used as a label, is more inappropriate than the first, but at the same time more relevant to the criminologist; these are situations in which the behaviour is illegal, but does not primarily involve property destruction. The most important illustrations of this, are certain types of theft which might necessitate some property destruction but are not legally classified and processed as such; the destruction is necessary for the theft but is incidental to it. When the windows of a house or the lock of a safe are broken to steal the contents, this is not referred to as vandalism; yet when telephone coin boxes, gas meters, parking meters, slot machines, etc. are broken in order to remove the contents, the behaviour is very often referred to as vandalism. The term is also applied to theft of sacred objects: when a church is broken into and various ornaments stolen, the incident, if it is not called "sacrilege", is called "vandalism". In August, 1966, two bronze plaques were stolen from a war memorial at Wandsworth Cemetery, clearly for

53. A B.B.C. Television Documentary "Who Are The Vandals?" (2/2/67) argued that part of the responsibility for vandalism by bored teenagers on housing estates (and neuroses among the mothers in their skyscraper cells) lies in "the vandalism by housing committees and architects who build too quickly and think too little." See a note by the programme's producer in Radio Times (26/1/67), p. 39.

disposal to scrap metal dealers. The Chairman of the Parks Committee said that he had "... never heard of a worse act of vandalism." This inappropriate labelling of offences which will be classified as theft rather than some form of malicious damage to property, is important in that these acts enter into the public stereotype of vandalism. The distinction between someone who breaks a telephone coin box for the money and one who pulls out the receiver "for fun", is blurred under the headlines and figures about "telephone vandalism". It is, of course, true that the eventual classification of such acts as theft or malicious damage is often quite fortuitous. In his study of adult window-smashers in a prison, Prewer mentions the case of windows being smashed prior to stealing articles on display in shop windows.⁵⁴ He notes that if the offence is interrupted in some way, or not accompanied by such obvious preparations as a waiting car, it is mistaken for a "silly piece of wanton damage."

Recognized Vandalism Offences

In this category fall those acts which not only violate the rules forbidding the destruction of property, but which are usually recognized and labelled as vandalism and processed as delinquent or criminal offences. To the extent that there is a mythology or set of beliefs about vandalism, these acts are the basis on which the mythology is formed. To the extent that there is a societal control culture directed towards controlling vandalism (by prevention, deterrence, punishment, therapy, etc.), these are the acts with which the control culture is concerned. To the extent that criminologists have theories about vandalism, these are the acts which their theories are designed to explain. In any context in which society's reaction to vandalism is conventionally discussed, these are the acts which are being reacted to.

Saying this does not, of course, imply that all these acts go through all the stages of being processed. Because of the conditions under which

54. R.R. Prewer, "Some Observations on Window Smashing," British Journal of Delinquency, 10 (October 1959), p. 110.

rule-breaking can be institutionalized, or at least tolerated, many such acts are recognized and labelled as vandalism offences but are never, say, reported to the police. A further number are reported to the police, but because of the low detection rate and other factors, the offender never gets processed. The eventual reaction to such offences is also more often inconsistent than totally rejecting. The boundary lines of this category are, like that of the others, fluid and shifting. Virtually every single one of these acts is capable of being redefined in terms other than those implied in the label "recognized vandalism offence."

Despite these qualifications, these acts remain as the core of vandalism as a socially defined problem and form of deviance. The subsequent chapters will deal mainly with these acts and the responses they evoke. At this stage - to find another answer to the question "what is vandalism?" - it is worth simply listing the types of acts included in this category. I am not interested here in classifications based on types of people, types of motivation, patterns of behaviour, legal categories, and so on. The classification that follows is based on the type of property destroyed: this was the most convenient way of organizing all my material on vandalism. It tells us nothing about how the behaviour is reacted to and it obscures the situational context of the act: for example, the category "vandalism to telephone kiosks" includes a heterogeneous series of acts ranging from a group of ten year olds smashing the glass panes of the kiosk, to an irate caller ripping out the receiver in exasperation at the inefficiency of the S.T.D. system. One is merely answering the question "what sort of damage is usually called vandalism?" The following list is by no means exhaustive; theoretically no item of property which exists is immune from destruction. These are only the most common targets:

- (1) Railways: includes damage done to moving trains (seats slashed, windows broken, etc.); rolling stock; obstacles placed on line.
- (2) Other Public Transport: buses, underground trains.

- (3) Telephone Kiosks
- (4) Private Property: especially houses, building sites, motor cars.
- (5) Schools
- (6) Sporting Fields: includes open air fields, bowling greens, gymnasias, golf courses.
- (7) Religious buildings: churches, synagogues, mosques.
- (8) Cemeteries: including vaults, crematoria.
- (9) Art Objects: paintings, statues.
- (10) Places of Entertainment: Dance Halls, Bingo Halls, Cinemas.
- (11) Memorials: War memorials, memorials for public figures.
- (12) Posters and Hoardings
- (13) Parks: including children's playgrounds, park seats.
- (14) Miscellaneous local authority property: street lamps, public conveniences, council flats, life-belts, street signs, bus shelters, litter bins, parking meters, etc.

Ideological Vandalism

This is a category of property destruction which possesses either or both of the following characteristics:-

(i) the rule is broken as a means towards some explicit and conscious ideological end: political, nationalistic, religious or racial;

(ii). there is no consensus over the content of the rule which is being broken and, more particularly, the content of the rule is being explicitly and consciously challenged.

To the extent that many acts in the other categories of property destruction (both institutionalized rule-breaking and recognized vandalism

offences) may be motivated by ideological reasons, it is difficult - as well as a political and ideological act in itself - to designate some acts of vandalism as ideological and others as not. In fact, as will be shown, the unanswered questions of both transactional theory (deviant to whom?) and neo-Durkheimian theory (functional to whom?) can be observed in sharpest outlines in regard to this category. Nevertheless, there is a recognizable type of property-destruction which, although it may be simply dismissed as "sheer" hooliganism or vandalism by most members of society, involves a clear ideological component if only in the sense that it is morally justified as such. Further, there are circumstances in which the actor is regarded, not as an outsider or deviant to be punished, nor even excused because he was "only having fun", but is, in fact, seen as a hero or martyr, fighting a just cause. Whether he is called a hero or a hooligan, a visionary or a vandal, depends on the same political processes which determine whether, say, a member of a Rhodesian African Party who sabotages a power station is called a "terrorist" or a "freedom fighter".

These points will be made more clear by looking at specific examples. one might start with the use of property-destruction as a tactic to achieve political change. Recent manifestations of this phenomenon (for example, stoning embassy windows, destruction by students and workers during demonstrations) have been regarded as somehow innovatory. It is probable, however, that there was a greater amount of such ideological property destruction in pre-industrial times. The main reason for this was the absence, for the vast bulk of the population, of legitimate means of expressing grievances, particularly through political parties and trade unions. Rude's discussion of crowd disturbances in France and England between 1730 and 1848 contains many illustrations of ideological vandalism.⁵⁵ These acts were, of course, not reducible to a single motive. There was,

55. G. Rudé, The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730 - 1848, (London: John Wiley & Sons, 1964).

for example, the traditional riot by the "labouring poor" in the Eighteenth Century as a means of redressing a particular grievance:

On such occasions, market towns, miners' villages and country lanes echoed to the sound of marching feet, crashing timber, or broken glass as working men and women settled accounts with corn factors, religious dissenters, mill owners, farmers or enclosing landlords.⁵⁶

There was in addition the type of damage during episodes, such as the English Food Riots of 1766, sparked off by a sudden increase in the price of grain.⁵⁷ On these occasions, mills were destroyed, flour thrown into rivers and records destroyed. Probably the best known historical example of ideological vandalism is the Luddite episode. The term "Luddism" is often used in connection with the type of industrial sabotage discussed under the heading of "organizational rule-breaking" which, as suggested, could be thought to involve ideological undertones. Recent analyses of Luddism by economic historians, such as Rude, Hobsbawn and Thompson, are more relevant, than first appears, to the contemporary study of vandalism in that they challenge the stereotype of such destruction as being "pointless and frenzied" or as being a mere "overflow of high spirits".⁵⁸ Of particular interest, also, is Hobsbawn's distinction between the two types of machine breaking: the first was "collective bargaining by riot", in which the wrecking implied no special hostility to machines as such but was, under certain conditions, a normal way of putting pressure on employers, particularly to concede wage increases. The second type was directed against machinery as such, particularly labour-saving machinery and is explained in terms of working class hostility to the new machines of the Industrial Revolution. A point that both Hobsbawn and Rude make about this type of machine breaking is, again, of contemporary interest; namely, that the destruction was not altogether indiscriminate: selected targets were chosen and there was often

56. Ibid., p. 34.

57. Ibid., pp. 38 - 45.

58. See particularly E.J. Hobsbawn, "The Machine Breakers" Past and Present (February 1952), pp. 57 - 70, reprinted in Labouring Men, (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1964), and Rude, op.cit., Chapter 5.

talk of "lists" of persons whose frames should be destroyed.

Although one might have reservations about Rude's conclusion "... apart from minor survivals, after 1817 industrial machine breaking had already had its day. Luddism, like other forms of popular action appropriate to the pre-industrial age, had no future in the new industrial society",⁵⁹ contemporary ideological vandalism has moved to many more arenas than the industrial. In political demonstrations, property destruction includes throwing stones at embassy windows, breaking cars, uprooting trees, tearing down street signs and breaking shop windows. Such acts are usually carried out in the crowd or mob situation, but there are also individual acts of property damage - usually referred to as sabotage - such as the blowing up of an embassy, public building or communication or power installations.

In the case of racial or religious conflict, most damage is again done in a crowd situation, such as the classic American race and lynch mob or the European pogrom, and, more spectacularly, in the recent racial disturbances in American cities. There are also individual acts of vandalism, for example, white racials throwing stones in the windows of a Negro family's home. Such vandalism is often expressed by symbolic acts of defacement, such as the painting of slogans and signs like swastikas. Of all these types of property destruction, it is this last which is most likely to be referred to as "vandalism": it is usually studied as such and referred to by social scientists interested in conventional vandalism, as opposed to, say, damage during political demonstrations, which is dealt with, if at all, by political sociologists.

In all these phenomena - although certain individuals taking part are motivated by different reasons - property destruction is used as a conscious tactic: to obtain revenge, or draw attention to a specific grievance, to gain publicity for a general cause, to challenge or insult symbolically a

59. Rude', Ibid., p. 91.

particular individual or group. There is another type of ideological vandalism, however, where the very content of the rules is being challenged. In the same way as the Marxist slogan of "Property is Theft" has sometimes been interpreted literally to mean that the rules governing the theft of property are not to be thought of as binding, so have certain movements advocated property destruction as a legitimate end in itself. This view can be seen, for example, in the current of anarchist thought which has literally interpreted slogans such as Bakunin's: "Let us put our trust in the eternal spirit which destroys and annihilates only because it is the unsearchable and eternally creative source of all life. The urge to destroy is also a creative urge."⁶⁰ Contemporary variations on this theme can be found in ideologies advocating "urban guerillas" to destroy the artefacts of Western civilization and, in movements such as the International Situationists, the Constructive Nihilists, etc.⁶¹ In Newcastle, for example, an offshoot of one of these movements, the Black Hand Gang, has placed stickers on walls and boards exhorting people to acts of vandalism: "SMASH THIS WINDOW", "TEAR UP SEATS", "DYNAMITE IN A HOLE".

It would be quite beyond the scope of this study to deal adequately with ideological vandalism: this would entail a consideration of the vast literature in areas such as political sociology, racial and ethnic relations and collective behaviour. The very fact, however, that such behaviour falls outside the field conventionally designated as criminology, need not

60. See the various articles on Creative Vandalism in Anarchy, 61, Vol. 6. No. 3, March, 1966. I do not wish to imply that all or most anarchists would take Bakunin's sentiments to justify all forms of vandalism. The types of "creative vandalism" which these articles recommend are either innocuous (such as pleasantly decorating a London Electricity Board transformer box) or genuinely "pro-social", such as destroying rubbish and litter like abandoned old cars.

61. See, for example, the journal King Mob Echo and various publications of the Situationists: in one of these, an analysis of the Watts Riots, entitled "The Decline and Fall of the Spectacular Commodity-Economy" (Supplement Internationale Situationniste, No. 10, December, 1965), the following appears: "... real needs are expressed in carnival, playful affirmation and the potlatch of destruction. The man who destroys commodities shows his human superiority over commodities."

necessarily be taken for granted. The choice of one's subject matter is not a value-free decision: the criminologist, for example, who, in the face of disagreement from the rest of society, decides that motoring offences present a greater social problem and need more research attention than many other conventional offences, is involved in a political act. Again, we must alert ourselves to the problems involved in defining our field of study: why does the criminologist not include what I have called "ideological vandalism" in his study of vandalism? Is it because he "does not have enough space?" Or is it because he does not think that this is "really" vandalism? The answers to these questions should be made explicit rather than ignored.

In the context of the present chapter, ideological vandalism is important for the following reasons:-

(i) Much conventional vandalism is, in fact, ideological: this is a point I will pay some attention to when discussing the mythology surrounding conventional vandalism.

(ii) Much conventional vandalism is thought to be ideologically inspired: for example, the term 'sabotage' with its ideological connotations is often used to describe acts of play vandalism by small children. A recent article referred to children throwing bricks on the railway as "... doing their best to sabotage British Rail."⁶² Often also, conspiratorial organizations are incorrectly blamed for vandalism. The imputation of ideological motives may not be the result of a simple misperception of the situation or of a desire to make the deviance appear to be more serious, but in order, in fact, to praise the behaviour. This is usually done by retrospectively reading into the behaviour motives that might not have existed.

This is even true for the types of vandalism offences regarded with

62. F.R. Casson: "Vandals", Family Doctor, (August 1966), pp. 464 - 465.

greatest social disapproval: for example, a pacifist writing about the formation of "non-violent elites" welcomed signs of Luddism in small communities which he hoped could be canalized into peaceful forms of action:

In recent months I have observed the genesis of a number of acts which I would place in this category - obstruction and incendiarism on railway lines, carried out mostly but not solely by children. Without reading too much into these activities, the involved spectator sees growing here an articulate group-consciousness directed not merely against British Rail itself, but against the alien standards it buttresses.⁶³

It is not important that this appears to be a strange position for a pacifist to take, nor is it important whether Moody's interpretation of railway vandalism is correct or not. What is important is simply that, because of lack of consensus over rules, much conventional vandalism can be rationalized, neutralized or even idealized.

These are cases where only a minority opinion would impute, say, political motives; it should be noted, however, that there are cases of vandalism which seem "obviously" to be ideologically inspired, but in fact have little to do with ideologies. Research, for example, (which I will discuss in detail later) on the 1959-60 swastika incidents in America, suggests that a fair proportion of the offenders had no obvious anti-Semitic motivation.

(iii) The perception of an act of vandalism as being ideologically motivated, rather than "motiveless", effects society's attitude to the act and the way in which it is dealt with. This is a complex relationship, and is part of a general issue which the whole thesis addresses itself to: namely, the relationship between one's explanation of deviance and the way one handles it. On the whole, it seems true that acts, which are seen to have a motive to "make sense", are less subject to the violent reactions usually directed to acts perceived as "motiveless". But a motive can be approved, or disapproved of, and this logically leads us onto the next

63. Roger Moody, Peace News (16/7/63).

reason for considering ideological vandalism.

(iv) The societal reaction to vandalism is overtly affected by ideological factors. At the simplest level, it would seem that if an act of vandalism is associated - correctly or not - with an ideology one disapproves of, the reaction will be more punitive. This point is obvious in regard to most cases of political vandalism; I have already suggested how the attitude to behaviour by groups such as students might change as a result of some of their members' involvement in ideological vandalism, the aims of which are disapproved. Property destruction by such groups is only tolerated if it is done for the "right" reasons, as defined by those in power and authority.

The very selection of certain types of rule-breaking for public attention, and for being defined as problems, is affected by ideological factors. In the interests of the dominant ideology, or consensus, or what is defined as "the public good", both institutionalized rule-breaking and conventional vandalism offences are responded to selectively. So, for example, certain types of incidental vandalism are more likely to be defined as problematic than others. Racist slogans abound on posters on the London Underground but very little is done about them; at the beginning of 1968 the posters of a large department store advertising a "Buy American Week" were changed so that the slogan "WE CLOTHE VERY LATE" became "WE CLOTHE EVERY CHILD IN NAPALM": this received a great deal of attention and all the posters that were written on were immediately replaced. In August, 1966, two different types of ideological vandalism were reported: in one, swastikas, the initials "N.S.M." (National Socialist Movement) and the slogan "No Black Police" were painted on the buildings in which Britain's first coloured policeman was to begin training; at the same time, French students painted anti-English slogans at Hastings Castle and Battle Abbey ("Mort Aux Anglais", "Nous Reclames l'Isle de la Manche", etc.). The latter incidents were very much more widely reported.

Certain types of vandalism are played down when they occur in a context about which some ideological ambiguity exists. An interesting comment appeared in one paper (Daily Mail 21/12/66) referring to the quashing by the Court of Appeal of a conviction, under the Race Relations Act, of a 17 year old boy who had stuck a pamphlet saying "Blacks Not Wanted Here" on an M.P.'s front door and had smashed a glass panel. The paper thought that the Court of Appeal was correct, and went on to comment:

This silly boy was sent to Borstal for 'stirring up hatred' when he could and should have been punished for common-or-garden hooliganism. The laws of the land are meant to prevent people making nuisances of themselves, not to prevent free speech, however half-baked the speaker.

The epithets used by this writer - "silly", "common-or-garden" and "half-baked" - clearly suggest that he is playing down the importance of such vandalism, perhaps because he is against laws to prevent racial discrimination. What is interesting is that, in other contexts, the very same epithets will be used to justify a punitive reaction to "motiveless" vandalism or else vandalism motivated by ends thought to be more reprehensible than racial discrimination.

(v) A final reason for wanting to study ideological vandalism lies in the simple fact that its overt behavioural characteristic - the wilful and illegal destruction of property - is identical to that of conventional vandalism. This is not, of course, to say that the behaviour means anything like the same thing to the actor or to society. It does justice to neither phenomenon to try to make them fit the same explanatory framework. One cannot, for example, explain a group of Negroes smashing hundreds of shop windows in Los Angeles, in the same way as one might explain two boys kicking in the glass panes of a telephone kiosk in South London. Nevertheless, we should be alerted to the fact that these very different phenomena might have common features of interest other than the fact that property was destroyed: in this case, there might be significant parallels

in the role of the mass media in spreading the behaviour. This is a possibility one should not ignore in the name of "narrowing one's field of interest."

CHAPTER 4VANDALISM AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM

The question "what is a social problem?" is similar, but not identical, to the question "what is social deviance?". Some social problems, like traffic congestion, floods and air pollution, are not forms of deviant behaviour. Some forms of deviant behaviour are not defined as socially problematic; for example, wearing inappropriate or bizarre clothes, and some deviants, for example, unmarried fathers, are not regarded as constituting a social problem group (which unmarried mothers invariably are). In some ways, though, the distinction between deviance and problems can be discussed along parallel lines to the distinction between rule-breaking and deviance: in both cases we are looking at some sort of labelling or transactional process.

In Chapter 1, it was suggested that social problems be studied by concentrating on the ways in which society sees a certain condition as threatening or in some way inimical to its interests, and then decides that something should be done about it. Dealing mainly with conventional vandalism offences, this section will use such a framework to look at vandalism as a social problem. There are two points of departure: the first is the consideration of both the objective and subjective aspects of the condition which is defined as problematic and the second is the focus on the processes, and the stages through which problems are defined and made visible.

Objective and Subjective Aspects

The distinction between "subjective" and "objective" does not refer to the difference between those aspects of the condition seen as problematic because, on the one hand, of subjective reasons (in the sense of emotional or value judgments) and, on the other, objective ones (in the sense of posing physical dangers). This type of difference is largely spurious: not only are physical dangers themselves subject to evaluative judgments, but also the subjective experience of something as threatening is, in

itself, a social fact. What this distinction does refer to is, on the one hand, the awareness by society that the condition or behaviour - in this case vandalism - is problematic, and on the other hand, the objective evidence - as far as it can be ascertained - on which this awareness is based.

Before taking up this distinction, it is necessary to remind oneself of the limitations - discussed in Chapter 1 - of the "subjective awareness" approach to social problems: absurd conclusions such as "if most people are unaware of a condition as being threatening or damaging there is 'really' no social problem"; unanswered questions such as "precisely whose recognition and awareness is important?" and the point that public definitions may be, and usually are, an entirely unsound basis for assessing the seriousness and magnitude of a social problem. Despite these limitations, however, there is no workable alternative to a definition of social problems, which includes the element of subjective awareness by significant groups, that the situation is a deviation, breakdown or threat, about which something should be done. Dentler's analysis of the "absurdities" of this position and Becker's analysis of the "ambiguities" of the Fuller-Myers approach, led to identical conclusions: one must explore these absurdities and ambiguities rather than use them to justify a return to some sort of absolutist conception of social problems.

The Subjective Awareness

The first question to answer is "what exactly is it about the condition which could lead people to define it as problematic at all?" In regard to vandalism, the answer is less obvious than might first appear; the answer would be simpler, for example, in regard to conditions or behaviour such as murder, organized crime, air pollution or traffic congestion. The issue is already oversimplified by using terms such as "people" or "society": one cannot assume a consensus about the definition of vandalism as a social problem, nor can one assume that the problem will be seen in the same way by everybody. In addition, some forms of vandalism

are very clearly dangerous or threatening, while others are not. Put in this form, then, the question can only be answered on a fairly abstract level.

In the first place, vandalism is behaviour which violates certain important rules. Under certain conditions, this rule-breaking is defined by significant groups - sometimes speaking for themselves, but more often speaking in the name of "society" - as being against their interests or as threatening to values they cherish. These interests and values concern both the real and the symbolic value of the damaged property. The real value is measured by such indices as the cost of repairing the damage or replacing the property and the cost of preventive measures. The symbolic value is represented by the threat to the ethics surrounding the possession of property. An assault on property is an assault on these ethics, which, in our society, involve a complex set of rights, statutes and obligations. Specific forms of vandalism are, in addition, threats to values surrounding the orderly resolution of racial, political and religious differences.

There are more specific problems which vandalism poses. Certain forms of property damage are simply inconvenient and annoying: broken chains in public lavatories, street lamps not working, slot machines jammed and so on. The consequences of vandalism are sometimes more than inconveniencing: loss of life or serious injury might result from objects being placed on railway lines, or lifebelts being torn from their fittings. Calls for medical aid may be delayed as a result of public telephones being damaged.

Aesthetic values are also threatened by many forms of vandalism, especially those involving the defacement of properties such as public buildings, monuments, war memorials and statues. Such defacement is particularly demoralizing if the property is newly constructed and in a prominent position. If, in addition, the property is sacred (such as places of worship and cemeteries) the damage or defacement is particularly abhorrent and may be described by the term "sacrilege". The feelings of

demoralization that defacement of public buildings often evoke, are well captured in the reaction of Salinger's Holden Caulfield on seeing obscenities scribbled on the wall of a public museum:

... while I was sitting down, I saw something that drove me crazy. Somebody'd written ' - you' on the wall ... I went down by a different staircase and I saw another ' - you' on the wall. I tried to rub it off with my hand again, but this one was scratched on, with a knife or something. It wouldn't come off. It's hopeless anyway. If you had a million years to do it in, you couldn't rub out even half the ' - you' signs in the world ...¹

Because of its stereotype as being wanton, malicious and pointless, vandalism presents further emotional threats. Even the mischievous-play element in some vandalism is part of the threat, because it appears to represent the "fun morality." Vandalism is seen as an inversion of the Puritan ethic which demands that actions should be carried out for a recognizable, utilitarian reason. For this reason, presumably, Cohen chose vandalism as the archetypal act of the delinquent subculture: it is "malicious, non-utilitarian and negativistic". These terms conjure up something like the behaviour of the original Vandals. For the public, vandalism is very much part of the stock image of delinquency. Burroughs' horrific vision of uncontrolled adolescent behaviour captures this image perfectly; note how many acts of vandalism he includes:

Rock and Roll adolescent hoodlums storm the streets of all nations. They rush into the Louvre and throw acid in the Mona Lisa's face. They open zoos, insane asylums, prisons, burst water mains with air hammers, chop the floor out of passenger plane lavatories, shoot out lighthouses, file elevator cables to one thin wire, turn sewers into the water supply, throw sharks and sting rays, electric eels and candiru into swimming pools ... in nautical costumes ram the 'Queen Mary' full speed into New York Harbor, play chicken with passenger trains and buses, rush into hospitals in white coats carrying saws and axes and scalpels three feet long; throw paralytics out of iron lungs ... administer injections with bicycle pumps, disconnect artificial kidneys, saw a woman in half with a two-man surgical saw, they drive herds of squealing pigs into the curb, they shit on the floor of the United Nations and wipe their ass with treaties, pacts, alliances ...²

-
1. J.D. Salinger, The Catcher in the Rye, (London: Penguin, 1958), pp. 207 - 208.
 2. William Burroughs, The Naked Lunch, (London: John Calder, 1964), pp. 51 - 52.

It is difficult to judge, in the abstract, how serious a problem vandalism is. It is virtually impossible, as well as perhaps intellectually sterile, to rank situations or behaviour in terms of their "social problem value": there is no consensus over what scale one would use for such an evaluation. All one can say about vandalism in this respect, is that, although it does not appear particularly serious compared with most other traditionally defined social problems, it does present threats which give it a high potential for being defined as problematic. It is not, for example, an isolated nor a particularly new phenomenon. Unlike, say, air pollution or marijuana smoking, it has not emerged relatively suddenly as the result of technological innovation or cultural diffusion. It is usually regarded as part of such general conditions as crime or delinquency and it is seen as a problem in so far as these phenomena have traditionally been defined as problems. It is also associated - less directly and more vaguely - with what is called "the youth problem" and "the problem of violence": these terms provide convenient pegs on which the definition of vandalism as a problem can easily be hung. Again, comparing vandalism with defined social problems like marijuana smoking, its impact is more readily visible and manifest: there is less need, in the case of vandalism, for the type of propoganda described by Becker in his account of the emergence of the marijuana problem.

Given this basic potential, what sort of awareness is there of vandalism as a social problem? One index of awareness we could use is, simply, the amount of public attention. Do the mass media, for example, devote much space to vandalism? Are there articles, discussions and programmes about the subject? Is it, in other words, a public issue? Such questions are difficult to answer, as they depend on assessing the awareness of vandalism relative to other issues. They also need a time perspective: at certain times there is a high awareness of the problem, at others, a relatively low awareness. One also has to specify the types of vandalism meant: some types have a low awareness and are virtually

invisible, others are almost continually visible and recognized as problems. None of these questions can be adequately answered without a full-scale public opinion survey; the very general answers which follow, use mainly secondary sources for assessing public awareness.

It must be made clear that one of the reasons why vandalism was selected as a research topic in the first place, was my own impression that this was a problem very much in the public eye at the time (1963-1964). A more systematic survey of the mass media during these and the subsequent three years confirms that in Great Britain during this period, vandalism was given a high amount of attention, both in itself and relative to delinquency and crime as a whole. The number of items about vandalism reported in the mass media, exceeded reports of offences of other types resulting in, say, comparable financial loss. The amount of reporting varied with waves of successive types of vandalism; the three most publicized during this period being vandalism connected with railways, public telephones and football matches. Although these waves of reporting, in which stories connected with each type had a maximum publicity value, are at the time of writing diminishing, it is still true that acts of vandalism - particularly those which have a visible and dramatic effect - have a high chance of being thrust in the public consciousness. A composite summary of the nature of public awareness during the period 1963-1967, would be something like this: "Vandalism is a serious and widespread problem in Great Britain today. Its extent and its cost to the community has been increasing since the first few years of the 1960's and it continues to increase."

On available evidence, it is not altogether clear just how serious vandalism is seen as compared with other types of delinquency. There is some information in studies attempting to rank offences in order of seriousness. In the Cambridge-Somerville study some 20 years ago, eight judges (four Police Officers and four Probation Officers) were asked to

judge a list of 69 offences in terms of seriousness. On a four-point scale from "least" to "most" serious, the offence "destroying city property" was seen to be only "fairly serious" and was ranked well below other "typical" delinquency offences such as theft and personal violence. (Arson, on the other hand, was placed among the most serious of offences.)³ Various attempts to scale or measure delinquency in this way have invariably placed vandalism among the least serious of offences: it always falls well behind theft, larceny, sexual offences and all types of personal violence. It would seem by "professional" standards, then, that vandalism, on the whole, is not seen to be a particularly serious offence type.

On the other hand, in the Northview survey conducted at a time when vandalism was receiving prominent publicity, it was seen as somewhat more serious. The act of "Placing Stones on a Railway Track" was ranked, below armed robbery but above offences such as using weapons in a gang fight, as the second most serious out of a list of 15 offences. Asked to say which type of delinquency had increased most, some 26% of the sample mentioned vandalism. This was only less than 2% below the largest category mentioned, property offences. It will be clear when looking at the statistics on vandalism, that this perception is almost certainly inaccurate.

Another way of gauging problem-awareness is to assess the amount of attention paid to vandalism by professional students of social problems. In the preface to his book on vandalism, Martin noted that his survey of the literature revealed almost no information at all about the subject; where vandalism was referred to, "... usually the authors simply pointed up the seriousness of the problem."⁴ From my own review of the literature some seven years later, I would reach substantially the same conclusion. With a few notable exceptions, namely, studies of ideological vandalism such as the

3. E. Powers and H. Witmer, An Experiment in the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951), pp. 329 - 332.

4. Martin, op.cit., p. vii.

swastika incidents, there has been no significant contribution to the literature. In recent years in this country, there has been enough attention to the problem to warrant a few articles in non-academic publications and lectures to various interested bodies, such as magistrates. This lack of attention is all the more noteworthy in view of the considerably interesting, theoretical issues which vandalism raises. Whichever side was being "realistic" in its assessment of the importance of the problem, it is clear that social scientists lagged behind the public in the amount of interest shown towards vandalism. One might compare the situation with that in regard to motoring offences, where the opposite is true: criminologists have recently tried to define this behaviour in problematic terms, while the public has stubbornly resisted such definitions.

Among the most significant groups from which an index of problem awareness can be derived, are the organizations directly affected by the problem. In contacts with these victim organizations, I attempted to discover to what degree they recognized vandalism as a problem for themselves. This is not a very easy assessment to make, because most organizations had been selected in the knowledge that they had been affected by vandalism; they would therefore tend to reply that vandalism was "a bit of a problem" or "quite serious". Such terms are not only unspecific, but the organizations, or their spokesmen, would be using different criteria of problem definition: to some, the problem lay in the absolute cost of the damage, to some in the increasing number of incidents and to others in the fact that fewer offenders were being detected or caught. One useful index is the point at which the organization starts defining vandalism as a separate problem. It does this by recording vandalism separately in its accounts and other statistics. Usually, local authorities, public organizations and large firms, deal with small amounts of damage under headings such as "maintenance", "miscellaneous", "routine replacement" or, simply, "theft". At a certain point, there is a recognition that vandalism presents a separate problem and is classified as such. This process raises

the interesting question, to be considered later, about just what it is that prompts this recognition; it also makes statistical comparisons of the incidence of vandalism extremely difficult. One simply cannot know how many of the "miscellaneous" incidents prior to the reclassification, were acts of vandalism.

I will return to the question of problem-awareness when discussing the processes by which individual victim organizations define vandalism as problematic; at the moment, the following three generalizations can be made:-

(i) In general, the victim organizations are less likely to define vandalism as a problem than are the public as a whole or the mass media. This applies to even the most threatening and highly publicized forms of vandalism, such as railway or telephone vandalism. There was a clear tendency among most organizations to "put the problem in perspective" and to deplore extreme and hysterical statements about vandalism made in various public arenas. This does not mean, of course, that they were entirely "right" and the public "wrong": there are many complex reasons why organizations should want to play down their problems. They might, for example, perceive (often realistically) that scare-publicity would make the problem worse; they might also simply want to deny the problem in order not to reveal defects in their own organization.

(ii) Almost invariably, victim organizations start defining vandalism in problematic terms because of some pressure being placed on them. This pressure might come from moral enterprise (by one of their own members or an outsider) or as a result of publicity in the mass media.

(iii) One of the conditions for social-problem definition is a perception that the condition is remediable. Somebody must see that something can be done to prevent, control or eradicate the problem. The very absence of this condition among many victim organizations leads to their apparent apathy or refusal to see vandalism in problematic terms.

Unlike the mass media, the politicians, the moral entrepreneurs, and the control agents who talk in terms of "an urgent need to do something about the problem", many victim organizations (again, realistically) do not think that anything can be done or is worth doing. The following example of this attitude is from a survey on the cost of vandalism to local authorities:

The bulk of replies and additional letters indicated a defeated acceptance of vandalism as an incurable nuisance. Very few authorities have actually set about tackling the problem. The cost of preventive measures is often as great if not greater than the cost of vandalism. One smart Alec suggested that vandalism might cost them less than answering the questionnaire!⁵

This report was compiled by an organization determined to define and publicize vandalism as a problem. The organization's comment on the above summary of the attitudes of the local authorities which completed its questionnaire, shows how social problems typically get defined and presented:

The cash cost is surely not the only aspect of the problem to be considered. The cause of vandalism is a serious social matter and until early education attaches more importance to a child's appreciation of the public services than to his knowing which is the longest river or the highest mountain, no hope can be held out for tackling the problem at its roots.⁶

This type of disparity between victim and public definitions may be illustrated with reference to hooliganism at football matches. In an enquiry carried out into this subject in 1967,⁷ questionnaires were sent to all First, Second, Third and Fourth Division Clubs in England and Wales, and First and Second Division Scottish Clubs. The questionnaire was distributed to a member of the Board of Directors, a team manager, a playing team member and a secretary or other member of the supporters' club. It was reprinted in the Sun newspaper and completed by 1,753 readers. While

5. "The Cost of Vandalism to Local Authorities: Results and Report of Answers to a Questionnaire," Local Government Information Office for England and Wales. (Mimeograph, 31st March, 1964), p. 5.

6. Ibid.

7. "A Preliminary Report on Soccer Hooliganism," Unpublished Report by "A Birmingham Research Group," (Mimeograph, 50 pp.). Subsequent references to the report will be in the name of its Research Director, Dr. J.A. Harrington.

the response rate from the clubs was very low - a fact which in itself indicates resistance from the victim organizations to problem-definition, and the readership response is not a random sample of public opinion, the differences between the groups (Table 1) on the "problem awareness" questions are of interest.

TABLE 1

Awareness of Football Hooliganism as a Problem

		Team Managers (33)	Players (22)	Board of Directors (68)	Supporters Clubs (42)	Sun. Readers (1753)
		%	%	%	%	%
Is hooliganism among fans increasing?	Yes	82	86	72	81	90
	No	15	9	23.5	12	5
	D/K	3	4.5	4.5	7	5
Is the problem today serious or much exaggerated?	Serious	76	59	63	60	89
	Exaggerated	24	41	35.5	36	11
	D/K	-	-	1.5	4	-
Is hooliganism a threat to the future of football?	Yes	45	50	47	69	76
	No	30	27	32	26	10
	Doubtful	25	23	20.5	5	14

The Objective Evidence

We must now examine the objective evidence for problem-definition and compare this to the subjective definitions made by society. It would be surprising if we did not find a discrepancy between the two; this much is suggested by Lemert:

In studying the problem defining reactions of a community it can be shown that public consciousness of "problem" and aggregate moral reactions frequently centre around forms of behaviour which on closer analysis often prove to be of minor importance in the social system.⁸

Lemert's statement of the issue, however, is not particularly satisfactory: how does one establish just what is "of minor importance in

8. Lemert, (1951), op.cit., p. 4.

the social system?" Merton's formulation of the same issue is less problematic:

We cannot take for granted a reasonably correct public imagery of social problem: of their scale, distribution, causation, consequences and persistence or change. These public images are often egregiously mistaken ...⁹

He further talks about instances of:

... marked disparity between the objective magnitude of human tragedies and the popular perceptions of them ... Popular perceptions are no safe guide to the actual magnitude of a social problem.¹⁰

What, then, is the "actual magnitude" of the vandalism problem? I will consider two main indices: number of offences (or number of offenders) and the financial cost of the damage.

(1) Amount of Vandalism and Number of Vandals: The most obvious objective source is the official statistics on the number of vandalism offences or the number of offenders apprehended and dealt with at various stages of the correctional process. One knows, of course, that such statistics are not "objective" indices at all, and that they are subject to many factors which render them both invalid and unreliable. Nevertheless - to use Kitsuse' and Cicourel's argument¹¹ - the official statistics are the index to use in measuring the rates of deviant behaviour generated in society; the corollary of their argument - that one needs to examine the processes of social control by which these rates are produced - is implicit in this whole chapter.

Taking the first stage of the rates recorded in the Criminal Statistics (England and Wales) as "Offences Known to the Police", there is an immediate defect in that the number of non-indictable offences under this heading are

-
9. Robert K. Merton, "Social Problems and Sociological Theory," in Robert K. Merton and Robert A. Nisbet (Eds.), Contemporary Social Problems, (New York: Harcourt Brace & World Inc., Second Edition, 1966), p. 792.
 10. Ibid., p. 793.
 11. J.I. Kitsuse and A.V. Cicourel, "A Note on the Use of Official Statistics," Social Problems, 11 (Fall 1965), pp. 131 - 139.

not recorded. Looking only at the indictable category, "Malicious Injuries to Property" (Classification No. 57), Table 2 indicates the frequencies of this offence and the percentage variations over the period 1930-1967. With the inexplicable exception of the later half of the Nineteen Fifties, the table shows a steady increase in the amount of this particular offence. This increase, however, was not at all disproportionate to the increase in the number of all indictable offences known to the police and in 1967 the number of malicious injuries was only 0.7% of this total.

TABLE 2

Number of "Other Malicious Injuries" known to the Police
(= "Malicious Injuries to Property" excluding Arson) 1930-1967

<u>Year(s)</u>	<u>Number Known</u>	<u>Percentage Variation</u>
1930-34	195	
1935-39	310	+ 58.9
1940-44	644	+107.7
1945-49	2,466	+282.9
1950-54	4,435	+ 79.8
1955-59	2,326	- 47.6
1960	3,911	+ 68.1
1961	4,491	+ 14.8
1962	5,200	+ 15.7
1963	5,806	+ 11.6
1964	6,449	+ 11.0
1965	6,956	+ 7.8
1966	8,525	+ 22.5
1967	8,858	+ 3.9

The main type of vandalism offences are to be found under the non-indictable category "Malicious Damage to Property" (Classification No. 149); Table 3 shows the number of persons dealt with for these offences, during the same period as the previous table.

TABLE 3Number of Persons Dealt with Summarily for "Malicious Damage to Property", Magistrates Courts, 1930 - 1967*

Year(s)	<u>Number dealt with</u>
1930-34	10,982
1935-39	10,504
1940-44	12,810
1945-49	10,912
1950-54	9,479
1955-59	12,336
1960	15,866
1961	16,399
1962	16,852
1963	17,003
1964	16,857
1965	19,192
1966	18,522
1967	18,014

* Note: Under the Malicious Damage Act of 1964, which came into force on 31st July, 1964, (S. 14(1)) of the Criminal Justice Administration Act, 1914, was amended to enable Magistrates Courts to deal summarily with some offences where the damage did not exceed £100 (instead of £20). Accordingly, Classification 149 includes persons who would formerly have been proceeded against under the Malicious Damage Act, 1861, and recorded under Classification 57. This change does not affect Table 2 as, in order to preserve comparability, the figures for offences known to the police under No. 57 continue to include all offences in which the damage exceeds £20.

Table 3 gives only slight support to the public impression that the 1960's showed the emergence of a serious vandalism problem. There is no support for the suggestion that since 1962 - the year most frequently cited as the turning point - vandalism has increased rapidly. Part of the fairly large increase in 1965 reflected in Table 3 is attributable to changes in the law which affected the recording of offences. As was the case with the indictable category, the increase in the number of these offenders over the years is not disproportionate to the total increase in offenders dealt with for all non-indictable offences: in fact, the increase

in the malicious damage category in the Sixties is less than the total increase. Its proportionate contribution to the total number of offenders dealt with for non-indictable offences is just over 1.0% and this figure is not increasing. These conclusions are borne out, from another angle, in Table 4 which summarizes the figures for persons found guilty of both main types of vandalism offence. These offences have contributed a decreasing percentage of the relevant total since 1962.

TABLE 4

Number of Persons Found Guilty of Malicious Injuries to Property and Malicious Damage 1961 - 1967.

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. of Persons Found Guilty</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>
1961	18,018	1.6
1962	18,952	1.5
1963	18,779	1.4
1964	17,791	1.3
1965	18,397	1.3
1966	17,668	1.2
1967	17,297	1.1

Using any of these three sets of figures, the increase in vandalism has not been greater, and in a number of years has been significantly less, than increases in other offences against the property and offences involving violence against the person.

It is interesting to compare these figures with those for an offence which often erroneously results in being labelled as vandalism: "Larceny from automatic meters and machines." The numbers of this offence known to the police increased from an annual average of 9,091 in 1950-1954, to 15,984 in 1955-1959, to 33,341 in 1960-1964, to 46,090 in 1965. Only in 1966 did this rate of increase decline (46,805). In the Metropolitan Area, the increase in larcenies from telephone boxes, meters and automatic machines from 1956 to 1965 was 454.5%, the highest percentage increase of any single category of property offences. Compared with these increases,

the vandalism figures, particularly those in Table 2, appear to be relatively stable.

It should, of course, be noted that vandalism has a low detection rate; of the 8,858 Malicious Injuries to Property known to the police in 1966 for example, only 3,523 were cleared up (39.8%). This rate is not very different, though, from that for most property offences.

As one might expect from the characteristics of the behaviour itself and the ambiguities in the societal reaction to it, the extent of unrecorded vandalism is high. This much is indicated by studies on self-reported delinquency, not all of which, unfortunately, distinguish vandalism as an offence type, none of which trace changes in the amount of unrecorded vandalism over time and most of which are American. All such standard studies I reviewed, suggest that the incidence of unrecorded vandalism is high, even relative to most other common offences such as theft. In one of the earliest of such studies 91% of 1,698 persons answering an anonymous questionnaire, had committed one or more offences after the age of sixteen.¹² The highest three offence types were:

	<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
Larceny	89%	83%
Disorderly Conduct	85%	76%
Malicious Mischief	89%	81%

In another study a few years later, 90 undergraduates were asked if they ever participated in "the deliberate and wanton destruction of the property of someone else." 27 out of the 40 men and 20 out of the 50 women replied in the affirmative.¹³ Using a larger and more representative sample of high-school students, in the American mid-West, Short & Nye

12. J.S. Wallerstein and C. Wyle, "Our Law-Abiding Law Breakers," Probation, 25 (April 1947), p. 112.

13. W.H. Clark, "Sex Differences and Motivation in the Urge to Destroy," Journal of Social Psychology, 36 (November 1952), p. 168.

found 60.7% had at some time deliberately damaged property, 17.5% more than once. For a far-Western sample, the figures were 44.8% and 8.2% respectively. (The extent, however, was definitely more widespread and repeated in a correctional institution surveyed: 84.3% and 49.7%.)¹⁴

Further studies of self-reported delinquency will be cited when discussing social class differences in vandalism. All these studies point to a high incidence of unreported vandalism, from 40% to 90% of the sample, depending on the type of population and the method of data collection. Some British data which bear out the American findings may be found in a study of self-reported delinquency among 14 - 15 year old boys from a working-class London suburb. 65.3% of the sample admitted to "Breaking the windows of empty houses"; in order of percentage-admission, this ranked only below "Letting off fireworks in the street" (82.1%), an offence which some might consider as vandalism; "Riding a bicycle without lights after dark" (76.5%) and "Deliberately travelling without a ticket or paying the wrong fare" (69.4%). In addition, 7.1% of the sample admitted to "Smashing, slashing or damaging things in public places - in streets, cinemas, dance halls, railway carriages and buses."¹⁵

Working on the dictum that the further one moves from the actual commission of an offence, the less accurate and reliable is one's information, it might be thought that by collecting data directly from victim organizations, one could obtain a "true" picture of the extent of vandalism. This is by no means the case: such data merely show in microcosm the same problems encountered in using the Official Statistics. Because of different methods of processing and recording, these sources do not yield standardized and comparable information. It makes little

14. J.F. Short and F.I. Nye, "Extent of Unrecorded Delinquency," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Political Science, 49 (November 1958), pp. 296 - 302.

15. H.B. Gibson, "Self-Reported Delinquency: Preliminary Results of an On-going Study," Unpublished Paper read at the Third National Conference on Research and Teaching in Criminology, Cambridge, July, 1968, Table 1.

sense, for example, to say that the Post Office had so many more incidents of vandalism in one year than did the Railways or more than it did in the previous year. With caution, however, one can use the figures provided by the victim organizations to make estimates, such as the extent of a particular type of vandalism and the proportion of offences known to the organization but not reported to the police. In addition, information about the mechanics whereby rates of vandalism are computed by the organization - as opposed to the crude figure which is the end result of this exercise - can throw light on the processes of deviance-generation. The following data from victim organizations illustrate some of these processes and highlight the problems of obtaining an objective index. Although they provide a rough measuring rod against which other estimates can be compared, they are not meant to yield an accurate picture of the total amount of vandalism in Britain.

Local Authorities: The first major problem in obtaining information from local authorities is simply that few keep adequate records at all on vandalism. When such figures are produced, they are usually done so in response to specific pressures: for example, a local councillor who has read something about the "vandalism problem" decides that something should be done about the manifestations of the problem in his area, which up till then might not have been particularly noteworthy. The matter then gets raised at a committee or sub-committee and the Borough Engineer or Parks Department is instructed to "get out the figures." This is a highly significant process and applies equally to other types of vandalism: the net result is that the current figures might be quite accurate, but previous figures are only very vague estimates. Another problem - understandable in view of the fact that local authorities tend to make a connection between vandalism and the cost of the damage to the ratepayer - is that the statistics more often pertain to cost of damage, rather than number of incidents. In addition, most local authorities use classifications such as "miscellaneous loss", "routine replacement", etc.,

which give no indication of the number of vandalism incidents. Finally, there is the problem - again not specific to local authorities - of the reluctance to part with information in the fear that vandalism figures will reflect on the good image of the authority.

I came across three surveys which attempted to discover the amount of various types of vandalism to local authority property. The most adequate of these was the L.G.I.O. survey mentioned earlier, but the emphasis of this survey was on the cost of vandalism to each authority. Consequently, there is little information on the number of incidents. In addition, not all the authorities to whom questionnaires were sent replied: there were 922 replies from 1,522 authorities, a response rate of 64.5%. The survey merely records the number of authorities reporting particular types of targets as having been damaged; for example, Public Conveniences (broken windows and plumbing; smashed tiles and basins) - 262; Street Lighting (smashed lamps and globes) - 196; Street Furniture (broken signs, nameplates, beacons) - 132, etc. We do not know the total number of incidents involving each target, nor, because of the emphasis and wording of the questionnaire, is it likely that the listing of targets is particularly accurate. Extracts from individual questionnaires gave impressionistic examples of the total amounts of damage of any one type; for example, "300 out of 20,000 deck chairs damaged in a day."

Such examples, although interesting in themselves, provide no basis for computing the total extent of various types of vandalism, nor are comparisons over time very reliable. An official of the L.G.I.O. estimated (in 1964) that vandalism to local government property had increased by twelve times since the 1930's and had doubled in the previous five years. He could not, however, produce figures to support these estimates. Opinions of various local government officials varied widely as to the extent to which vandalism of various types had increased and whether this was a "phenomenon of the sixties". The Park's Director of a London borough, for example, writing from forty years' experience, noted that although the

amount of damage was probably on the increase, vandalism in parks was nothing new and that the public had been given a false impression of the extent of the problem because of publicity given to single glaring incidents.¹⁶

Another enquiry was the 10% sample survey carried out by the National Association of Parish Councils in 1963.¹⁷ Again, the results give us no indication of the actual extent of vandalism: we are merely told that "... in roughly half the 7,500 parishes with parish councils some damage probably occurred through vandalism in 1963".

The final survey was that produced by the Council of British Ceramic Sanitaryware Manufacturers in 1965.¹⁸ The Council sent out a questionnaire in 1964 to all local authorities (including county boroughs and urban and rural authorities), 251 of which replied; a number considerably below 10% of the population. The questionnaire focused on the provision of facilities in public conveniences, but many of the replies mentioned vandalism. Again, information about the extent of the problem is vague: we are told that "of the 251 effective replies received, an increasing number of authorities have threatened to curtail their facilities directly because of repeated acts of vandalism";¹⁹ at another point in the report, however, it appears that only 33 authorities specifically complained of vandalism.²⁰ The report does contain much illustrative material about the extent and type of damage that local authorities have to contend with, for example:

16. C.R. Stock, "Vandalism in Parks," Local Government Chronicle, (26 March, 1966), pp. 535 - 537.

17. "Against Vandalism," National Association of Parish Councils, National Circular No. 184 (1964).

18. "Survey of Washing Facilities in Public Conveniences in Great Britain and also of Vandalism in Public Conveniences," Council of British Ceramic Sanitaryware Manufacturers (March, 1965). This will be referred to as the C.B.C.S.M. survey.

19. Ibid., p. 13.

20. Ibid., p. 22.

Until full time supervision was provided at the - - conveniences, it was necessary to send workmen to the conveniences as often as twice a week to repair malicious damage. This generally took the form of pulling pipes off walls and breaking door locks ...

A common feature of all these surveys - one that will be considered when discussing the processes of problem definition - is that the information was collected and presented within the context of moral enterprise. The organizations responsible were interested in the information primarily in so far as it could help to increase the visibility of the vandalism problem and in getting something done about it. This does not necessarily mean that the data were deliberately distorted, but it does mean that they were presented in such a way as to emphasize that vandalism was "serious" and "increasing".

A similar point applies to data from individual local authorities. The most comprehensive material I was able to obtain was from Birmingham; Table 5 consists of selected examples of the amount of vandalism in the city over one year.²¹ For reasons already indicated, reliable comparative data of this sort are extremely difficult to obtain: the table only illustrates something of the amount of vandalism in one large city. From other data I have, it would appear that this amount is somewhat higher than in other British cities of comparable size.

21. These figures were collected when studying the background to Birmingham's "Stop Vandalism" campaign, to be discussed in detail later.

TABLE 5

Extent of Vandalism to Birmingham Corporation Property:
Selected Examples for the Year Ending 31st May, 1965.

<u>Type of Property</u>	<u>Cases of Damage Reported</u>
Public Conveniences	
Doors	49
Coin Locks	51
Cisterns	34
Electric light fittings	45
Miscellaneous	94
Gas Lighting	
Lanterns	6,057
Electric Lighting	
Bowls	5,685
Refractors	1,392
Lamps	2,295
Traffic Bollards	117
Pedestrian Crossing Beacons	464
Other light fittings	248
Other property in streets	
Litter Bins	247
Street Name Plates	305
Traffic Signs	230
Parks	
Benches, signs, etc.	335

Post Office: Most sources indicate that the gross rate of damage to public telephone kiosks and telephones increased during the period of research. The beginning of the Sixties showed a clear increase over the previous decade although by 1966 and 1967, there is some evidence that this increase had begun to tail off. Again, a close examination of the figures and the methods of collecting the, provides interesting information about the processes by which these rates are arrived at.

The first point to note is the familiar but invariably neglected fact that detailed statistics were only kept when the problem "appeared" to be getting more serious. In the case of the Post Office, this date was as late as 1964. From that date onwards, the records were more detailed and complete. Forms were devised - although they were apparently only used

systematically in certain areas - to record details about the property damage such as: day of the week when damage occurred; type of damage (glass broken, cord damage, coin-chute blocked, directory-holders damaged, telephone other than cord damaged, etc.); preventive measures already in use; cost of parts repaired; total man-hours expended; total duration of fault, etc. Before such forms were devised (in 1966), the information received was open to several errors: for example, various areas had different methods of reporting: Region A might report six panes of glass broken as one incident, Region B might report this as six separate incidents. There was also the extremely significant problem about damage to the coin box: should this really be reported as malicious damage, or is it simply theft? Even with more sophisticated recording devices there are still some problems in the methods of collecting figures. A standardized form does not necessarily ensure reliable data and there is the general problem - common to most types of vandalism - about the initial reporting of the incident: the potential reporters include engineers on maintenance duty, cleaners, regular inspection teams and ordinary members of the public. Their reports made on different criteria and with different degrees of diligence have to be funnelled through the engineer's department and go through various stages of recording before the information is eventually extracted on monthly return forms. At each layer of the rate-collecting process different errors might arise.

These difficulties, combined with the additional factor of a public authority trying to maintain an image, resulted in contradictory figures being presented to the public. In one case, three officials gave me significantly different sets of figures for the amount of vandalism in the same year. In another case, figures obtained directly from Post Office officials differed from figures given by the Postmaster-General in reply to a Parliamentary question and (less surprisingly) from estimates made in the mass media. The mass media reports were very often distorted: comparisons of changes in the rates of vandalism over periods of time were

particularly misleading. The main reason for this was a confusion in the unit of measurement: some figures referred to the total number of vandalism incidents reported in a particular year, others referred to the total number of telephones put out of order in a particular year; while others referred to the total number of telephones out of order at any one time. In view of these difficulties it is impossible, even after a number of lengthy interviews with the authorities concerned, to give more than an estimate of the rates. The following shows the range of figures quoted "authoritatively" by various sources:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Number of Vandalism Incidents Reported</u>
1963	55,000 - 63,094
1964	70,000 - 110,708
1965	100,000 - 140,000
1966	120,000 - 130,000

In each case the correct figure was somewhere in the middle: with an increase of 15,000 between 1963-1964; 30,000 between 1964-1965 and a decrease of 10,000 in 1966. Figures available for the first half of 1967 suggest that the decrease in the previous year continued. It should be noted that a substantial proportion of the large 1964-1965 increase is, in a sense, an artefact in that it is accounted for by the gradual introduction during this period of the S.T.D. system. S.T.D. boxes were much easier to break open than the older push button machines and, in addition, contain silver and not coppers. This technological innovation led to an immediate and rapid increase in the number of cases of breaking the coin box to steal the money: an offence which accounts for at least half of the total number of cases of wilful damage to telephones.

Another picture of the extent and seriousness of the problem can be obtained by looking at figures for the total amount of telephones out of order. It must again be repeated that although these figures were quoted as "the result of vandalism", as much as two-thirds of the total figure was due to theft, rather than vandalism. When a handset is stolen, or

the coin box broken, the result is that the phone is out of order (during 1965, this could have been for as long as three months, due to the shortage of labour and spare parts). In any event, at the peak for this type of vandalism, at the end of 1965, the national average for public telephones out of order was about one in thirty-five. In urban areas, however, the average was about one in twelve; the following estimates for the four main cities in England were made by two newspapers:

<u>City</u>	<u>Number of Telephones Out of Order</u>		<u>Total Number of Telephones</u>
	<u>October 1965*</u>	<u>January 1966**</u>	
Birmingham	370	518	1,760
Liverpool	250	185	2,200
London	1,200	2,300	12,000
Manchester	330	480	2,600

* Daily Mail (28/10/65)

** Daily Telegraph (5/1/66)

If the figures given by the Assistant Postmaster-General in the House of Commons (27/10/65) are more reliable, then these figures are slightly exaggerated: he quoted the figure of 2,600 (out of a total of 57,000) out of order in England in October, 1965.

Railways: Estimating the amount of vandalism to various types of railway property is also a difficult task. In the first place, a very wide range of behaviour is involved: damaging installations on the train while it is in motion, throwing stones at the window of a passing train, placing objects on the railway lines, damaging signalling apparatus, etc. It is virtually impossible to obtain estimates of the damage in all of these categories. The usual questions arise about the reliability of the initial reporting of incidents and there are also some regional variations in the methods of reporting and recording. At the later stages of the funnelling process, the figures are more reliable and complete: the annual reports of the Ministry of Transport's Chief Inspector of Accidents contain accurate figures on the number of train accidents due to malicious

acts²² and various reports to the Chief Constable of the British Transport Police Force contain figures of acts reported to the police and the number of offenders prosecuted for various types of vandalism.

Although the situation is somewhat more ambiguous in regard to the railways, it appears that, as with local authority property and telephones, the most significant increase in the problem was noticed between 1963-1964. This period coincided with the time in which maximum publicity was being given to all types of vandalism, and the situation was "ambiguous" in the sense that many British Railways spokesmen felt that the extent of the problem was inflated by this publicity. Certainly, the method of reporting was influenced by the heightened problem-awareness. Although measures are specifically laid down in the Railway Rule Book and various supplementary instructions about the reporting of damage, obstructions and other irregularities, in 1964 a much more widespread system of recording was encouraged within the provisions of these rules. As a result, certain minor incidents previously only reported locally, were transmitted through to the higher management levels. "In consequence," as was noted in a departmental report at the time, "a much larger number of incidents are reported than was the case a year or so ago. This has made the situation appear statistically worse than is actually the case." A particularly highly publicized case of vandalism in the following year resulted in greater patrolling and observation by British Transport Police and in more reporting by the Civil and Signal Engineering Departments.

Even given these circumstances, Table 6 indicates that the increase in the most common types of vandalism over this period has not been spectacular.

22. These reports also contain details about the acts; see, for example, "The Railways Accidents: Report to the Minister of Transport on the Safety Record of the Railways in Great Britain during the year 1966," (London: H.M.S.O. 1967), pp. 69 - 71 and p. 106.

TABLE 6Extent of Vandalism on the Railways (1960 - 1966)

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. of Cases of Wilful Damage Reported</u>
1960	3,576
1961	4,169
1962	4,641
1963	4,031
1964	4,548
1965	3,875
1966	3,689

The increase in certain types of vandalism, such as that by football supporters on trains, has been very definite and it also appears that the more conventional types of railway vandalism, such as placing obstructions on the line and throwing stones at passing trains, have had more serious consequences. In 1962, 44 train accidents due to malicious acts by the public were reported to the Chief Inspecting Officer of Railways; in 1963 there were 50, in 1964, 73, and in 1965, 111. There was a slight decrease in 1966, to 106.

Illustrative evidence - of ^s somewhat less accuracy than the above figures - may be quoted from individual areas:-

- (1) London Midland Region: 50 incidents reported between January and May, 1964. These include:

... passengers and train drivers being injured by stone throwing, objects or detonators being placed on the line in the paths of fast moving trains, signalling equipment being damaged and such irresponsible acts such as blasting a line side cabinet, housing signal and telecommunications circuit with a shotgun (Press Release, Public Relations Office, London Western, 28/5/64).

- (2) Eastern Region, 1963: 10,000 items damaged or stolen on electrified lines,

... some of this damage might have been accidental, but the greater part was obviously wanton. The toll included 4,600 seats slashed, 1,700 lamps broken, 400 ventilator covers damaged and many toilet compartment fittings destroyed.

Other regions have similar stories to tell. (Press Release, British Railways Board, 28/2/64).

Other Victim Organizations: Trying to get information from the numerous other victim organizations listed in Appendix A - and the list is by no means comprehensive - presents problems in addition to those already encountered. Many of them are not public bodies and therefore have no need to produce figures for open scrutiny. Commercial organizations - such as the large entertainment groups - might deliberately deny the problem and suppress figures for fear of adverse publicity.

Interesting information was obtained from the various bodies connected with churches, war memorials, public monuments, ancient buildings, etc. The Ecclesiastical Insurance Office, which covers about half the Church of England churches in the country, reported at the end of 1965 that there had been a definite increase in vandalism over the "last few years" and that the organization definitely saw it as a problem. There were 1,500-2,000 incidents in 1964, but this total includes many incidents of arson and, in fact, the 30 or so large incidents of arson accounted for most of the damage. The General Manager of the Company, however, thought that there had been a genuine increase in vandalism and that the arson figures had remained constant ("you always get the chap who sets fire to a church.") In 1965 he estimated the increase in malicious damage as about $2\frac{1}{2}$ times over the previous five years: "Five years ago was the turning point." This cannot be taken as a reliable estimate of the increase in vandalism to churches: in the first place, the company only covers half the Church of England churches and, secondly, the method of recording the figures is open to error. The manager's basis for assuming that vandalism had greatly increased was interesting. The firm offers a package deal to churches to insure them directly and specifically against malicious damage. This deal was not popular a few years before, but now many churches had become aware that malicious damage was a real risk and were prepared to pay the added premium. The General Manager assured me that this was not just the result of sales-

manship: the company, in fact, tell the churches that fire is the real risk, but the churches insist on including malicious damage as well. This demand, however, does not necessarily mean that a real increase in vandalism had occurred, but that the churches were influenced by the greater public awareness of vandalism as a problem during the relevant period.

The Ancient Monuments Society also reported a "considerable increase" in the problem during the sixties, but could not provide figures to support this. The Commonwealth War Graves Commission, on the other hand, reported that, although they were always aware of "routine petty vandalism" (such as scribbling names), they did not see vandalism as a major problem. In the regular reports submitted to them by caretakers, petty damage was classified as "maintenance", so they had no separate record of the amount of vandalism. Outbreaks of vandalism were sporadic - perhaps three or four major incidents a year - and the organization did not perceive a rise during the last few years: "vandalism is not really a separate problem which we put on the agenda as something separate and specific".

This last point - whether vandalism is recognized (in records, agendas, annual reports, statistics, accounts, etc.) as something "separate and specific" - is, in fact, an excellent index of both the subjective awareness of vandalism as a problem and the knowledge that it has objectively increased or become more serious. Organizations such as the National Trust and the National Farmers Union agreed in rather general terms that vandalism was a problem and that it was increasing. These sentiments, however, seem to be influenced more by a general awareness of the vandalism problem than by actual knowledge that the problem was very significant in their own area of interest. Neither organization could produce reliable figures on vandalism.

A similar picture is reported from other organizations prominent in the public stereotype of the type of targets for vandalism. In regard to gas meters and other such property, the North Thames Gas Board report that

vandalism is not considered a problem in the organization: their impression is that the amount of damage has remained at a fairly constant level; in any event, no separate record is kept of vandalism apart from theft and accidental damage. None of the entertainment companies contacted thought that vandalism was much of a problem: one noted that incidents were only reported in a minority of theatres and cinemas and that there had been no appreciable increase over a period of years; damage (such as that from cigarette burns on the chairs and throwing ice-cream at the screen) had been suffered ever since cinemas had first been built. Because of the great expense involved and the fact that an insurance claim was inevitably made, damage to screens was regarded as a major incident and always reported; minor damage to seating, toilets, carpets, etc., was dealt with as part of the accepted daily maintenance.

The replies of the three large building and construction companies contacted indicate - if nothing else - the lack of consensus that exists in the perception of vandalism as a general social problem and as a problem for the particular organization. Table 7 summarizes the replies of the spokesmen for these companies.

TABLE 7

Awareness of Vandalism as a Problem by Three Building
and Construction Companies.

Company	"Is vandalism a general problem?"	"Is vandalism increasing in general?"	"Is vandalism a problem in your organiz- ation?"	"Is vandalism increasing in your organiz- ation?"
A	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
B	Yes	No	No	No
C	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

None of the organizations could estimate the exact amount of vandalism incidents. Only organization B would not admit to any under-reporting; it had a fixed procedure for Site Agents or Foremen to report to the head office or contract managers. Most damage to building under construction takes the

form of breaking windows to enter the building and it is usually quite fortuitous whether such incidents get classified as "wilful damage" or "theft". All three organizations were explicit in condemning the public's attitude in refusing to report damage to the company or the police. This is a theme that re-occurs in virtually every victim organization: the public rarely report incidents. This is partly attributable to the general reluctance to "get involved" which applies to most types of crime, but is compounded in the case of vandalism because so much of the damage is institutionalized and in most urban settings, not particularly noteworthy.

(2) Financial Cost: The other major index of problem-definition that leads itself to some quantification, is financial cost. This index raises the same questions as those of number of offences or offenders: relative to what is the cost of vandalism to be reckoned - other property crimes? Over what period is the cost of vandalism to be compared? In addition, there is the problem of distinguishing between primary and secondary cost: the cost of repairing the actual damage and the cost of preventive measures. also no There are/standardized records on the cost of vandalism comparable to the Official Criminal Statistics. Enquiries from one possible such source - insurance companies - revealed that the ordinary insurance policy rarely covers property damage from vandalism as a specific category, consequently there are no separate records for the cost of vandalism. In any event, the cost of most individual acts of vandalism is of such minor proportions that few of the victims would press claims.

Leaving aside estimates in the press - which, during the period of review, were merely inspired guesses and often widely off the mark - the only way of finding out the cost of damage is by asking the victim organizations themselves. The obvious defects in the adequacy, reliability and comparability of such information can be anticipated. Within these limitations, however, - and bearing in mind that research of a much more intensive type would be required to obtain an exact estimate of the cost of vandalism, say, in Britain over a period of a year - the following figures

may be cited. These figures do not cover comparable periods and are not collected in standardized forms: they are merely a sample of the cost of vandalism to at least the major organizations involved. They provide some sort of standard against which societal judgments can be evaluated.

Local Authorities: Of the three general surveys mentioned when considering the extent of vandalism, only the L.G.I.O. report gives some indication of the cost of vandalism to local authorities. Table 8 summarizes these replies.

TABLE 8

Estimated Cost of Damage from Vandalism Reported by Local Authorities (1963)

<u>Amount of Damage</u>	<u>No. of Authorities</u>
Under £50	210
Over £50	123
Over £100	139
Over £250	126
Over £500	87
Over £1,000	81
Over £5,000	15
Over £10,000	8

Total estimated cost of damage reported - £561,565.

Source: "The Cost of Vandalism to Local Authorities"
Local Government Information Office, 31st March 1964.

Of the 922 replies received, 157 quoted no figure and so no amount is included in the table. The figure of £561,565 is therefore the estimated cost to half the local authorities. Some replies to the question "How much?" were "considerable", "fairly large sum", "running into thousands", etc. The secondary cost (of preventive measures) was given only in a few cases, and is not included in the figure of £561,565.

From contacts with individual local authorities, it is clear that these figures are not particularly accurate. It is not known what proportion includes secondary and indirect costs (such as extra measures to protect or strengthen property against damage; publicity campaigns to

prevent vandalism; or extra insurance premiums) or labour costs. Some figures over-estimate the cost of vandalism by including loss from theft and routine wear and tear. Some of the difficulties in obtaining an accurate record of costs may be illustrated by quoting from a Borough Engineer's Report:

Public Conveniences: no separate costs of vandalism are kept and the damages, which are daily occurrences, are often put right by the Maintenance Inspector. The estimated costs of vandalism for one year is £500.

Housing Sites: although not directly chargeable to the Corporation, these costs are obviously passed on in the long run ... over the 12 months' run on one contractor's building site, he estimates that there has been £1,200 actual damage and that the delays will involve him in £5,000 extra labour costs.

The L.G.I.O. does not include figures for Scotland; figures I was able to obtain suggest that the picture is very similar. Table 9 summarizes, for illustrative purposes, the amount of damage in Edinburgh in 1965.

TABLE 9

Estimated Cost of Damage from Vandalism,
Edinburgh Corporation Property, 1965.

<u>Type of Property</u>	<u>Cost</u> £
Housing	11,500
Educational Property	4,100
Civic Amenities	3,150
Bus seats, shelters and other Transport Department equipment	2,730
Street and Stair lighting	2,450
Street furniture, etc.	650
Parks, trees, playgrounds, etc.	600
Halls	300
Health Facilities	120
Parking meters	40
Total	<u>£25,740</u>

Source: Information given by Lord Provost of Edinburgh at meeting of Town Council, 17th February, 1966.

Taking all sources into consideration, a very rough estimate of the cost of vandalism to local authorities in Britain in 1965 would be £900,000.

Telephones: Figures on the cost of vandalism to telephones are somewhat more accessible, as the Post Office is accountable to Parliament for its spending. Bearing in mind the errors in recording already discussed and the fact that the cost of damage in the course of theft would also be included, the following can be taken as fairly reliable figures of the annual cost of telephone vandalism:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Cost</u> £
1961	60,000
1962	65,000
1963	90,000
1964	150,000
1965	200,000

Source: Written Answer, House of Commons, 26/1/66

Subsequent estimates for 1966 ranged from £240,000 to £260,000, but estimates for 1967 suggest that the rate of increase is declining. These figures exclude overheads and loss of revenue. Partly by including guesses of these costs - but not stating this - estimates of the cost in the mass media were often wildly exaggerated. In 1965, for example, the figure of £500,000 was widely quoted.

Railways: Estimates of the cost of vandalism to British Railways varied widely: not only are there the familiar problems of distinguishing between primary and secondary cost, finding ways of excluding costs due to theft, accidental damage and routine wear and tear, but also the problem of distinguishing between the cost of the repairs alone and the total bill, which includes the costs resulting from delays, re-routing, etc. In 1965, for instance, the repairs alone cost £150,000, but the total bill ran to £500,000. In addition, there is the recurrent problem of allowing for rising costs of material and labour: a spokesman for the Southern Region, for example, quoted an increase in their costs between 1963-1964 as from £52,000 to £65,000, but at the same time suggested that the actual incidence of vandalism on their trains had remained "pretty constant" during that period. In fact, with the exception of mass media reports which made many

of the errors referred to above, most sources agreed that in 1963, 1964 and 1965, the annual cost of vandalism was fairly constant at about £500,000. This figure includes consequential losses and expenses from preventive action.

Other Victim Organizations: Nothing near a total coverage of victim organizations was obtained; it would be meaningless, therefore, to estimate the total amount of damage. All that can be said with certainty is that the total is less than the cost for the three main targets put together.

Taking all possible sources, a rough estimate of the total cost of vandalism in Great Britain in the peak year, 1965, would be about £2 million.

Summary: This section has been concerned with the discrepancies between the objective and subjective aspects of vandalism as a social problem; actual magnitude and seriousness on the one hand and popular attention and judgment on the other. It should be clear that, while this sort of distinction is real enough, it is not as easy to sustain conceptually or to demonstrate empirically as some theories of social problems would lead us to believe. On the one hand, objective indices of problems such as vandalism are peculiarly difficult to establish: it is not only technically difficult to discover the actual magnitude and seriousness of such problems, but also unclear what criteria should be used to evaluate such information. There is also the crucial problem, raised by the distinction between rule-breaking and deviance, as to what exactly is to be assessed "objectively". On the other hand, the so-called "subjective elements" do not exist somewhere apart from reality in a numinous world of their own. The amount of attention and the type of evaluation that a condition receives, is affected by real changes, even if the change is not in the condition itself, but in the fact that more attention is being paid to it by others. The subjective elements, in turn, affect the way in which the problem develops.

The very least that can be said about vandalism as a social problem,

is that discrepancies do exist between its objective and subjective aspects. Can one go further than this? Certainly, the sociologist would find it difficult to prove conclusively that vandalism is - to use Lemert's phrase again - "a problem of minor importance in the social system" and that too much attention is being paid to it. It would be very difficult to imagine a satisfactory proof of this sort. On the other hand, there is enough evidence on vandalism and other social problems to justify going further than merely pointing out discrepancies. One can also say that much of the societal reaction to vandalism is spurious: "A group or community reaction which is disproportionate to the extent and seriousness of the deviation provoking it."²³ The following are the most important types of spuriousness that are recognizable:-

(i) On the most basic level there was, during the research period, a substantial exaggeration of the amount, seriousness, cost and novelty of vandalism. I do not want to play down the extent of vandalism; on the contrary, research on unreported delinquency and contact with victim organizations, shows that the behaviour is much more widespread than any statistics indicate. Nevertheless, popular judgment consistently overestimated the actual magnitude of the problem. Both the contribution of vandalism to the total crime picture and its increase in the last ten years relative to other crimes are significantly less than is thought to be the case.

(ii) The attention given to vandalism was disproportionate to that given to other types of crime and deviance of equal or greater seriousness. The bulk of ordinary property crimes, for example, or the more serious of motoring offences, are more problematic than most types of vandalism, but receive less attention: they cost the community more, the offenders are more likely to recidivate, and in the case of motoring offences, greater threat to human life is presented. One might compare vandalism with two

23. Lemert, (1951), op.cit., p. 449.

other types of offences with which it shares some common features: arson and litter offences. In both cases, the financial cost to the community and the nuisance value are at least equal to that of vandalism. In the case of arson, the cost is very much more: a single building burnt down costs more than the cumulative damage from hundreds of average incidents of vandalism. Arson is difficult to prevent, it is more likely than vandalism to be associated with professional crime (such as protection rackets and major defraudings of insurance companies) and it is more likely to have the unintended consequence of human injury or loss of life. Yet arson is not defined as problematic: speeches are not made about it, editorials are not written about it and there are few campaigns against it.

(iii) The magnitude of vandalism in this country was exaggerated if one compares it to the problem as it exists elsewhere. Admittedly, it is not particularly consoling for the citizens of London, Glasgow or Birmingham to be told that their problems are far less acute than those faced by, say, American cities of comparable size. It is, nevertheless, important to introduce some comparative perspective to correct the biases of a purely parochial judgment. In 1963, for example, a rough estimate of the total cost of vandalism in this country would have been about £1,700,000; in the same year, the cost of school vandalism alone in New York City was estimated at \$1,113,000.²⁴

(iv) There are significant spurious elements in the way in which certain types of vandalism are given more attention than others. Using the simple index of amount of newspaper space, less attention was given to forms of vandalism, which by all criteria, such as cost, extent, aesthetic offence, inconvenience and potential threat to human life, were just as serious or

24. Note in Federal Probation, XXVII (March, 1964), p. 76. For other figures on school vandalism in America, see N. Goldman, "A Socio-Psychological Study of School Vandalism," Crime and Delinquency, (July, 1961), p. 222. For some figures on other types of vandalism in America (e.g. parks, railways and transport companies) see Martin, op.cit., pp. 9 - 14.

more serious than others. One might compare, for example, the high degree of problem-status accorded to telephone and railway vandalism to the low problem-awareness of local authority property.

The Conditions for Problem Definition

We are left with a number of unanswered questions: why is vandalism, or a certain type of vandalism, defined as problematic when, on closer analysis, it appears not to warrant this definition? Which types of vandalism are more likely to be defined as problematic? Who are the significant groups that do this defining? What conditions have to exist or what stages have to be passed through before a successful problem definition emerges? So far, only some very general lines along which these questions could be answered have been indicated. We know, for example, that vandalism poses many threats which give it a basic "problem potential" from the outset. We know that certain conditions, such as the dramatic nature of the damage or the emotive value of the target, increase the chances of that type of vandalism being defined as problematic. But one must be more specific than simply indicating the possible sources of spuriousness in the societal reaction or of discrepancies between the subjective and objective aspects of a social problem. What is needed is a description of what actually happens in the course of generating the awareness and definition of certain forms of behaviour as problematic.

This task has been almost entirely neglected by sociologists. What attention has been paid to it, has mainly been in terms of the natural history approach, which - as we saw in Chapter 1 - has certain limitations, particularly centring around the need to specify who is responsible for each stage and the improbability that social problems do, in fact, go through this fixed sequence. At the very least, though, the natural history approach alerts us, as Becker noted, to the fact that to understand a social problem fully, we must know how it came to be defined as such. The questions Becker poses from a modified natural history position are precisely the ones that need answering in regard to vandalism: to whom, and how, does a condition

first appear troublesome? How is it brought to other people's awareness?
 What tactics are used to win support for defining the condition as problematic?
 What is the role of the mass media in spreading concern about the condition?
 What organizations develop to do something about the problem?²⁵

It is possible that the deviation amplification model - which will be directly used in the Mods and Rockers section - is useful in the present context. The sequence is particularly relevant in examining the role of the mass media in defining the vandalism problem. The idea of feedback is, in addition, useful in correcting the image of a linear sequence which lies behind the Fuller and Myers approach: although awareness might lead to policy formation and reform, it is also true that policy formation and reform increases the awareness of the condition, thus making for a circular type of model.

The most basic starting-off point is the existence of a number of conditions, apart from the characteristics of the behaviour itself, which determine whether an act is defined as problematic or not. These conditions may be described in some sort of temporal sequence, but, in order to get away from the somewhat rigid and mechanistic implications of the natural history approach, I will simply list the three major sets of conditions or processes which appeared in defining vandalism as a problem. These are:

- (i) Awareness and Visibility
- (ii) Enterprise and Publicity
- (iii) Favourable Beliefs.

These conditions are not exclusive nor are they the most obvious ones. They were, however, common to all types of vandalism defined as problematic and I would suggest that they have to be present to some degree for any successful problem-definition to emerge. For some cases, the role of these conditions will be marginal: if, for example, a type of deviation is dramatic,

25. Becker, Social Problems, (1966), op.cit., pp. 11 - 14.

highly visible and obvious, the degree of enterprise necessary to define it as problematic is less. On the other hand, there are types of behaviour which apparently pose very minor threats and are of low visibility: these need a highly organized enterprise to be elevated to problem status.

These three conditions will now be analysed separately as they appeared in various types of vandalism.

(1) Awareness and Visibility

The need for somebody to become aware of a certain condition as dangerous, troublesome or threatening, is both the first stage and the most necessary condition in the development of a social problem. This awareness, in turn, is dependant on the condition being visible: it must be seen, heard or read about before anyone can start defining it as an actual or potential threat. Lemert makes the same point in regard to deviation: "In order for deviation to provoke a community reaction, it must have a minimum degree of visibility, that is, it must be apparent to others and be identified as deviation."²⁶ These dual conditions of visibility and awareness can most usefully be dealt with simultaneously.

Most forms of vandalism start off - relative to other social deviations and problems - with a high degree of physical visibility. The target of most vandalism is public property; public not just in the sense that it is publicly owned, but that it is prominently accessible and visible to the public. One can see the ripped-up seats in a railway carriage and a broken pane of glass in a telephone kiosk in a sense that one cannot "see", for example, the results of blackmail, white-collar crime or shoplifting. The consequences of many forms of deviation involve more the symbolic violation of cherished values than actual physical damage. This means that ways of increasing visibility and awareness, such as spotlighting "horror stories" about individual incidents or publishing statistics showing "dangerous" increases in the amount of deviance, are somewhat less needed

26. Lemert, (1951), op.cit., p. 51.

for vandalism. In other words, vandalism starts off with some advantages in the initial phases of problem definition.

Given this basic visibility, though, we still have to explain why vandalism in general and certain types in particular, became defined in such socially problematic terms in Great Britain during the Nineteen Sixties. Why should vandalism have been looked upon during this period as a peculiarly contemporary phenomenon when it had the same visibility at earlier times? What increased the visibility of certain forms of vandalism? In answering such specific questions, one may be able to generate more formal theories about the conditions making for heightened visibility and awareness.

In the first place, visibility and awareness can be increased by real and objective changes in the extent or seriousness of the condition. This effect is by no means easy to establish, nor is it as straightforward and automatic as first appears: people can become aware of a condition as problematic without any real change having taken place. The reverse is also true: a real change can take place without anyone noticing it. As we have seen, the "real and objective" changes in regard to vandalism are somewhat ambiguous. To repeat in a different form the conclusions of the previous section, the awareness of change was greater than most of the significant changes which did take place. It would be introducing an element of pseudo-accuracy to attempt to calculate the proportion of the awareness of change which was due to real change, as opposed to increased attention and publicity.

The visibility of certain types of vandalism has been increased in recent years not so much by any real change in the extent of the behaviour, but by certain technological innovations which have made new techniques of vandalism possible. In regard to writing on walls, for example, a notable innovation has been the use of the felt-tipped pen. In the past it was fairly easy to rub out slogans on bus shelters, lamp posts and

walls: these were written with chalk, pencil or crayon, all of which instruments are less indelible than the felt-tipped pen. This factor has, combined with the introduction, especially in new towns, of smooth, highly receptive surfaces such as plastic, terrazzo, high finish concrete and mosaic, to make wall-writing much more difficult to get rid of and hence more visible. An example of an area which suffered this problem is the Precinct of Coventry's rebuilt city centre where vandalism was defined in highly problematic terms. The Vice-Chairman of the Education Committee was quoted as saying:

It was all very well for a courting couple years ago to spend a whole afternoon carving "Jack Loves Judith" on a tree. It took them a long time and the marks grew out anyway. With a felt pen on some of these new surfaces you can do a lot of damage in a few minutes and nothing will wash it out. (Guardian 3/3/66).

A technological innovation of similar importance has been the aerosol spray. All poster and advertizing companies contacted drew my attention to the effect of this invention. Aerosol sprays are much easier and quicker to apply than paint, and fairly long slogans can be sprayed on posters in a matter of seconds. This decreases the chance of detection even in busy public settings and allows a number of offences to be committed in a short time.

A major factor in increasing visibility, is the dramatic and spectacular nature of the condition or event. This is a point that Merton has commented on:

Pervasive social problems that seldom have dramatic and conspicuous manifestations are apt to arouse smaller public attention than problems less serious, even when judged by the beholder's own values, which erupt in the spotlight of public drama.²⁷

It is mostly for reasons of this kind, that telephone vandalism and railway vandalism could emerge as highly visible social problems as a result of a few spectacular incidents. In discussing the Mods and Rockers,

27. Merton, (1966), op.cit., p. 793.

I will pay more attention to the role of single incidents in provoking the societal reaction. These incidents were not as dramatic in regard to telephone and railway vandalism but, nevertheless, they did occur.

The awareness of telephone vandalism was heightened by publicity given to cases where calls for emergency services were delayed because public telephones were damaged. Tragic as the consequences of these cases were, they did not occur with very great frequency. During the period 1964-1967, which marked the greatest incidence of telephone vandalism, I was able to trace only five cases which were unambiguously of this kind: in two of these children died because their parents could not find an undamaged public telephone in time to summon medical help; in another two, medical help was delayed but with no serious consequences; and in another case, eight people were injured in a fire after calls to the Fire Brigade were delayed because all the phones in the immediate area had been ripped out. No doubt there have been numerous other unreported incidents in which calls for emergency help have been delayed because of vandalism; it is unlikely, however, that if any of these had resulted in loss of life or serious injury, they would not have been reported. The awareness of the vandalism problem was heightened, though, by information from mass media and moral entrepreneurs which gave the impression that these cases were frequent, even commonplace. The problem was often re-defined to make its dramatic consequences its most frequent consequences. The local paper in Birmingham - an area which was seriously affected by telephone vandalism and had high problem-awareness - carried the following editorial:

The man who breaks open a telephone coin box and steals the money from it is guilty of more than theft, criminal though such action is. He is also guilty of acting without any decent regard for the distress and even the tragedy that he may be causing by depriving people in the vicinity of an essential public facility. He is cutting them off from emergency services required at times of accidents, fires, sickness and childbirth and his action makes him an enemy of the community. (Birmingham Post 19/11/65).

Similarly, a columnist dealing with vandalism in general, wrote:

They are known as vandals. I call them potential murderers. They are the lads who wreck telephone boxes for the sheer hell of it, and so hold up emergency calls to doctors, hospitals and ambulance services. (News of the World 8/5/66).

Figures about the number of telephones out of order were quoted to increase the visibility of this threat. Commenting, for example, on an incident in Oxford, in which a father was delayed in obtaining medical help for his sick child, the Daily Mirror (6/1/66) informed its readers that "... louts and petty thieves ... are putting nearly half Britain's 75,000 phone boxes out of action every year." This information is misleading for two reasons: firstly, although it may have been true that half the phones were damaged at one time or another during that year, at any one time, the total "out of action" was about one in thirty. Secondly, nearly all phones "out of action" are useable for emergency "999" calls.

The manifestations of railway vandalism which erupted in the spotlight of public drama were more spectacular. I have already quoted the figures of the number of accidents probably caused by trains running into obstructions placed on the line; in many more cases, accidents were averted by the objects being discovered in time. Much the most serious and visible of these accidents, and one that acquired legendary publicity, was a derailment that took place at Elm Park, Essex, on March 29th, 1965. Two people were killed and fifteen injured in the accident which was found to be caused by the "wanton obstruction" of the track by some metal objects.²⁸ This incident received wide publicity ("Hooligan Line Hunt", "Death Track Sport", "Dreaded Mile", etc.) and significantly increased the visibility of the vandalism problem. The type of behaviour that caused the accident, however, was not particularly new. It was part of a pervasive problem that railway officials have had to contend with for many years: objects being

28. "Railway Accident: Report on the Derailment that occurred on 29th March, 1965, near Elm Park." Ministry of Transport (London: H.M.S.O., 23/6/65), p. 7. See also the remarks on the report (pp. 7 - 8) on the general problem of hooliganism on railway lines.

placed or thrown on the line by children, with deliberate intent to cause damage or as part of a game, or adults disposing of unwanted junk. This single incident, however, did more than any statistics to increase awareness and visibility.

Another highly visible form of railway vandalism and one that emerged as a problem in its own right, was that associated with crowds travelling to and from football matches. There is no doubt that extensive damage was caused by this type of vandalism and, at various times, British Railways had to resort to various measures such as totally banning "football specials" in certain areas or banning the supporters of certain teams from travelling. Nevertheless, this aspect of the problem achieved an artificially created visibility and even in 1964 when they were launching an "anti-Vandalism Drive" the British Railways Board did not see vandalism on football trains as a major problem:

... Football trains have been the target for uncontrolled hooliganism, and in one area the railways have had to withdraw them altogether. But of much greater concern to the Railways Board are the incidents which receive little publicity. These include interference with overhead electric wires, tampering with traction switchgear and signalling and large-scale pilfering of lineside equipment resulting in many cases in delays and disruption to rail services, with the attendant risk to passengers. (Press Release, British Railways Board Public Relations Division, 28/2/64).

In other words, the victim organization itself is confirming Merton's point that "pervasive" problems arouse less attention than those which have dramatic qualities. The same point can be made by comparing the awareness of railway and telephone vandalism on the one hand, with vandalism to local government property on the other. In the latter case, the fact that the damage is mostly routine and unspectacular (defacement of walls, breaking street lamps, etc.) gives it a lower visibility, despite the fact that the extent and cost of the damage and, in some cases, its potential danger, is just as great. During the research period this type of damage needed very conscious moral enterprise to bring it to the attention of the public, while telephone and railway vandalism spoke for themselves.

The same tendency may be observed in microcosm in the case of school vandalism. The type of school vandalism that is almost exclusively visible and shapes society's conception of the problem, is the spectacular incident in which a school is broken into one night and - to use the popular descriptive phrase - an "orgy of destruction" takes place. This type of incident invariably sets off the process of problem-definition (for example, by local education authorities). The more pervasive types of school vandalism (incidental or organizational rule-breaking) are, in many senses, more serious. Goldman's study of school vandalism in New York confirms the same point that emerged from my contacts with local authorities and interviews with Northview headmasters:

... everyday damage to school property - breaking windows, cutting desk tops, gouging walls, damaging washroom equipment, etc. - was more costly in the long run than the occasional more spectacular acts of vandalism in which one or two rooms may be extensively damaged.²⁹

Another factor which increases awareness and visibility, is the type of property that is damaged. It is not necessarily damage to the most expensive type of property which gets noticed, but property which has an important symbolic value. One might compare - simply using the index of number of incidents reported in the mass media - the amount of attention given to damage of religious property and local authority property. Between 1965 - 1967, the national press reported 45 separate incidents of damage to churches and cemeteries and 112 separate incidents of damage to local authority property. This reporting ratio of 1:2½ is grossly inaccurate, the correct proportion being something like 1:100.

The distinction between rule-breaking and deviance should be mentioned again. Although rules are by no means automatically enforced when someone becomes aware of their infringement, it is obvious that enforcement cannot occur unless the rule-breaking is visible. Heightened visibility and awareness often combine with other factors to increase the likelihood of

29. Goldman, op.cit., p. 222.

certain forms of property destruction being labelled and processed as a vandalism offence. As an illustration, one may take the case of vandalism at the Kennedy Memorial at Runnymede. In June, 1965 there was a great deal of public indignation about the memorial being defaced. A number of names ("Glyn", "Dell", "Andy") and obscenities had been carved or scribbled on the stone of the memorial. This damage was noticed after "four young hooligans" were seen breaking shrubs and bushes near the memorial. The boys ran away and the National Trust Warden and the police (who apparently were "amazed" at the shocking condition of the memorial), were called. The damage was widely publicized: a long article in the Sunday Mirror (5/6/65) for example, headed "Britain's Shame" talked about how vandals had done their best "... to deface the monument, desecrate the memory and so dishonour the name of Britain." The offenders were labelled as "the mentally disturbed and the childish who cannot resist making an exhibition of themselves". From all sources there was a call for greater vigilance to prevent this sort of damage. In fact, the damage had taken place throughout the whole year since the monument had been built; this type of vandalism is common and entirely predictable, especially on monuments and similar property in isolated places. Incidental vandalism became defined as problematic, through a combination of conditions: (i) heightened visibility resulting from a single incident, which in itself was trivial; (ii) the fact that the property damaged was sacred and of highly symbolic value; (iii) the suggested association of the vandalism with ideological reasons, for which there was no evidence at all.

(2) Enterprise and Publicity

The concept of moral enterprise is of crucial importance in understanding the development of a social problem. Becker's original use of the concept was related to the creation and enforcement of rules rather than how social problems emerge. The elements of rule-creation he emphasizes, however, - enterprise, personal interest and publicity generation - are relevant to both situations. In fact, Becker's description of how the Marijuana Tax Act was created is at the same time a

description of how marijuana smoking emerged, at a particular time and in a particular place, as a social problem.

I will use the term "enterprise" to refer to all the actions which take place in defining a condition as a social problem once it has already become visible and someone is aware of it as posing a threat. What is actually said and done by significant individuals, groups or organizations at this stage? Whose responsibility do they define the problem? How do they achieve the maximum publicity to ensure that something is done? Enterprise, of course, may be necessary in the first place to heighten visibility and to create the awareness of a threat.

In this section, various types of enterprise, interest and publicity will be illustrated in order to generalize about the conditions that make for successful problem-definition. One might begin by looking at vandalism which has a low visibility and, hence, requires more enterprise and publicity before it can be defined as problematic. Significant in this category is vandalism to local authority property and I will describe efforts made by two organizations and a number of individual local authorities to define such vandalism as problematic.

The Local Government Information Office is an information and public relations organization set up in 1963 by the main local authority associations. Soon after this date it initiated a survey on the cost of vandalism to local authorities after its Press Officer, in the course of preparing an article on the effects of vandalism to local authorities, discovered that no figures of this sort had ever been collected. The explicit aim of the enterprise was to make the problem more visible: although the questionnaires sent to each authority included a question on measures taken to prevent vandalism, the L.G.I.O. was not specifically interested in policy formulation. It saw itself as performing a public service in drawing attention to a state of affairs which was thought to have been ignored for too long. There was a large element of Ranulf's

"moral indignation" in the way in which the results of the survey were presented to the public. The initial press reports announced routine manifestations of vandalism in a dramatic way ("Southend: more than 1,000 street lamps broken each year") and struck a note of indignation at the attitude of local authorities "... a defeated acceptance of vandalism as an incurable nuisance". One local authority, for example, was quoted as saying: "Vandalism has become such an accepted practice that separate votes covering every park, bus shelter, etc., in the town have to be budgeted for in levying the rates!" Similarly, an "Insurance Company Expert" was quoted: "Wanton damage is so widespread that since premiums must inevitably rise following claims, most councils prefer to grin and bear the loss themselves. They find it cheaper in the long run."

While conceding that the cost of preventive measures is often as great if not greater than the cost of vandalism, the L.G.I.O. clearly condemned the defeatism of local authorities who do not even try to tackle the problem. It is worth quoting again the conclusion of the report, as it is so characteristic of the way in which social problems become defined. After noting the defeatism and citing the "smart Alec" who suggested that vandalism might cost his local authority less than answering the questionnaire, the report went on:

The cash cost is surely not the only aspect of the problem to be considered. The cause of vandalism is a serious social matter, and until early education attaches more importance to a child's appreciation of the public services than to his knowing which is the longest river or the highest mountain, no hope can be held out for tackling the problem at its roots.

The L.G.I.O. officials who publicized the report were very much concerned with "tackling the problem at its roots" and stressed causes of vandalism such as "the decline in values" and "the breakdown in discipline". This spirit of a moral crusade, which we will encounter in sharper detail in some of the campaigns against the Mods and Rockers, can be illustrated in the fact that the Office distributed to interested parties the full text of a sermon about vandalism given by a Congregational Minister. This sermon - reproduced in Appendix C - should not, of course,

be taken as representing the views of the L.G.I.O.; it was nevertheless printed and issued by them.

Despite the large element of disinterested moral indignation in this enterprise, its potential appeal to victim organizations and the public was based more on financial grounds. The interest in defining vandalism as a problem and in obtaining information on methods of prevention, lay in the possibility of saving councils and ratepayers an (unspecified) amount of money. The enterprise had very little success, however, in stimulating local authorities to any action: successful problem-definition and enterprise more often stemmed from initiative at the local level.

The C.B.C.S.M. enterprise was less noteworthy for any attempt at moral crusading, but more interesting for its combination of commercial interest and sophisticated publicity techniques. As contrasted to the L.G.I.O. the organization is a purely commercial one, and not a public service body, although in its report, it made strenuous efforts to emphasize the public service which it was performing.

In the latter part of 1964, the Council of British Pottery Manufacturers (which in January, 1965, merged with another organization to form the Council of British Ceramic Sanitaryware Manufacturers) sponsored a questionnaire to local authorities in the United Kingdom. At the time, it was concerned to ascertain the provision of free washing facilities in public conveniences, and stated that it was stirred to such action by complaints about the lack of such provisions and also by the public health implications of a typhoid epidemic earlier in that year.

The questionnaire did not in any way refer to, or ask any question about, vandalism, but "... the references to vandalism were such as to merit its inclusion in this survey as a major subject for consideration."³⁰

30. C.B.C.S.M. Survey, op.cit., p. 3.

While this assertion is true, it is nevertheless also true that in the Survey, in the Press Conference to launch it and in the subsequent publicity it received, the vandalism aspect was spotlighted at the expense of the original aims. Vandalism was exposed as a major obstacle to providing adequate facilities in public conveniences:

... Public conveniences are clearly a necessary part of our lives. Yet this basic necessity is threatened because of the attitude of what can only be a small minority - vandals. Evidence would seem to indicate that vandalism generally is on the increase and the time is approaching when a really concerted drive is going to be necessary.³¹

The threat of vandalism to public conveniences was defined as "an urgent national problem", and the findings of the Survey were summarized as follows:

The Survey has revealed in all its starkness the frightful and fearful growth and impact of the vandals on public conveniences and the way in which the activities of these people interfere with the well-being of normal citizens. A determined effort must be made by all concerned to stamp out effectively the activities of vandals and the public should co-operate with the police to a far greater extent than now appears to be the case to be ruthless and efficient in ending vandalism ...³²

The Survey, then, while ostensibly concerned with other issues (the provision of facilities, the quality and design of equipment, etc.), laid its greatest emphasis on vandalism. This was even more apparent in the publicity for the Press Conference to launch the Survey. This part of the enterprise was handled by a professional public relations firm which circulated the press with an invitation, extracts of which are reproduced below, to a Conference which was intended to "... bring together at any one time a greater representative gathering of parties interested in Britain's health and hygiene than any other comparable conference."

SANITARY POTTERS INVITE LOCAL AUTHORITIES TO MEET YOU TO
LAUNCH THE FIRST EVER COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY of Britain's
Public Conveniences.

You, too, must have suffered: you have used a toilet and

31. Ibid., pp. 4 - 5.

32. Ibid., p. 32.

found no toilet paper; smashed wash basin; broken seat; the walls a mass of artists' design. The reason, vandalism of course. And "come spring, come the vandals." The vandals who seem to have spent the winter months wrecking telephone kiosks, smashing railway specials, now prepare to launch their annual attacks on the conveniences of Britain.

... Frankly, we have facing us as a nation a frightening picture, horrifying in some cases.

The time for action is now and suggestions will be put forward for a rapid improvement in the standard of Britain's public conveniences. (Circular letter from C.B.C.S.M., March, 1965).

The conference was attended by journalists and representatives of local authorities, manufacturers, health officials and public health inspectors. The highlight of the conference (which I attended and later discussed with various of those present) was the unveiling of a full-size model of a public toilet, constructed on the floor of the Conference Room. The model bore various examples of vandalism, and after the unveiling an official of the C.B.C.S.M. demonstrated (with realistic aggression) the action of a typical vandal: ripping out the chain, wrecking the toilet roll, kicking the seat in and scribbling on the wall.

The emphasis of those attending the conference was very much on their public duty and responsibility in getting something done about vandalism to public conveniences. The C.B.C.S.M. too, were emphatic in disclaiming any commercial interest in trying to expose vandalism:

On the face of it, some may say that vandalism indirectly aids the industry because of replacements. But this is short-sighted and certainly it is no part of the manufacturers of ceramic sanitaryware to divert a good proportion of their output in replacement of fitments in public conveniences due to the activities of vandals. Indeed, the demand due to increasing calls upon their output could be embarrassing. The industry is actively engaged in meeting demands from new housing, from conversions, from industrial requirements as well as local authorities and replacement of fitments because of vandalism is output which can ill be spared. Furthermore, the calls of the export market and the desire to co-operate in the Government's scheme for exports, makes it all the more necessary in the national interest to reduce the incidence of vandalism.³³

33. Ibid., pp. 17 - 18.

Again, as with the L.G.I.O. efforts, we have an example of a condition previously ignored or reacted to in such a way that it is institutionalized, being elevated into the status of a national, moral and social problem.

One of the most interesting types of enterprises was those by individual local authorities. During the research period, some twenty of such cases were reported and in each one a very similar pattern could be distinguished. In the first stage, an awareness had to be created of vandalism as a local problem. This would occur in one of three ways:

(i) a magistrate, judge or similar public figure would draw attention to the increase in vandalism throughout the country and call for it to be "stamped out" in the area;

(ii) a local government official or politician, influenced by the heightened visibility of vandalism given in the mass media or from a personal sense of public duty, would take the initiative in having the subject raised in some way: by writing to the local newspaper, calling on the council to set up a "working party", or making a speech at a school prize giving day;

(iii) a dramatic local incident of vandalism (often misleadingly reported) or the publication of figures showing the extent of the problem locally, would provoke someone in the community (such as a local politician, clergyman or newspaper editor) to take up the issue.

The problem would then be given considerable publicity and opinions would be voiced - in the council, from the pulpit, in newspaper columns, by headmasters on speech days, by mayors at inaugural lunches - about its possible causes and how it could be dealt with. Some temporary body, like a Council working party or sub-committee, would be set up to investigate the seriousness of the problem, or a conference of interested parties and "experts" (the Chief Constable, local authority officials, headmasters, social workers and businessmen) would be convened to discuss the problem.

In about a quarter of the cases the enterprise did not get further. In the rest, some more permanent body was set up and given responsibility to publicize the problem and to formulate, and in some cases to carry out, policy decisions. Invariably, the campaigns petered out or else reached their climax with ambiguous results, it never being quite clear whether the enterprise was successful or not in reducing vandalism. At these later stages in particular, the enterprise would be faced with what Becker has perceptively identified as a unique dilemma of the rule enforcer: on the one hand, to justify his position he must demonstrate that the problem still exists and is perhaps worse than ever, but on the other hand, he must show that his enterprise has been worthwhile and that the evil is being dealt with and approaching an end.³⁴

A brief description of the activities of three of Britain's largest local authorities which showed an interest in vandalism will illustrate some of these common features, as well as some more general aspects of the processes in problem definition. Each of these authorities reached somewhat different stages with their enterprises.

(a) London: Paradoxically, the most restricted of these enterprises was undertaken by the Greater London Council, the area of which has the greatest concentration of most types of vandalism. The enterprise was restricted both in scope and in the stage of problem definition and social action it reached. It was initiated by a question at a meeting of the Council on 5th July, 1966 about the problem of rowdiness and hooliganism on council estates. The questioner (a member of the opposition Party) suggested that rowdiness had reached such proportions that some tenants were going in fear of their lives. He asked what action could be taken to prevent the spread of hooliganism. The Chairman of the Housing Committee replied that a full report about hooliganism on the Council's estates would be submitted to the Committee. The Director of Housing submitted this

34. Becker, (1963), op.cit., p. 157.

report in May, 1967, and it was presented by the Housing Committee to the Council a month later.³⁵ This report covered "... vandalism, malicious damage and theft of Council property at housing estates, since misbehaviour of this kind is so often associated with hooliganism." It dealt with the form and extent of the problem; the causes (discussing such factors as "tenant's standards", play and recreational facilities, effectiveness of local supervision, increase in complexity of housing provision, assistance from police) and possible ways of improving the situation. It also gave detailed case histories of hooliganism on twelve separate council estates. Despite the comprehensive and constructive nature of the report, little, apparently, was done about it. It was presented to the Council, received virtually no publicity and the enterprise never went beyond the stage of describing the problem and considering possible solutions. One can only speculate on some of the reasons for this failure: the solid and un-sensational nature of the report which did not lead itself to emotive publicity, the absence of a sufficiently motivated individual or group prepared to take the matter further and, perhaps, various party political issues not apparent to the outsider. It is also probable that the theme running through the report, that "the burden of control must fall on the Council", was an embarrassing conclusion to those who would have preferred the responsibility to be allocated to the tenants themselves, the police or society as a whole. I will discuss later the tendency of the successful entrepreneur to shift responsibility elsewhere. Specific recommendations, even if these were not entirely unambiguous, about the need for facilities such as supervised Adventure Playgrounds, might also have been unwelcome to members of the Council opposed to such ideas on financial or ideological grounds.

35. "Hooliganism on Housing Estates," Report by the Director of Housing, Greater London Council, (Ref. Hg. 821, (1/5/67)). See also Minutes of the Council, 6 - 7 June, 1967, p. 353, para. 3.

(b) Glasgow: Glasgow is a city with a traditional reputation for being associated with violence. This association has been less with property damage than with personal violence, particularly in recent years, in the form of teenage gang fighting on the large housing estates. The most frequent manifestations of vandalism have been connected with the gang phenomenon: breaking shop windows by drunken groups at night and over the week-ends, scrawling slogans and the names of rival gangs on the walls of the city. It is beyond my scope to document the whole tradition of violence and the reaction it evokes in Glasgow, but one cannot understand the awareness of vandalism without recognizing this tradition. In recent years there has been a marked preoccupation with the increasing seriousness of violent crime in Glasgow, to the point where policy about the problem has assumed major significance in party politics in the area. In April, 1965, the Chief Constable presented a special report to the magistrates about the upsurge of violence in the city and there were campaigns and counter-campaigns throughout the year on such specific issues as bringing back the birch for crimes of violence. In November of that year, an organization called the "Society for the Protection and Safety of the Public" was formed, with the primary objective of bringing back the birch for violence, vandalism and hooliganism. There was much publicity about the deterrent effect of corporal punishment on vandalism and the Society claimed to be "snowed under" with letters of support. (Times 10/11/65).

At the same time, the Corporation itself planned to take concerted action in selected areas of the city to combat hooliganism and vandalism and attempted to involve the Scottish Home and Health Department and various voluntary organizations. Early in the next year, magistrates were reported to have discussed, but eventually opposed, schemes for the formation of vigilante groups on housing estates; instead they recommended greater efforts to recruit special constables. (Glasgow Herald 31/1/66). It was then decided to single out one estate for a pilot project on delinquency by the Corporation and the Home and Health Department. Later

in the year a special sub-committee was appointed by the Magistrates' Committee and representatives of the Corporation's Education and Parks Committee. The sub-committee was to consider the possibility of common action against vandalism with various national bodies.

It is necessary to read the Glasgow newspapers of this period to obtain the full flavour of the public concern about vandalism. The press often reported these various campaigns and plans as if they were solely concerned with vandalism - a heading in the Glasgow Record (14/7/66) read "Good Citizens Plan Can Beat Vandalism" - whereas the concern of most groups was with one broader issue of crimes of violence in general. The national interest, though, in vandalism, provided an easily identifiable focal point and the dominance of these broader issues in Glasgow enabled the awareness of vandalism to be successfully heightened. What is particularly interesting in this light, is the absence of clear evidence that vandalism - as opposed to violence in general - had actually increased. When Easterhouse Estate, for example, was singled out for a pilot project on delinquency in February, there were conflicting claims as to whether vandalism on the Estate had increased. One paper estimated the increase to be ten times in recent years, the Chief Magistrate thought that there was "a substantial increase", social workers on the Estate thought there was "some increase" while the police claimed that the situation was no worse than the same time the previous year, a claim that some of the residents agreed with. This type of ambiguity shows in microcosm a situation characteristic of much of the early stages of problem-definition: it is seldom clear whether awareness is due to a real change in the condition or more attention being paid to the same condition.³⁶

36. By noting this ambiguity, I am not of course trying to suggest that situations which have not changed should never be defined as problems. ¹ Desirable problem-definition is often entirely dependant on someone recognizing that a condition which has always existed, is now no longer tolerable and needs attention, either in the form of research or in immediate solutions.

(c) Birmingham: By far the most advanced and interesting of the efforts of individual local authorities was that by Birmingham Corporation in 1966 - 1967. Again, some background factors - not peculiar in themselves but unique in the particular combination they took in Birmingham - must be sketched in to understand the way in which the enterprise was generated. There was, to begin with, the statistical reality that, among British cities of a comparable size, Birmingham has had more than its fair share of vandalism from about 1963 onwards. With not more than the usual journalistic hyperbole, the local newspaper referred to an incident of vandalism in February, 1966 as "... typical of a problem that has been eating like a cancer at the heart of the new Birmingham for the past few years". (Birmingham Post 22/2/66). Characteristically, the incident of vandalism which sparked off a remark such as this, was highly dramatic and visible: a Roman Catholic Junior School was broken into, equipment, including two pianos and a radiogram, wrecked, and the whole annex of the school eventually set on fire. A member of the Education Committee reacted by saying that he would raise the subject of vandalism at the next committee meeting and mentioned that more than 20,000 school window panes had been smashed the previous year. He said that this particular incident had left him speechless: "... I cannot coin the words to describe this senseless and wanton damage. It was nothing but a blatant and disgusting act of hooliganism. In this case it amounts to arson and sacrilege."

Incidents of this sort, however, merely served to increase public awareness of the problem. The cost of vandalism to the Council during the previous year was estimated as between £30,000 - £50,000. Among the most important reasons for what appeared to be a somewhat disproportionate amount of vandalism in Birmingham during this period, was the rapid redevelopment that had taken place in the city. Apart from the presence of much derelict property waiting demolition, there were new sights such as the Bull Ring, escalators, vast areas of plate glass, tiled subway walls, water fountains and so on. While these factors could hardly be

said to have made the city "a vandals' paradise" (Birmingham Post 22/2/66) they probably did increase the range of targets usually damaged, the visibility of the damage and the emotive reaction the damage would evoke ("We build new things for them, and look how they treat them"). Types of vandalism that occurred on a national level appeared to be especially acute in Birmingham. Public telephone vandalism, especially with the introduction of the S.T.D. system in Birmingham in 1965, was particularly prevalent and was the target of a separate campaign for higher penalties, introduced by the Recorder of Birmingham. Vandalism in the city was an issue that was raised in both local and national politics at the time.

Against this background and in view of the national publicity that the vandalism problem was receiving, it is not particularly surprising that at various times in 1965 and 1966, individual departments of the Council started paying attention to vandalism. In August, 1965, for example, the Health Committee passed a resolution to inform the General Purposes and Watch Committees about various cases of vandalism in day nurseries under its control. It sent a report about these incidents and asked other committees to consider introducing preventive measures. This resolution was referred by the General Purposes Committee to a sub-committee and, at the same time, the Town Clerk was asked to ascertain the action taken by other departments to prevent vandalism to their property. In a report in December, 1965, the Town Clerk summarized the replies received from various departments, together with statistics from some departments on the amount of vandalism in the 12 months preceding 31st May, 1965.³⁷

In the light of later developments - the beginning of a full-scale anti-vandalism enterprise just less than a year later -. there are three points arising from the Town Clerk's report which are of interest:

37. Report of the Town Clerk to the General Purposes (Special Purposes Sub-Committee), 20th December, 1965; plus Appendices. (Some examples from this report are quoted in Table 5).

(i) he notes that in a calculation made in April, 1963, the cost of damage to the Corporation in the previous year (1962) was approximately £37,000. This means that the figure quoted at the beginning of 1967 (when the anti-vandalism campaign actually got under way) of £50,000 damage in the previous year, was not an excessive increase: (ii) other figures provided in the report and supplemented by more up-to-date information in 1967, suggest that some types of vandalism, at least, had decreased rather than increased in the two years immediately preceding the campaign. Table 10 shows the figures for the amount and cost of damage in parks.

TABLE 10

Extent and Cost of Vandalism in Birmingham Parks 1962 - 1966

<u>Year</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>
No. of cases	320	334	322	303	199
Estimated cost of making good damage caused	£2,250	£2,375	£1,861	£4,493	£2,166

The decline in vandalism in 1966 was later attributed (by the same people who, caught up in the rule enforcers' dilemma, had to argue at the same time that vandalism was getting worse) to the introduction of patrols by mobile Park Rangers. In initiating the campaign, it was argued that such schemes had a great deterrent value and should be more widely implemented: (iii) this claim, however, should be evaluated alongside a particularly significant sentence in the Town Clerk's report:

It would appear that from the views expressed by the General Manager of the Building Department and the General Manager of the Parks Department, the measures taken to prevent vandalism are tending to be more costly than making good the acts of vandalism, and your sub-committee may wish to have regard to this aspect of the matter.

The Special Purposes Sub-Committee was evidently more impressed by the seriousness of the vandalism problem as revealed in the report. When they reported back to the General Purposes Committee in January, 1966, they recommended that the Watch Committee should increase the number of foot constables and further recommended that:

the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee be authorized to give the widest possible publicity to many cases of vandalism suffered by the Corporation to property in their ownership in an endeavour to secure the co-operation of the general public in an effort to eliminate this anti-social behaviour.

This recommendation is characteristic of the early stages of problem-definition: the condition must be exposed, publicized and made visible to as wide an audience as possible. The sub-committee was determined to do this, even if it involved setting aside one of the most important points made in the Town Clerk's report: namely, that measures to prevent vandalism might be more costly than the damage itself. Their comment on this point was:

Whilst this may be a valid statement your Sub-Committee is strongly of the opinion that vandalism, not only to corporation-owned property, but to property in private ownership, is reaching such serious proportions that there should be no relaxation of any of the measures taken to secure its elimination.

Such statements reveal the uncompromising nature of many moral crusades: the problem is getting worse, one cannot relax until it is completely eliminated.

Acting on this report, the General Purposes Committee decided, in place of the recommendation, to publicize the vandalism problem and to convene a Conference of all Committees affected by wilful damage to property under their control (Education, Health, Public Works etc.). The aim of the Conference, which duly took place in November, 1966, was to "... examine steps to be taken to prevent vandalism to Corporation and private property". Most of the Conference consisted of a discussion of various ways and means to prevent vandalism: closed circuit television, alarm systems, Park Rangers, heavier penalties by the courts, etc. Eventually, the proposition that commended itself, was the inauguration of a "Stop Vandalism Week". It was decided that "... in view of their current success in reducing vandalism to property under their control", the task of organizing the "Stop Vandalism Week" be given to the Parks Committee.

At this point the enterprise moved rapidly to its final stages. The Parks Committee took over and in the beginning of January, 1967, the "Stop Vandalism Week" (which was to be 9th - 15th January) was launched with the most extensive and successful publicity of any similar campaign. I will pay more attention later to the actual content of the campaign; i.e. what methods of prevention and control it visualized and also how effective it proved to be. In the present context, I want to summarize the way in which the campaign was presented and the publicity it achieved.

The purpose of the campaign was defined not so much in terms of the "elimination" of the problem as of increasing the community awareness of vandalism as a problem it had to deal with. The themes behind the "Stop Vandalism Week's" publicity campaign were, thus, community awareness and responsibility. A whole range of community organizations were drawn into the campaign, and more than 650 of them were used as publicity outlets. Some 600,000 publicity items were distributed (leaflets, posters, vehicle-window stickers, lapel badges, etc.), all bearing variations on the slogan "If you Lend a Hand, We Can Stop Vandalism" and suggestions of how members of the community could help to stop vandalism.

The week was launched by the Lord Mayor and a large "Stop Vandalism" Exhibition was mounted in the Bull Ring. All these events received wide local publicity: £500 was spent in advertisements in local newspapers and a message was shown daily on the newscaster on the outside of the Bull Ring Centre building. Extensive national publicity in newspapers, television and radio was also obtained: a clearing house for vandalism information was set up at the Parks Department and information was collected and issued daily to the Press.

As I will indicate in Chapter 6, the effect of this campaign on the vandalism problem was essentially ambiguous and difficult to assess. This of course, applies to most ventures of a similar sort in the field of delinquency-prevention. The campaign clearly succeeded in increasing the

level of problem-awareness and visibility in the community. Whether this result could have been achieved some other way, and perhaps with less expense (the campaign cost approximately £5,000) is again difficult to assess; it is possible that a single spectacular incident of vandalism might have increased problem-awareness to the same degree. It is also problematic as to how permanent the effects of the publicity were; the General Manager of the Parks Department commented a month after the campaign: "although a week of intensive publicity has been very much worthwhile, it is felt most desirable that a continuous campaign should be sustained."

Commercial interest was obviously a major motivating force in most of the enterprises considered so far. Although other motives were present to some degree - aesthetic considerations, public service, moral indignation -, the commercial factor was the most apparent rallying point for the enterprise: if something wasn't done about vandalism, it would be the taxpayer or ratepayer who would lose. In other cases the commercial element was even more apparent, and the enterprise was initiated out of a clear vested interest. In these situations, the group that takes the initiative sees itself as a victim or potential victim and appeals for assistance from the powers that be.

Examples of this sort of enterprise could be found in the pages of various relevant trade magazines. Publications such as "The Confectioner", "Tobacconist and Stationer", "Licensing World", "Kinematograph Weekly", etc., carried stories of various appeals by their readers for something to be done about vandalism. An individual proprietor, or local branch, might complain to the police or town council, collect signatures for a petition, or call upon the local magistrates to "get tough" with vandals. None of these campaigns reached the stage of the organizations which developed to deal with the Mods and Rockers. The most persistent of these groups were publicans, and if the reports in the Morning Advertiser (the trade paper) are reliable, local Licenced Victuallers Associations devote a great deal

of attention to vandalism and hooliganism in pubs.

During the research period, there was an average of one report every fortnight about Local Associations taking some sort of action: general calls to "bring back the birch", demands for local magistrates to take a stronger line, demands for police protection or attempts to draw up a "Black List of Hooligans". In a few instances - notably those involving hooliganism on buses - Trade Unions were instrumental in drawing public attention to the problem. In these cases "hooliganism" did not entail property damage, but physical attacks on bus crews. The usual result of an outbreak of incidents of this sort was a refusal by crews to work after certain hours.

Vested interests can be an important factor in the redefinition of certain types of rule-breaking into social problem terms. An interesting example was the outbreak of an anti-smoking campaign at the end of 1965, which took the form of spraying the word "Cancer" in red paint on posters advertising cigarettes and tobacco. The British Poster Advertising Association asked Scotland Yard to help fight the campaign, one large tobacco company carried out a survey of its posters when reports of the vandalism began, and the sales manager of one poster advertising contractor was quoted as saying: "I have been out trying to catch someone, and if I do I shall see that they are charged. This is serious wilful damage. This seems to be a campaign against smoking, and it means a lot of work for us..." (Daily Telegraph 7/9/65).

Poster-daubing is among the most tolerated and incidental types of property damage, it is very rarely defined in problematic terms. A combination of three new elements led to its temporary redefinition as a problem, meriting such attention as the Daily Telegraph headline: "Vandals' War on Cigarettes Posters". The three elements were:

(i) the switch from "harmless" graffiti (such as painting moustaches on the girls in the cigarette posters, or even scrawling obscenities) to messages which had a very obvious ideological component;

(ii) the presence of groups who had to interpret the message (cigarette-smoking causes cancer, therefore don't listen to the advertisements) as a threat to commercial interests;

(iii) a technological innovation - the use of aerosol sprays - which increased the magnitude of the threat.

Two incidental comments might be made about the attempts by vested interest groups to get vandalism defined in social problem terms. The first is that it was either not realized, or else deliberately ignored by these groups, that in virtually all instances the cost of preventive measures would exceed the cost of the damage. This point weakens the case for problem-definition on purely financial grounds. The second point is that much illegal property damage does not get defined as problematic for the very reason that this definition would be more expensive in the long run. This is the case with much licenced rule-breaking described earlier; for example, a hotel keeper who regularly has rugby teams staying in his hotel and causing about £20 worth of damage over a week-end, would rather put up with this state of affairs than, say, ban the team from his hotel, press charges or try to reclaim the damage. I traced a number of instances where hotel managers took strenuous efforts to counter any attempts by the press to give publicity to this type of vandalism.

Initiative towards making social problems more visible and defining them in a particular way, is often taken in the name of social science. This was the function performed by the classic poverty surveys in Great Britain, although Booth, Rowntree and others connected with this movement exhibited more of an element of moral crusade than present day social scientists will confess to. Nevertheless, the aim of all moral enterprise in increasing the visibility and awareness of certain problematic conditions, was certainly present in the muckraking tradition of the Chicago School and is no less present (even if it is disguised) among today's "applied sociologists" and other social scientists concerned with problem conditions such as poverty, old age, mental illness, illegitimacy.

The popularization of social science - for example, in such journals as New Society - has done much towards increasing problem awareness and visibility.

The role of such initiative in regard to vandalism has been negligible and highly selective. As I have already pointed out, criminologists and sociologists of deviance have taken little interest in the topic. During the period between 1963 and 1968, when vandalism reached its highest visibility in the public arena, only one piece of research was carried out into vandalism, in this country. This was the enquiry by the Birmingham group (almost wholly consisting of psychiatrists) into the subject of football vandalism and hooliganism. Even in this case, the initiative came not from social scientists but from the Minister for Sport, who originally suggested that the research be carried out.

In the light of the relatively small amount of sociological research in this country, the absence of research on vandalism is perhaps not surprising.³⁸ It indicates a lack of resources and personnel as well as a low interest in the problem. These first two conditions, however, do not apply in America and it is more surprising to find how little problem-oriented research into vandalism has been carried out there. The exception - studies of vandalism connected with anti-Semitic outbreaks - is an interesting one, as it shows the selective processes which determine how certain types of problems are selected for research attention. In this case, it was the presence of well-organized interest groups, with a direct and immediate concern about the problem, who took the initiative in carrying out or sponsoring research. At least three important studies

38. I have located only one study of vandalism carried out at the level of a post-graduate qualification. This consists mainly of a questionnaire study of some London housing authorities. See D.R. Mycroft, "Juvenile Vandalism," Dissertation, Post-Graduate Diploma in Psychology, University of London, 1964.

were made of the 1960 swastika-daubing incidents in America:³⁹ one (Stein, Martin and Rosen) was sponsored by the American Jewish Committee who invited the New York School of Social Work to carry out the enquiry; another (Caplovitz and Rogers) was published by the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai Brith, whose Civil Rights division also supplied the information for the research; and in the other (Deutch), information was also collected through the facilities of the anti-Defamation League.

In the most recent article on vandalism to date, a bibliographical footnote listing studies "... directed towards the understanding of vandalism", contains nine items, no less than five of which are concerned with the swastika-daubing incidents of 1960.⁴⁰ This phenomenon involved some 650 incidents and led to the arrest of some 170 offenders. These figures contribute a minute part to the total vandalism picture, yet because of the presence and enterprise of an interest-group who were prepared to sponsor and assist research, these incidents resulted in a substantial proportion of the social scientists' contribution to understanding vandalism.

The important question about the role of mass media publicity in affecting deviance itself will be considered elsewhere; in the present context, I am interested in publicity as a condition for problem-definition. As such, we have already observed its most obvious role as part of an enterprise to make the problem more visible. The mass media often act as entrepreneurs in their own right, when, for example, they campaign against

39. H.D. Stein et al, op.cit.; D. Caplovitz and C. Rogers, Swastika 1960: The Epidemic of Anti-Semitic Vandalism in America, (New York, Anti Defamation League of B'nai Brith, 1961) and Martin Deutch, "The 1960 Swastika Smearings: Analysis of the Apprehended Youth", Merrill Palmer Quarterly of Behaviour and Development (April, 1962), pp. 1 - 22; two further articles were based on some of this research or derived from similar sources: Herman D. Stein and John M. Martin, "Swastika Offender: Variations in Etiology, Behaviour and Psycho Social Characteristic," Social Problems, 10 (Summer 1962), pp. 56 - 70 and Howard J. Ehrlich, "The Swastika Epidemic of 1959-1960: Anti-Semitism and Community Characteristics," Social Problems, 9 (Winter 1962) pp. 264 - 271.

40. Wade, op.cit., p. 95.

a particular evil or attempt to "expose", "probe" or "uncover" a particular condition - out of public service or commercial interest. There were a number of campaigns and exposures in regard to vandalism; more of the former, mainly because of the difficulty of finding out much about the problem.

Exposures during the research period - feature articles in newspapers and programmes on the radio or television - consisted mainly of a digest of the statistics and a presentation of horror-stories, such as those about lives being lost as a result of vandalism. The statistics tended to be selective and the distinction between real increases and increase in attention, seldom made. There were often wide disparities between figures quoted by different sources and distortions occurred, for example, by quoting rough estimates as if they were accurate figures. This occurred in the case of telephone vandalism where mistakes of up to £300,000 were made in quoting the annual cost of damage.⁴¹ Especially in the case of local authority property, no distinction was made between the cost of vandalism and the loss from other sources, such as theft.

Both in campaigning and exposing, the mass media are an integral part of the process of problem definition: they heighten the visibility of a problem simply by drawing the public's attention to it and also by emphasizing its more dramatic aspects. The conscious use of a number of techniques - all to be examined in detail when looking at the reports on the Mods and Rockers - emphasizes the threatening aspects of the vandalism problem and gives the public a peculiar and often distorted image of it. Unnecessarily emotive language was used ('The vandalism death track'), unrealistic threats were posed ('The whole public telephone service could

41. On 26 April, 1966, two newspapers, the Daily Sketch and Daily Mail, quoted an estimate by the Assistant Postmaster General of the annual cost of such damage as £4,500,000. It was not clear who was responsible for this over-estimation of at least four million pounds.

break down") and a subtle screening device was used to pick out particularly newsworthy items. When vandalism was in the news, related areas of interest were scanned to select vandalism items, however tenuous the connection. During the research period, four local authorities initiated programmes concerned with their youth services or with juvenile delinquency in general, which were reported by the mass media as if they were programmes specifically directed at vandalism. In other instances, reports about the annual Criminal Statistics or local Chief Constable's reports, were headlined to emphasize the vandalism figures. A report in The Times (14/1/66) on the Magistrates Association's memorandum of evidence to the Royal Commission on the Penal System (which covered a range of issues such as sentencing, institutional treatment, giving information to magistrates on the result of treatment), was headed "Heavier Fines for Vandalism Urged". A notable example of such screening occurred in a report on one day of the hearings during the Aberfan Disaster Tribunal. Evidence was heard about some crucial telephone cables having been stolen from the tip; the Chairman of the Tribunal commented: "These people ought to have heavy hearts and a lot on their consciences." Despite the fact that this was a case of theft and not vandalism and that a great deal of more important evidence was heard on the same day (for example, about previous representations by the villagers about the safety of the tip), the Daily Telegraph (8/12/66) chose to head its report of the hearings "Judge Criticizes Phone Vandals on Tip No. 7. 'Lot on their Conscience' ". No other national newspaper mentioned this.

As a partly unintended consequence of such techniques, the media play a crucial role in increasing problem-awareness. They are also crucial in spreading the particular beliefs favourable to problem-definition, and in transmitting concepts, images and stereotypes about the nature of the problem.

(3) Favourable Beliefs:

In tracing the stages through which various types of vandalism emerged to be defined as problems, one repeatedly comes across the same sort of statements being made about the nature of the problem. The mass media, the victims, the moral entrepreneurs and the public, express a number of beliefs which seem to function to ensure that the condition is in fact defined as a social problem. In addition, the beliefs or opinions justify certain ways of dealing with the problem. I will consider in the next chapter those beliefs, conceptions, images and stereotypes through which society tried to explain and understand vandalism as a form of behaviour. In this section I would like to discuss three themes which appear to be virtually universal prerequisites for successful problem-definition. These belief themes will appear again, in almost identical forms, in regard to the Mods and Rockers.

The beliefs are: firstly, that the condition under consideration is not an isolated or particular one, it is part of a broader social or national problem and is a manifestation or symptom of something more "fundamental"; secondly, that the condition is remediable: something can be done about it; and, thirdly, that something must be done about the condition or else it will deteriorate. A corollary of the last belief, because of the first, is that the responsibility for doing something lies with "society", or more specifically, the Government.

Thus, in regard to vandalism, the following sorts of assertions were made:-

(i) the particular form of vandalism being considered - say, damage to telephones - was part and parcel of the general vandalism problem;

(ii) the general vandalism problem was itself part of a broader problem, variously defined as: "the delinquency problem"; "the problem of violence"; "the youth problem"; "the problem of the general decline in values (or morals, or respect for property)".

"get beyond control". It was up to society as a whole, or the Government, to do something.

The problem was thus conceptualized in terms of a pyramid of scope, effect and responsibility: visible at the top, was merely one aspect - say, damage to telephones - but at the next level down there was much more - seats slashed in railway carriages, bricks on railway lines, broken bottles on football grounds - while at the base there was an ominous and solidly rooted social problem. The pyramid could only be demolished by attacking the base.

This sort of conceptualization has obvious functions for successful problem-definition and variants of it have been used to expose the evils and dangers of prostitution, alcohol, drugs, masturbation and so on. In regard to vandalism, this conceptualization had, in addition, a less obvious function for some victim organizations; it allowed them to deny - sometimes quite reasonably and at other times less reasonably - that vandalism was, in fact, "their" problem. These victim organizations took pains to point out that they were not responsible for the situation: it was not their fault in the first place, and they could not solve the problem themselves. Thus local authorities - even when they were trying to do something about vandalism - did not want to be stigmatized as a "high vandalism area" and soccer clubs did not want their supporters to be stigmatized as a "bunch of vandals". The result of such denials meant that it was not only the moral entrepreneurs and those really worried about vandalism who were defining it as a social problem; those who were uninterested in enterprise and publicity exposure were projecting exactly the same pyramidal image of the situation.

It would be repetitive to illustrate this conception with separate reference to every type of vandalism; in each case the statements were variations on the same themes. I would like to use the single case of football hooliganism and vandalism which brings out these and related

themes in the process of problem-definition in sharp outline.

"Football hooliganism" is a description that encompasses a wide range of behaviour, before, during or immediately after a football match: brawling among the spectators, throwing bottles and other missiles on to the field, carrying dangerous weapons, assaulting players or referees, invading the pitch after a goal has been scored, etc. The Birmingham Research Group included all these forms of behaviour together with "foul support" (e.g. distracting the opposite side), "soccer mania", "riots", etc., under the classification of "soccer hooliganism". There is little opportunity for actual vandalism during the game, except by damaging property in refreshment rooms and toilets on the ground. Most damage takes place in public transport going to and from the ground - especially supporters' coaches and British Railways "specials" - and to property - especially shop windows and public houses - in the immediate vicinity of the ground.

Disturbances of various sorts among spectators at large football matches do not constitute a new phenomenon. The culprits in the past were usually thought to be adults and their behaviour was associated with drunkenness. Before the sixties this behaviour had a relatively low visibility: details of hooliganism were not well publicized and were known intimately only by followers of the sport. The behaviour was to some degree institutionalized, and tended to be regarded with little more than tolerant amusement as a part of the "Andy Capp" image of the working class. Often, tolerance levels were exceeded, and punitive sanctions invoked; the behaviour was not, however, seen in socially problematic or threatening terms. By the 1963-1964 season, however, football hooliganism began to acquire the status of a fully-fledged social problem: it was associated with the general problem of vandalism and violence, the offenders were seen as "young hooligans" and there was talk of the government having to do something about the "creeping menace". The behaviour was conceptualized in terms of the social problem pyramid.

The elevation of football hooliganism to problem status was due to a number of complex factors. Most obviously, there was the perception that the amount of hooliganism had increased, and that it had taken more serious forms: for example, more dangerous weapons were being used or more property was being damaged. The mass media certainly presented the picture of a clear increase in extent and seriousness, and the Birmingham Research Group state that the majority of their informants (those in Table 1 together with other contacts) "... viewed the matter of football hooliganism today as an increasing and serious one."⁴² As Table 1 also indicates, however, there was not altogether a consensus on the extent of the increase: some 30% of the sample thought that the problem was "much exaggerated". The 74 separate police authorities surveyed, were equally divided about whether the problem had increased or not and slightly less than half thought that the problem was not serious. On the basis of information from all sources, the Report's conclusion was, "How far the reported increase in soccer hooliganism is real and how far due to increased attention and reporting of these events is difficult to ascertain."⁴³ It would seem fair to say - as with vandalism as a whole - that although some visible increase had taken place, this increase was exaggerated, partly because of the attention paid to other contemporary forms of vandalism.

It is also clear - from observation at football matches at the time, scrutiny of mass media reports and the findings of the Birmingham group - that the amount of publicity and the greater vigilance of the police increased the amount of deviance. These exaggeration and amplification effects will be dealt with in the Mods and Rockers study; there is enough confirmatory evidence that a similar process occurred in the case of football hooliganism. In regard to the exaggeration effect for example,

42. Harrington, op.cit., p. 6.

43. Ibid., p. 5.

the Birmingham Group notes "... Sportswriters have difficulty in reporting unexceptional games and may welcome the opportunity to report crowd incidents when there is little to report on the field of play ... reporters are sometimes sent specifically to report hooliganism rather than reporting details of the match."⁴⁴ Reports did not just cover one or two noteworthy incidents, but included details about others even if they were trivial, run-of-the-mill and virtually non-events. The policy was to report everything on what one paper (Daily Sketch 3/4/67) called "The Hooligan Front". A tendency has also been noted for "the number of arrests to increase when local concern over the problem is increased"⁴⁵ and give a number of instances/^{are given} when misbehaviour was stimulated by public attention, for example:

Warnings over the public address system that any offenders will be severely dealt with and appealing for public co-operation appear sometimes to be effective but on other occasions such appeals are merely provocative. On one occasion a member of our team heard such an appeal made which included a particular request that fireworks should not be set off; this was immediately followed by a volley of bangers being exploded on the terraces with the obvious approval and encouragement of a large section of the crowd.⁴⁶

The impression sometimes transmitted by the mass media was not merely that football hooliganism was increasing and becoming more serious, but that it was virtually an entirely new form of behaviour. The proverbial observer from another planet reading British newspapers from about 1963 onwards would obtain the impression that football hooliganism was entirely unknown in the history of the game in this country and that it had just suddenly "happened" at the time that telephones were being smashed and the Mods and Rockers were "running riot". This impression, of course, is functional to problem-definition: a new threat looks more menacing than

44. Ibid., p. 28. In the light of these and other similar comments it is surprising that the Report concludes that the majority of the mass media "... show a responsible attitude to the problem of hooliganism" (p. 29).

45. Ibid., p. 5.

46. Ibid., p. 37.

something which has been lived with for years. The impression, however, was a type of collective fiction or myth, sustained even by those who could see through it. Disturbances of various types have been endemic in the history of football: throwing objects on to the field, abusing players and referees, public drunkenness after the matches, are virtually institutionalized forms of behaviour. More serious violence also existed before the Sixties. In 1899 a F.A. Cup Semi-Final between Sheffield United and Liverpool was abandoned when the crowd invaded the field, the same happened five years later in a cup-tie between Tottenham and Aston Villa. In Glasgow, violence at the Celtic-Rangers encounters, with their overtones of religious conflict, is part of the unwritten folklore of the city. In 1941 Celtic was ordered to close its ground for a month after fights during a match against Rangers; this sort of sanction was never used in the Sixties.

The impression that the problem was something novel was reinforced by the view that football hooliganism had somehow been "imported" from foreign countries, particularly on the Continent and in South America. Violence at football matches was not really British at all, it had been picked up through contact with foreign teams and reading about foreign crowds. To quote two press comments, at random, after a particularly violent Saturday afternoon:

Hooliganism among English soccer crowds moved another step nearer Italian style rioting on Saturday (Daily Telegraph, 11/10/65).

British fans have a long way to go yet before Roman standards of violence, but each season sees them moving a little nearer (Sunday Mirror, 10/10/65).

As one might expect, very few people with any knowledge of the game could honestly endorse this sort of stereotype: only 12% of the Birmingham Group's national sample of managers, directors, players and supporters' clubs thought that "foreign influences" was a factor causing hooliganism; as much as 42% of the newspaper sample, however, did think so.⁴⁷

47. Harrington, op.cit., p. 7.

The probability of football hooliganism being accorded full social problem status was considerably heightened by the perception that the situation presented a potential threat to Britain's national prestige. When the "good name of the British sporting public" or "national pride" was at stake, one could be sure of a receptive audience for appeals to end "..." the creeping menace which is blackening the name of soccer" (Daily Sketch 10/12/66). Such appeals were particularly prevalent in the months preceding England's staging of the World Football Cup in July, 1966. The following two comments were made after incidents in January and April of that year:

... soccer is still reeling and stunned by this ultimate in shame and humiliation. The human garbage have plummeted our national sport to its lowest ever depths of viciousness and wanton hooliganism. (Sun 17/1/66).

It may be only a handful of hooligans who are involved at the throwing end, but if this sort of behaviour is repeated in July the world will conclude that all the British are hooligans ... Either the drift to violence must be checked or soccer will be destroyed as an entertainment. What an advertisement for the British sporting spirit if we end with football pitches enclosed in protective wire cages. (Editorial, Sun 21/4/66).

After the World Cup had taken place and England had won, comments like this were made during the next season: "The proud banners of Britain's soccer triumphs are being trampled in the mud of mob violence." (Daily Sketch 8/5/67).

The pyramidal conception of football hooliganism is difficult to locate because the situation could be blamed on so many agencies. At various times, responsibility for football hooliganism was allocated to the following: the players (bad play, and fouling); the supporters; hooligans in the crowd who were not "really" supporters; the standard of refereeing (thought to influence crowd behaviour by 87% of the Birmingham Group's sample); and the clubs (for inadequate facilities, not disciplining their players and supporters, etc.); the Football Association (inadequate discipline of players); the police (being too tough, not being tough enough); the courts (mainly for not giving more severe sentences: 84% of

the Birmingham Group's sample thought that methods of dealing with hooliganism were inadequate) and the Government (for not giving the courts or police enough powers and generally for not "tackling the problem at its roots").

The pyramid emerges most clearly if one looks at the statements of those connected with the game: supporters clubs, club directors, players, managers, etc. These groups are not "victims" or "targets" of vandalism in the sense that British Railways are; nevertheless, they stand to lose if their own clubs, or the sport as a whole, become stigmatized for bad behaviour. The tendency among such groups, and official bodies such as the Football League and the Referees Association, was to somewhat play down the problem and very definitely to deny their own responsibility for it. Table 1 indicated the tendency of officials, when^w compared with the general public, to play down the threat; more indicative of this attitude is the Birmingham Group's difficulty in obtaining co-operation from officials. Dr. Harrington describes a "lack of support and even antagonism of a few important figures in the football world" to the enquiry and the "cold shoulder" which was given to them by the Football League when approached for information. His description of this reaction is plausible in the light of the general perception of the problem:

There is an attitude within official football circles that hooliganism in the game is just accidental. Some clubs argue that if brawling wasn't taking place on the terraces, the rowdies would be breaking the Town Hall windows ... certain eminent people in football say, "It isn't anything to do with us: we don't want to know." They feel that the solution lies at the society's doors, not theirs.

There is little doubt that football hooliganism is thought to be part of the general vandalism problem: 84.2% of the Birmingham Group's sample agreed that hooliganism was related to vandalism generally. (The figure for the general public was 78% and for the managers 91%). The difference between officials and members of the public was most clearly shown on the question of whether crowd control was adequate: 66% of the public said "no", while only 16% of the Directors said "no". The

following series of verbatim statements shows most clearly the conceptions of the problem presented by various officials and directors:

There is no such thing as soccer hooliganism. It is a suitable occasion for the manifestations of general lawlessness and violence that is appearing in society in all its aspects.

The root of the problem is not inside, but outside the football ground ... when hooliganism is reduced in society generally it will also disappear from the football terraces.

Someone will call me a fascist or a reactionary but I shudder to think what thing will be like in a few years unless this is treated as a national problem. It is a Government problem ... more discipline and heavier penalties are needed. Football, of course, will be blamed for all this, but it isn't just our problem. (Mr. A. Hardaker, Secretary of the Football League, 17/1/66).

I think this is something that has gone beyond Everton and football and even sport. This vandalism is a national problem and as such I think we should not try to tackle it at Government level. (Mr. H. Catterick, Manager of Everton F.C., 18/1/66).

There were exceptions to these reactions and by the 1966/67 season, some clubs had moved towards taking responsibility for their own supporters, for example, by organizing vigilantes at games and supervising behaviour on special trains. There were also moves to ban certain known "trouble-makers" from the ground and to ban flags, banners and other "provocative" equipment. Closer co-operation with the police was urged and spectators were encouraged to support the police and not to hinder them making arrests. There was a determination among most clubs to clamp down on the problem, a perceptible change from their attitude a few seasons previously; in the words of the Sheffield United Chairman: "It is time clubs stopped burying their heads in the sand and decided on concentrated action to stamp out hooliganism."

This change of policy did not mean a departure from the pyramidal conception of the problem: soccer hooliganism was still seen as a national problem. The clubs, however, felt that the problem had got too big to evade responsibility; clearly they would have to act out of commercial self-interest and also because the sport had assumed a larger part in the public spotlight. Everyone connected with the game was under pressure from

the mass media and other sources to change their policy: there were almost weekly headlines "F.A. Must Clamp Down on Soccer Violence", "Clubs Must Curb Their Hooligan Element", etc.

The more widespread and visible the problem became - and at the time of writing it shows little sign of abating - the more severe were the sanctions urged from all quarters and the more likely was the theme of football hooliganism as part of a wider social malaise, to be repeated. Relatively new forms of deviance such as large-scale disturbances by students and political activists were simply absorbed into the pyramid: it was all part of the same problem. At the beginning of the 1968 season one official in the soccer hierarchy was noted as insisting that "... soccer is suffering from an international malaise which has also expressed itself in Grosvenor Square, American draft-dodgers and Continental universities".⁴⁸ Football hooliganism was still just a symptom and, moreover, a symptom that society had now begun to expect as part of the contemporary scene and which had to be ritualistically denounced:

Bad behaviour among football fans is now accepted as an almost inevitable part of the Saturday sporting scene. Which means that the situation has surged long past the danger level. (Daily Mirror 20/2/68).

The football season and Saturday afternoons being as regular occurrences as Bank Holiday week-ends, football hooliganism acquired a problem status very similar to the Mods and Rockers phenomenon at its peak.

48. Quoted in Alec Greenhalgh, "Football Returns to Face Threat," Guardian (3/8/68).

CHAPTER 5IMAGES, CONCEPTIONS AND STEREOTYPES

The processes of identifying and dealing with a particular type of deviance necessarily involve a conception of its nature. The deviant is assigned to a role or social type, shared perspective and images develop through which he and his behaviour are visualized and explained, motives are imputed, causal patterns are searched for and the behaviour is grouped with other actions thought to be of the same order. This imagery is an integral part of the process of identification: the labels are not attached after the behaviour has been identified, as some transactional theorists seem to indicate. Without some readymade imagery, the behaviour could not be identified; the psychiatrist, for example, cannot identify certain actions as being symptomatic of mental illness, without a prior knowledge of the relevant diagnostic categories. Once the initial identification has taken place, of course, the labels are further elaborated: the drug addict, for example, may be fitted into the mythology of the dope fiend, and seen to be dirty, degenerate, lazy and untrustworthy. The primary label, in other words, evokes secondary images, some of which are purely descriptive, some of which contain explicit moral judgments and some of which contain prescriptions about how the behaviour should be dealt with.

Social control then, involves not only a specific institutional apparatus and set of personnel, but also a body of images, conceptions and stereotypes through which the deviant is understood. These conceptions not only have consequences for the actor - in the sense that they directly effect what is done to him - but also for the society which affixes the labels. They are ways for society to understand itself and to draw boundary lines between right and wrong. The conceptions further function to justify a particular view of the world, as Berger and Luckman note, a need arises for a "conceptual machinery" to account for the deviant condition" ... the deviant's conduct threatens the societal reality as such, putting into question its taken-for-granted cognitive and normative ...

operating procedures."¹ This means that certain images of the deviant may be more comfortable and tolerable than others. The political assassination of a popular leader, for example, may be easier to explain in terms of mental illness than any other model: if the action was seen as rational, it might cast doubts on the type of society which could produce such a leader.

This Chapter will be concerned with the nature of images, conceptions and stereotypes that develop around vandalism. It is important to emphasize that these need to be understood not just out of intrinsic interest, nor to point out the obvious fact that society is often gravely wrong in its conceptions of deviance. These conceptions must be examined because they form the basis of social policy: if the deviant is seen as "sick", then one attempts to cure rather than to punish him; if his behaviour is seen to be caused by "family breakdown", then one might direct preventive measures at the family. The imagery also effects the points at which the deviant is fed into the social control apparatus: if one believes that "little old women" who shoplift are not really criminals and do not present any threat if they are ignored or informally cautioned, then they will not be subject to formal legal processes. An integral part of the conceptual machinery, then, is the body of justifications and rationalizations for acting in a particular way towards the deviant.

I cannot discuss all the characteristics which are imputed to vandalism, but only select those which are the most pervasive and the most often used by significant groups in society: agents of control, those campaigning to define vandalism as a problem, the mass media. The images of vandalism I will identify are by no means universally held and they are in themselves ambiguous and often contradictory. In concentrating on these composite images and also trying to identify what Lemert calls

1. Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckman, The Social Construction of Reality, (London: Allen Lane, 1968), p. 131.

the putative deviation ("... that portion of the societal definition of the deviant which has no foundation in his objective behaviour"²), there is a possibility of caricaturing the societal reaction. Nevertheless, one can identify images which emerge with sufficient clarity to justify concentrating on them as the dominant conceptions society has of a type of deviance and the significant mediations it uses in social control.

Three major clusters of images about vandalism will be considered:-

- (i) the behaviour as being homogeneous and meaningless;
- (ii) the actors as being typical young delinquents or "yobs";
- (iii) the behaviour as being deliberate, or else determined by emotional disturbance or social forces.

These images will be counterposed with what is known, respectively, about the types and patterns of vandalism, the social characteristics of vandals and the causal factors connected with vandalism.

Vandalism as Homogeneous and Meaningless: Types and Patterns

The two most pervasive images of vandalism are, firstly, that the behaviour constitutes a homogeneous behavioural category and, secondly, that it is meaningless.

The assumption of homogeneity was explicit in the process of problem-definition: various types of behaviour became associated with each other, labelled with the single term "vandalism" and conceptualized as part of the same phenomenon. The label - whether behavioural or legal - was used to cover a wide range of actions, taking place in different contexts, with different meanings for the actors and with different consequences for society. The use of such a label to signify a category of behaviour is in itself unobjectionable: terms such as "delinquency", "crime", "sexual offences" are similarly used to cover a heterogeneous range of behaviour with a single definitional characteristic. Categorization cannot be

2. Lemert, op.cit., (1951), p. 56.

avoided, it is intrinsic in the very use of language and to use a single term to cover a number of situations, people, events or actions, is not to imply that all the objects in the class are the same. The complementary problems, however, in using the term "vandalism" are, firstly, that the label itself is by no means clear and, secondly, that there is a tendency to go beyond the use of a linguistic category and to assume that all the objects in the category have identical characteristics. This tendency constitutes part of what is usually referred to as "stereotyping" or "overgeneralization".

I have already dealt with the problems in using the term "vandalism"; it is necessary to be reminded in the present context that the term is ambiguous and its use is determined by a number of contingencies. To the extent that the sociologist can reveal these ambiguities and contingencies, he must use them to counteract the way in which society tends to reify the label. The second problem arises not from the use of the label "vandalism" in the first place, but from the image of homogeneity that seems to be a consequence of this use.

This tendency to stereotypical thinking has already been illustrated in describing the pyramidal conception of vandalism as a social problem. It consists of certain assertions about the nature of the deviance, most particularly that, in all its manifestations, the deviance is "basically" the same. There is a propensity or urge to destroy property, this might be expressed against different targets, but the identity of the target and the precedents, contexts and consequences of the damage are fortuitous or irrelevant. It is also asserted that the same type of actor is responsible for all manifestations of vandalism; (an extreme version of this assertion being that not merely is it the same type of actor, but the very same actors who are responsible for all vandalism).

Most people, if presented with a full description of particular acts of vandalism, will realize that they are not facing a homogeneous

behavioural category. They will not find much difficulty in distinguishing, for example, between a ten year old boy throwing an old tyre on a railway line, a group of drunken football fans smashing shop windows on a Saturday afternoon and a man deliberately wrenching off the coin-box of a public telephone. The point, however, is that society tends to react as if it cannot make these distinctions. It imagines that vandalism is a homogeneous type of behaviour and that vandals are a recognizable social type. The situation is analagous to that of racial stereotyping. Many people might believe that all negroes are, in fact, the same; many more people are aware of differences (some negroes are clean, some are dirty, some are violent, some are not) but think and - more importantly - act as if all negroes were the same. This is basic to the complementary phenomena of prejudice and discrimination.

The processes of stereotyping and overgeneralization are as functional in reacting to deviance as in reacting to minority group membership. If objects or people with a single definitional characteristic (skin-colour, religion, commission of a certain crime) are, in addition, given identical secondary characteristics (all negroes are lazy, all Quakers are kind, all sexual offenders are violent) the situation becomes easier to explain, to pass judgment upon and to deal with. To say that a social process is functional, necessary or even inevitable, does not, however, mean that one can disregard its consequences. In the case of vandalism, a crucial consequence is that the explanations, images, judgments and policies will be fundamentally mistaken if they do not distinguish between different types of vandalism. Moreover, they will be even more fundamentally mistaken if they are based only on those types which are the most visible and publicized. While the sociologist legitimately conceives of his role in terms of making generalizations and constructing categories, he has an equally important role in destroying the descriptive categories used by others if they are based on misconceptions. An important result of research on homicide, for example, has been to destroy the image of the typical

murderer as the stranger who strangles helpless women in dark alleys. The result of such research has not only been to say that the typical murder (in the statistical sense) is somewhat different, but to say that there are very different types of murderers, and that a single policy will not necessarily apply to all of them. Similarly, this section will be devoted to counteracting the homogeneous imagery of vandalism, by constructing some sort of typology of the behaviour.

Such an exercise is also necessary to counteract the image of vandalism as meaningless. This image is even more deeply entrenched, in the sense that if people react only as if vandalism is homogeneous, they actually do believe that vandalism is meaningless. Consistently and repeatedly, vandalism is conceptualized in one or other of the following terms: meaningless, aimless, pointless, senseless, motiveless, sheer, wanton, irrational, non-utilitarian, without rhyme or reason, indiscriminate and reckless. These images - very close to those conjured up by the original Vandals - reflect many attitudes and serve many purposes:-

- (i) they register a sense of incomprehension about the behaviour. Our society places a high value on rational and utilitarian action, especially that which is directed towards economic ends. If a course of action appears to result in no apparent economic gain to the actor, it seems difficult to understand. Theft, even if it is condemned, is explicable; vandalism is not, and is therefore described as senseless. The violent element in vandalism is also more difficult to comprehend than violence against the person, as the targets of vandalism often appear to be unrelated to the source of the aggression. Incomprehension, though, is mainly due to the absence of economic motive and it is for this reason that vandalism is seen as the archetype of wanton and non-utilitarian delinquency;
- (ii) the image of meaninglessness does more than register the observer's inability to find any meaning in the behaviour. It also functions to reassure him, to preserve for him a picture of what his particular society is about. This is Erikson's point about the boundary-maintaining functions which society's ideas about deviance serve; one has to know the "shapes of

the devil" in order to know what values are being asserted:³ in this case, the value of rational and utilitarian action;

(iii) it follows from this, that the picture of vandalism as meaningless serves to justify certain degrees and types of social control. To repeat Berger and Luckman's point about the conceptual aspect of social control: the deviation must not be allowed to threaten the societal reality, if it does it must be annihilated or neutralized.⁴ People in our society do things for certain recognizable and credited motives, if we cannot find these motives, then we cannot afford to tolerate the behaviour. If social definitions of deviance are ways of making sense of the behaviour, then we can say that the way of making sense of vandalism, is to assume that it does not make sense. Any other assumption would be threatening. We also tell the deviant, in effect, that if he does such meaningless and unjustifiable things, we should not be expected to justify what we say or do about him;

(iv) in specific contexts, the image of meaninglessness, serves to discredit and deny the legitimacy of what motives might exist behind the action. In the case of ideological vandalism, the label of ruthless, senseless vandalism, is used politically to deny that the action has any legitimate cause. Similarly - as I will show - to describe certain types of vandalism to schools as "pointless, wanton destruction" might be a way of covering up the uncomfortable fact that there might be something wrong with the school.

I will use two ways of trying to counteract the dual images of homogeneity and meaninglessness: the first is to outline a typology of vandalism based on the situations and contexts in which the behaviour takes place and the meaning it might have to the actor; the second is to uncover some of the regularities and patterns which might lie behind the distribution of vandalism.

3. K.T. Erikson, (1966), op.cit., especially Part I "On the Sociology of Deviance" and Part 3 "The Shapes of the Devil".

4. Berger and Luckman, op.cit., pp. 130 - 133.

1. Types

As a starting point, one may take Martin's division of vandalism into three basic subtypes:-

Predatory Vandalism

Vindictive Vandalism

Wanton Vandalism⁵

Predatory Vandalism refers to damage carried out for recognizable economic reasons; for example, "junking" of lead or tin from roofs, smashing and looting parking meters, telephone coin-boxes and other automatic vending machines. In Vindictive Vandalism, the damage expresses antagonism and hatred towards particular individuals or groups. The damage might be an attempt to intimidate a particular victim or to settle a real or imagined grievance; for example, a youth club being damaged by boys who have been excluded by the leader. Vindictive Vandalism might also be expressive of minority group conflict; for example, stoning the home of a negro moving into an all-white neighbourhood. Wanton Vandalism is property destruction which:

... occurs for diverse reasons in a wide range of situations, it is neither oriented towards obtaining scarce goods nor does it ... seem to be essentially vindictive destruction against the property of special persons or groups. Instead, the identity of the individuals or groups owning the property destroyed seems entirely irrelevant.⁶

The extremes of wanton vandalism are, on the one hand, play activity carried out by relatively young children (e.g. breaking windows as part of a game) and, on the other, wild destruction by individuals or groups "mad at the world" or in open conflict with the community. Although Martin derived his typology from sources other than his sample of 29 vandals adjudicated delinquent (for example, other case records, newspaper reports) he classified only this sample in terms of the typology. Twelve of the seventeen incidents in which the boys were involved could be so classified:

5. Martin, op.cit., Chap. IV "Types of Vandalism," pp. 72 - 103.

6. Ibid., p. 89.

three were predatory, five were vindictive and four were wanton.

There are a number of reasons why Martin's typology is not acceptable as it stands. The two most tightly defined categories, predatory and vindictive vandalism, are too broad; even using Martin's own examples, they contain too varied a range of behaviour. Under predatory vandalism, for example, he includes the action of vagrants smashing windows to ensure a bed and food in a police station or prison.⁷ This action is surely not acquisitive in the same sense as is looting a parking meter; it would be better described as Tactical Vandalism.⁸ Then, looking at the category of Vindictive Vandalism, it is clear that not all cases of vandalism involving religious or political conflict (i.e. ideological vandalism) can be included under this heading. Chalking slogans such as "Ban the Bomb" on a wall is not a vindictive act. In fact, a whole range of incidental vandalism, such as graffiti, cannot be fitted into any of Martin's three categories. The major objection to his typology, however, lies with the last category, Wanton Vandalism. This seems a residual rather than a clearly defined category, in which one simply places those forms of vandalism which do not fit into either of the other categories. The very use of the term "wanton" echoes to some extent the layman's image of vandalism as meaningless. I will try to show that Martin's contention that the identity and ownership of the property destroyed "seems entirely irrelevant" is mistaken; even in Wanton Vandalism - which, applying Martin's typology to all acts of vandalism, is by far the largest category - there are meaningful patterns to be uncovered.

I will now describe the various types of vandalism encountered in the research, in terms of a typology based mainly on the subjective meaning of the behaviour to the actor. I will use the terms "acquisitive"

7. For examples of this behaviour, see Prewer, op.cit., pp. 107 - 111.

8. Martin, in fact, uses this term - in a footnote - as part of a residual category of vandalism. The example he gives is of sailors damaging their ships to delay their return to sea; op.cit., p. 77 ff.

(covering Martin's "predatory") and "vindictive" although both tightening the range of Martin's categories and including in them behaviour which he does not mention and would probably have classified as "wanton".

(i) Acquisitive Vandalism: Acquisitive vandalism takes a number of forms. Firstly, there is junking which plays a major part (despite Cohen's stress on non-materialistic theft) in the descriptions of gang delinquency by Shaw, Thrasher and others. Gangs would take lead and copper from the pipes and roofs of houses, or brass from fittings on trucks and sell them to junk dealers.⁹ Lead is still stolen, although the culprits are more often adult criminals. Other contemporary manifestations of this form of crime include stealing telephone cables, ripping out various forms of electrical and plumbing installations from buildings under construction (particularly on new housing estates) and tearing bronze from statues and memorials. Every single one of these types of behaviour was described at one time or another as "sheer, wanton vandalism" (or in synonymous terms consistent with the image of meaninglessness).

Akin to this form of predatory vandalism, is damage carried out to remove property for personal use rather than for sale. Martin cites the example of "twisting off of automobile radio antennae by boys who wanted to use the tubes as zip gun barrels".¹⁰ One might also mention the removal of objects such as car insignias, street name-plates and traffic signs as part of a game (to see who can collect the most objects) or for a collection of souvenirs. Such behaviour figures prominently among student escapades and it is not unusual to see student dwellings in which street signs, labels signifying "Gents" and "Ladies", "No smoking" signs, and so on, are prominently displayed.

A further form of acquisitive vandalism is looting. Smashing of

9. For examples, see F.M. Thrasher, The Gang Abridged Edition, (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1963), pp. 110 - 111, p. 113.

10. Martin, op.cit., p. 96.

parking meters, automatic vending machines and telephone coin boxes has already been mentioned. In addition, gas and electricity meters, slot machines, pin-tables and juke-boxes are broken to remove money. It is difficult to make exact calculations, but it is likely that at least three-quarters of damage to this sort of property is done in the course of theft.

A final form of acquisitive vandalism is the smashing of a shop window preparatory to stealing articles on display. This could be the impetuous act of a single person, or part of a well organized smash-and-grab raid.

The objection could be raised that in each of these forms of predatory vandalism, one is dealing with ordinary property theft: they should not be labelled as vandalism at all, and they would not be legally processed as malicious damage. This objection is altogether valid, but the point is that each of these acts leave results which are seen, and hence labelled, as the products of wanton vandalism. As such - bearing in mind the most significant of these illustrations during the research, telephone vandalism - they contribute significantly and quite incorrectly to the image of vandalism as homogeneous and meaningless.

(ii) Tactical Vandalism: There are a number of contexts in which vandalism is a consciously employed tactic to achieve an end other than acquiring property or gaining access to property. Unlike vindictive vandalism, the next category, the damage does not necessarily involve the expression of hostility and while the target itself may be chosen somewhat arbitrarily, the choice of property-destruction as a form of action is deliberate and planned.

Much ideological vandalism is tactical, with the end in mind of drawing attention or gaining publicity for a particular cause. Much slogan-painting and other property defacement is of this type: the author is putting across a particular message which, perhaps because of the absence of, or lack of, faith in other channels, he has decided to do in

this illegal way. The choice of method and target is deliberately made and the consequences of the act are deliberately assessed.

Tactical vandalism directed towards attracting attention might result from personal troubles rather than ideological convictions. Psychiatric committals are sometimes precipitated by an incident of property destruction: these actions are less often the result of manic excitement, than an attempt by a depressed or suicidal person to draw attention to his plight.

Another form of tactical vandalism I have already mentioned is the use of window-breaking to be arrested and provided with food and a bed. Although such behaviour seems a somewhat esoteric and insignificant form of vandalism, it contributes a fair proportion to the amount of adults committed to prison for vandalism. In Prewer's sample of 98 window smashers in a London prison, 19 said that their motive was to "get under care". Whether the object was short term care (police station) or long term care (prison) the situation in each case was of a homeless, destitute man looking for a warm bed and food. These men often preferred prison to a hostel or reception centre, and some were regular window breakers, coming in particularly at the beginning of winter. Their tactics included throwing a brick at a police car or through the window of a police station, or conspicuously breaking a window in front of a policeman.¹¹

Another context in which tactical vandalism occurs is in the industrial setting. Industrial sabotage might be carried out to ensure regular rest periods, for example, by jamming a machine. Such vandalism, as noted, rarely becomes visible and is often institutionalized. An allied type of tactical vandalism is illustrated in the following case:

Two naval airman wanted to get out of the Navy for domestic reasons. Several applications on compassionate grounds had

11. Prewer, op.cit., p. 109.

failed and as a last resort they went into a hangar on board a commando carrier and damaged a helicopter, smashing the windows, the exhaust pipe, etc.¹²

(iii) Vindictive Vandalism: The use of property destruction as a form of revenge is an extremely important sub-type of vandalism. It looms much larger in the total vandalism picture than is apparent and it accounts for many more cases which, on the surface, look wanton or meaningless. There is a range of problems for which vandalism offers itself as a solution, for example, where one feels one has been unfairly treated, as a form of spite, in order to get one's own back or to settle a long term grudge. The grievance might be imagined rather than real and the eventual target of destruction only symbolically related to the original source of hostility.

Whether the vindictiveness is direct or indirect, vandalism of this sort is not only - in the short run at least - emotionally satisfying, but also a very safe outlet: detection is unlikely, and one is far less likely to be hurt than if personal violence was resorted to. Personal violence is, in any event, often an impossible alternative because the object of one's grievance is inaccessible. Prewer sums up the ways in which vindictive vandalism may be seen by the actor:

... to break a man's window is a much safer way of paying him out than to punch him on the nose, for example. The victim is left with a cold draught, to be followed later by a glazier's bill, and he may remain in complete ignorance as to who has done the deed. The smash itself may be pleasurable, so that this form of revenge is often safe, usually certain and always sweet.¹³

Twenty men in his sample of 98 adult window smashers claimed that their motive was to get revenge. A further eleven used window-breaking to draw attention to a grievance (the act was therefore also "tactical").

12. The result was not simply dismissal from the service, but also 18 months' detention. The story has an ironic twist, in that one of the men's application for a discharge had been recommended on the morning of the episode.

13. Prewer, op.cit., p. 110.

although bearing no grudge against the actual owner of the window (in this sense the act was "wanton"). These 31 men made up the largest single group in the sample.

Reported examples of vindictive vandalism of this sort - mainly carried out by adults - include:-

breaking his employer's office equipment by a man who felt he was wrongfully dismissed;

breaking the windows of an Employment Exchange by a man who alleged that an official had discriminated against him;

breaking the windows of a National Assistance Board office by a man who had been refused money.

Of more importance in contributing to the general stereotype of vandalism are acts committed by juveniles. The most obvious situation in which this type of vindictive vandalism occurs, is when a group or individual feels victimized by a particular adult; for example, a school teacher, shopkeeper or youth leader. A shopkeeper may have his windows broken after reporting someone to the police, or - more commonly - a group might break a window of a club or coffee bar from which it feels it has been unfairly excluded: a typical example of this sort is contained in the following account:-

... we had such a long waiting list that there was no point in adding to it. Among those who weren't allowed in was particularly one wandering gang who came to the doors several times ... One night after Whitsun week it was found that the club had been broken into on Whit Monday and completely wrecked. The gang scattered tea and sugar, they smashed tables, they tore out the electric wiring, they tore books into shreds ... It all happened because they felt excluded, so their reaction was primitive. They actually agreed that they hadn't intended to do much damage at first - they just wanted to get in, but once inside they got excited and couldn't stop smashing.¹⁴

Although the exact proportion is difficult to estimate from press reports alone, interviews with the Northview headmasters and other sources indicate that much school vandalism is motivated by a sense of revenge.

14. Quoted in T.R. Fyvel, The Insecure Offenders: Rebellious Youth in the Welfare State (London: Chatto and Windus, 1961), p. 127.

More often than is apparent, evidence indicates that the culprits are not outsiders, but pupils of the school. In these cases the vandalism is preceded by punishments, deprivation of privileges, expulsions or other potential sources of grievance.

The following episode, although typical of such vandalism, occurred in a type of school in which vandalism is not usually reported:-

More than 40 pupils at a £400-a-year school for sons of Colonial civil servants and foreign businessmen have been withdrawn by their parents after disturbances to which the police were called ... The pupils ... ran through the buildings ... smashing windows and overturning furniture. Then they threw a bust of the Headmaster ... into the river ... The school has been the scene of open conflict between pupils and Mr. M (the Headmaster) for a year. Trouble broke out when the boys' privileges, for which their parents pay extra fees, were withdrawn. They claim their clubs were shut down and that they were barred from using the swimming pool and common room. The following day the boys broke down the common room door, overturned furniture and smashed windows. (Sunday Telegraph 4/6/67).

It is probable that vindictive vandalism is a large proportion of the total amount of vandalism committed by gangs. Juvenile gang activity is very much a part of the image of senseless violence, but although vandalism is mentioned as characteristic of the delinquent subculture - particularly of the "conflict" type - none of the standard research gives any account of the nature of such vandalism. The exception is Miller's recent study of gangs in "Midcity".¹⁵ From data on 150 gangs and an intensive study of 21 gangs, he concludes that not only is property damage a relatively minor part of the gang's activity, but that the damage was not entirely random and wanton. The objects and facilities damaged were those used and frequented in the course of everyday life and most damage was to public or semi-public (e.g. gyms, social agencies) rather than private property. Moreover, the damage was directed to specific targets; both examples that Miller gives are of vindictive vandalism: defacing the automobile of a mother responsible for having a gang member committed to a

15. Walter B. Miller, "Violent Crime in City Gangs," Annals, 364 (March 1966), pp. 96 - 112.

correctional institution and breaking a window of a settlement house after being rejected. Miller's comments are relevant:

Little of the deliberately inflicted property damage represented a diffuse outpouring of accumulated hostility against arbitrary objects; in most cases the gang members injured the possessions or properties of particular persons who angered them as a concrete expression of that anger ... There was little evidence of senseless destruction: most property damage was directed and responsive.¹⁶

It is, of course, true that most vindictive vandalism is rational and utilitarian only in the sense of providing the actor with the satisfaction of knowing that he has obtained his revenge and that his victim has been discomforted. It is irrational and non-utilitarian in the sense that only in rare cases will the victim be moved to change his position because of the vandalism: the club leader is unlikely to be intimidated into admitting a gang because it has broken the club windows, the N.A.B. will not change its mind about giving a man assistance. In fact, the consequences for the actor if he is apprehended, might be to leave him in a worse position and increase his grievance. Much vindictive vandalism is only carried out with the thought of expressing immediate indignation and anger, as the following incident indicates:

In (February) West Ham fans, angered by their team's defeat by 3rd Division Swindon in an F.A. Cup replay were believed to have smashed the windows of a sports shop (opposite the Club's ground) owned by West Ham's captain, Bobby Moore.

The symbolic nature of vindictive vandalism is illustrated clearly in the following archetypical case:

A thirteen year old boy, disappointed at the Christmas gifts received after praying, decided to "get his own back on God" and damaged and then set fire to a church, resulting in £50,000 loss.

Although such behaviour might be characterized as irrational, it is by no means wanton, in the sense of being arbitrary.

So far, the illustrations of vindictive vandalism considered have been

16. Ibid., p. 119.

those involving direct or symbolic retaliation or revenge. It is as well to restrict the term vindictive to such behaviour; and not to expand it beyond its literal meaning, as Martin does, to include property damage motivated by any type of aggression or hatred. One might place such behaviour, together with much of what Martin labels, as "wanton vandalism", in a separate category which I will simply call "malicious vandalism".

(iv) Malicious Vandalism: The defining characteristic of malicious vandalism is not only that it expresses malice, aggression or anger (which in a sense is true of most forms of vandalism) but that the action is neither, on the one hand, as specific as in vindictive, tactical or acquisitive vandalism nor, on the other, as differentiated, diffuse or arbitrary as terms such as "wanton" imply. The action, to use Miller's terms, is both "directed" (in the sense that the identity and ownership of the target is not entirely irrelevant) and "responsive" (in the sense that it is a response to particular situations or needs).

The term "malicious" often carries the implication not just of hatred but of action enjoyed for its own sake and even action that is seen to be amusing. Thus, the practical joker obtains malicious satisfaction at the expense of his victim. This combination of hostility and fun is present in many cases of vandalism, and Martin distinguishes one dimension of this when he talks about the continuum between wanton destruction by rampaging adolescents and wanton destructiveness during play.¹⁷ Most types of "wanton" vandalism contain both the elements of malice and fun and only in certain cases is the image of rampaging adolescents at all appropriate. Nevertheless, I will use separate categories to distinguish between pure malicious and pure play vandalism: in the first case, the dominant motivation being anger (although the action may contain a play or fun element), and the second case, the dominant motivation being some component of play, such as curiosity or competitiveness (although the action may

17. Martin, op.cit., p. 95.

contain an element of malice).

It is beyond my scope to discuss all the possible subjective feelings which might precede the type of malice expressed in vandalism; these include boredom, despair, exasperation, resentment, failure and frustration. It is significant that in everyday language the escape from such states is often expressed in metaphors such as breaking out, breaking away and breaking clear. The impotent rage and hostility which finds expression in vandalism might also be motivated by a sense of envy. One might visualize a sequence dependent on a number of contingencies (again, beyond the scope of the research to consider) such as availability of other solutions, the opportunities of property damage and previous socialization, running from (i) boredom, frustration, envy, to (ii) hostility towards a person, organization, institution, situation to (iii) malicious vandalism.

Outside the area of conventional vandalism, this sort of pattern can be seen in much industrial sabotage. Ramsay, for example, describes the sources of hostility among merchant seamen, - drudgery, economic injustice, bossing by authorities - and the way they find expression in acts of vandalism:

... we brushed bucketloads of rust under the bends in L-shaped girders, and in the furthestmost corners we brushed nothing at all. It would all come out when the next cargo of petrol was delivered, and we sincerely hoped that it would give engine trouble to every motorist who used it in his car; if it ruined their engines altogether, that would be all the better.¹⁸

When sailors are loading stores and accidentally let a sling load crash on to the wharf below, their action is usually one of suppressed glee rather than sorrow. Deck crews who are driven too hard can quite calmly paint over oil and water and take malicious delight in doing so. All these private acts of hostility happen directly, without premeditation, without going through the formal process of making a complaint and getting no satisfaction: the seamen know the futility of making formal complaints and save themselves the time.¹⁹

These illustrations are quoted at length, not because this type of

18. Ramsay, op.cit., p. 85.

19. Ibid., pp. 124 - 125.

vandalism contributes much to the total amount; in fact, as an institutionalized type of rule breaking it contributes virtually nothing to the image of vandalism. They are important, however, in indicating how behaviour which on the surface is meaningless and non-utilitarian, is responsive, directed and makes sense to the actor.²⁰

Ramsay's illustrations are also worth quoting for capturing the elements of hatred and enjoyment in these acts of sabotage, which correspond to what Cohen describes as the "fusion of versatility and malice" in the delinquent subculture.²¹ These elements have often been described in the literature on delinquency; the classic example is Thrasher's:

We did all kinds of dirty tricks for fun. We'd see a sign, "Please keep the street clean", but we'd tear it down and say, "We don't feel like keeping it clean". One day we put a can of glue in the engine of a man's car. We would always tear things down. That would make us laugh and feel good, to have so many jokes.²²

Examples of this sort could be multiplied from contemporary reports: pouring acid on car roofs; pulling out all the flowers of floral clocks; strangling swans in ornamental lakes; slashing the tyres of all the cars in a car park; stripping the insulation round water mains; dumping the manhole covers in a sewerage farm; putting matches in the tyre valves of police cars (which causes the tyre to leak, and when it gets hot, the match ignites); throwing life belts into the sea; placing sleepers on railway lines; throwing stones at the drivers of passing trains; urinating in public telephone receivers; defecating in the lifts of council flats; pouring dye or acid into swimming baths; sabotaging the engines of children's miniature trains; ripping out lavatory chains in public conveniences; placing bicycle chains on railway overhead wires to cause short circuits ...

20. It is interesting that Ramsay, whose subject is simply the work situation of seamen, remarks on the similarity between acts of sabotage at sea and vandalism ashore; such as knifing railway carriage seats, which, he suggests, should not be dismissed as being inspired by the superficial reason of teenage irresponsibility (Ibid.).

21. A.K. Cohen, (1955), op.cit., p. 29.

22. Thrasher, op.cit., p. 77.

In all such examples the motivation is diffuse and ambiguous and we need to know more about each situation before consigning it to a particular category. In some cases, the element of hostility is more apparent and fun might be a secondary component, or, particularly in a large group situation, apparent to the actors well after the action has been initiated. In other cases, the game element may be primary. In some cases the act is intentionally designed to cause serious damage or injury, in other cases, particularly involving very young children, the actor might be hardly aware of the consequences of what he has done. Were the individuals who stripped the insulation from the water mains round one river aware that this would result in freezing the mains and depriving a village of its water supply for two days? Are children who place objects on railway lines for a dare or who run onto the line in a game of chicken aware of the possible consequences of these acts? Evidence indicates that this type of railway vandalism is carried out by children under ten, generally without appreciation of the consequences.²³ The game might be enjoyed for its own sake (a competition to see who can place the most objects on a given stretch of track), or the action might be motivated by curiosity: in one incident an eleven year old boy dragged a sleeper and two sacks of metal spokes on to a main railway line to see what would happen (he claimed that he had seen this sort of thing on television). If we are to take at face value the following encounter in a London juvenile court between a magistrate and another eleven year old boy who had placed an object on a railway line, these acts might involve a greater element of hostility:

Magistrate: There might have been thirty people killed because of what you did ... did you know what you were doing?

Boy: I thought there might be an accident.

Magistrate: Did you really want an accident where people could have been killed or crippled for life?

Boy: Yes.

23. The offence of "trespass" accounts for some 90% of the prosecutions by the British Transport Police. Contrary to the stereotype, offences such as throwing stones at drivers are in the minority.

Malicious vandalism also ranges from calmly executed acts of hostility, to outbreaks of gleeful rage by a group which goes far beyond its original intention and gets carried away by the excitement of the situation. The following example indicates the extent of damage that can result in the latter situation:

Using the hatchet from the emergency tool kit, four youths smashed or tore off the following objects in fourteen parked coaches: 228 windows, 128 compartment mirrors and picture glasses, 86 window blinds, 38 window straps, 190 electric light bulbs, and 8 fire extinguishers.

It must be admitted that, like "wanton vandalism", the category of malicious vandalism is to some extent a residual one, containing acts that cannot be readily classified in any easily explicable way. The features that distinguish it from the other categories, however, and the diversity of patterns within it, are enough to counter the dual images of homogeneity and meaninglessness.

(v) Play Vandalism: Enough property gets destroyed in the course of play activity to have warranted including this action in Chapter 3 as a form of rule-breaking which is virtually institutionalized. Although there is a play element in most malicious vandalism, there are clearly forms of property destruction carried out entirely in the spirit of play. Clinard and Wade note that the element of malice is missing in much vandalism by young children, and classify it as "... destructive play motivated largely by curiosity".²⁴ In casual play situations, other motivations besides curiosity, include the spirit of competition and skill. The quantity of the damage will be stressed - for example, how many windows or street lamps can be broken - or particular skills tested, for example in aiming at moving targets or standing various distances from the target. Wade cites a good example of the casual atmosphere in which such vandalism occurs:

The first time we did vandalism, me and my brother and another boy down at the garage, we were smoking and playing cards. They had some old cars in the back; we played around there. We cleaned

24. Clinard and Wade, op.cit., p. 497.

them out one day ... This one guy threw a whiskey bottle up on the roof; threw another. It hit the side of the window. We just started throwing at the windows. When we were through, we had broken twenty seven of them. We saw who could break the most. There wasn't anything else to do. We finally got tired and just left ... 25

In play vandalism, the fact that property is destroyed might be a minor or even incidental part of the game. The participants might be surprised that their behaviour is disapproved of, although in some cases this knowledge gives an additional edge of enjoyment to the game.

This five-fold classification of vandalism is by no means exhaustive. It leaves out group vandalism carried out in a public setting (such as breaking bottles during a football match) and the whole range of ideological vandalism. The motives for the latter type are particularly complex and need not necessarily be the obvious ones: the acts might be tactical, vindictive or hostile. Research on the 1959-1960 swastika daubing "epidemic" throws interesting light on the diversity of the incidents and motives. Caplowitz and Rogers²⁶ distinguish between random and specific hostility: the first includes "pranks" stimulated by similar events in the mass media, expressions of diffuse hostility to the middle class adult world with the epidemic suggesting a handy target or a vague urge to go out and do something. The second type ranges from a mild distrust of Jews, through a more explicit anti-Semitism, to the activities of organized neo-Nazi clubs. Similarly, Deutch²⁷ distinguishes between ideological and non-ideological offences (although tracing anti-Semitic motivation in both groups) and Stein et al²⁸ divide the thirteen classifiable incidents they studied into vindictive vandalism, which was a clear expression of anti-Semitism (8) and wanton vandalism of the play type, which covered undirected mischievous destruction(5). A case included in the last type, for example, was of two

25. Wade, op.cit., p. 99.

26. Caplowitz and Rogers, op.cit., pp. 35 - 36.

27. Deutch, op.cit., p. 13.

28. Stein, op.cit., Chap. III.

boys wanting to do something, and one suggesting "let's paint swastikas".

The usefulness of the typology may be demonstrated by applying it to particular forms of vandalism identified superficially by the nature of the target damaged. This exercise is important to counter, from another angle, the homogeneous image: causal analyses and social or legal policies based even on such apparently specific clusters as "school vandalism", "railway vandalism" or "telephone vandalism" can be very mistaken. I will give two examples to show how such clusters give little indication as to the diversity of the contexts in which the property may have been damaged.

Firstly, telephone vandalism may be one of the following types:-

- (i) acquisitive: thefts of coins from the coin box;
- (ii) tactical: a homeless man breaking a pane of glass to get arrested;
- (iii) malicious or vindictive: ripping out wires or mouthpiece
(reported in one case to be due to "exasperation at the inefficiency of the telephone system");
- (iv) malicious: urinating in the mouth piece;
- (v) play: children breaking the panes of glass.

My second example, vandalism to churches and cemeteries, includes an even larger number of possibilities. The following are some reported examples:-

- (i) opening graves for jewellery, taking church ornaments (acquisitive);
- (ii) breaking crosses, paintings and ornaments (might be malicious, or ideological, or carried out in the context of a religious delusion);
- (iii) daubing slogans and signs such as swastikas (ideological);
- (iv) painting the font pink and white, pouring powdered milk down the organ pipes (play);
- (v) smearing blood and placing pieces of animal fur on the altar
(Black Magic or similar ceremony);
- (vi) toppling memorials and tombstones (malicious or play).

Similar sets of illustrations could be given for each of the groupings

of conventional vandalism offences listed in Chapter III.

2. Patterns

Vandalism has so far been described in terms of its subjective meaning to the actor; to the extent that the sociologist can show how different these meanings are, he can counteract the image of homogeneity and, to the extent that he can show that a substantial proportion of the acts have some meaning at all, he can counteract the image of meaninglessness. Another more conventional way of uncovering the patterns behind the offence would be to look for correlations between vandalism and the characteristics of the property which has been damaged. It is a sociological truism that such correlations would not provide any causal explanations and that they are not sufficient if they are "inadequate on the level of meaning". It is important, nevertheless, to look for these correlations, not only because they might demonstrate a logic or pattern that runs counter to the wanton and meaningless image, but also because they might provide clues for causal explanations of otherwise inexplicable acts. The following are some of the more important such patterns:-

(i) Ownership of the Property: One of the single most important characteristics of the targets of vandalism is that they tend to be publicly rather than privately owned. This fact runs counter to Martin's contention that the ownership of property destroyed by "wanton vandalism" is entirely irrelevant.

The major targets of vandalism - local authority property (schools, parks, street lighting, etc.), trains, telephone kiosks - are all publicly owned. The ratio of private to public property reported in the press during the research period was about 2.5 to 100. Although it is certain that damage to much private property is unreported (for example, breaking the windows of houses, scratching the paint off motor cars) the same applies to public property, and it is likely that this ratio only slightly under-represents private property.

The possible interpretations of this pattern lie, on the one hand, in the greater opportunities to break public property, and on the other, in the anonymous nature of such property and its symbolic value. One could speculate that the vandalism attributed to adolescent-protest or subcultural types of forces is more likely to be directed against targets which are depersonalized, which are not easily identified with and which belong to "them"; the council, the government, the public institution, authority.

(ii) Physical Characteristics: Much vandalism tends to be directed at property characterized by two clusters of physical attributes, to some extent polar opposites of each other: on the one hand, derelict or incomplete property and on the other, new and attractive property.

Evidence from building contractors and local authorities indicates clearly that houses and other buildings in the process of construction or demolition are more likely to be damaged than completed buildings. Parks Departments report that seed beds and shrubs are more often damaged than flowers in full bloom. Bodies such as the Ancient Monuments Society responsible for the administration of monuments, churches, cemeteries, note a clear tendency for buildings, which are allowed to fall into ruin, to be damaged. Once such building are put into good order, it is rare for acts of vandalism to be resumed. The C.B.C.S.M. report notes that although some new public conveniences are immediately damaged, this is a wave that soon dies over, and the consensus among local authorities is that the better maintained are the facilities, the less likely they are to be damaged.²⁹ From a number of other sources, the same connection between vandalism and property that is derelict, unused, dilapidated, dirty and in a bad state of repair through weather, age, and neglect, is reported.

There are a number of possible reasons for this connection. One is simply the deterrent effect of the presence of caretakers or attendants at

29. C.B.C.S.M. Survey, op.cit., p. 22.

the better kept buildings. All sources, however, agree that the connection between vandalism and derelict property occurs independent of this effect. Other possible reasons include the likelihood that there is less motivation to take care of property which is already dirty and badly kept. The analogy of litter in streets and parks is relevant. Buildings which are allowed to fall into ruin are regarded as "fair game" and they are also seen as not really belonging to anyone. There is also the fact that incomplete buildings offer attractive targets, a particularly important factor in play vandalism. The location of such buildings in certain areas is also important: there is some evidence to suggest that buildings such as day nurseries, schools and clinics which are damaged, are in or near areas of the city where there is much demolition, decaying property and new housing estates. The trouble spots for telephone and railway vandalism are often in similar areas.

The counter-pattern to this is the occurrence of damage to new and attractive property. This is very often property in a prominent place and which might appear strange and in some ways alien, for example, a new abstract statue on a housing estate. The following is an account of what happened to a "water feature" on a modern council estate:

... On the first evening it was filled, it became the centre of wholesale hooliganism and before the evening was over, the pond was filled with stones, soil, broken milk bottles, planks of wood and even an old car body dragged from nearby wasteland. A number of young children had been pushed into the water.³⁰

On the whole, the effect of novelty which such property has, dies down, and is counteracted by a more pervasive effect of derelict and uncared for property.

Much property which is damaged is also attractive in the literal sense of being more likely to attract, or tempt vandalism, particularly of the play type: greenhouse windows, milk bottles, crates of eggs and

30. G.L.C. Report, op.cit., Appendix, p. 5.

sacks of cement, are examples.

(iii) Social Characteristics: Along the same lines as the Chicago School used the concept of a high delinquency area, it is possible to distinguish, for some types of vandalism, the existence of high vandalism areas. Most local authorities and organizations such as the G.P.O. and British Railways, can easily identify areas in which vandalism is more likely to take place: these tend to be industrial and urban, rather than rural; and within a city, working class areas, areas of high mobility and decaying slum areas.

There are no hard data available to clarify this picture, and given the range of vandalism we would, of course, expect to find exceptions to this pattern. Specialized types of vandalism would have their own high areas. Something of a pattern can be illustrated, however, with reference to two types of vandalism on which some data are available; firstly, vandalism on council estates and, secondly, vandalism to schools.

Data from the G.L.C. report on hooliganism on council estates, Mycroft's questionnaires to 21 London Borough Councils, and large cities such as Birmingham and Glasgow, make it quite clear that most vandalism takes place on flatted rather than cottage estates (and more specifically even, in flatted areas on cottage estates) and large rather than small estates. The effect of play and recreational facilities is ambiguous: some councils report that facilities attract vandalism, some report no effect, but, on the whole, estates with fewer facilities tend to have more vandalism. effects These/are even more apparent in estates situated in areas where there are few facilities, these attract young people from the neighbourhood who congregate on the communal parts of the estates and it is on the whole these communal parts (stairs, lifts, courtyards, laundries) which get damaged, rather than the "private" areas.

Inferences about causation and policy may also be made when trying to examine some patterns behind school vandalism. Fairly comprehensive

information is available in Goldman's study in Syracuse in which he interviewed 367 teachers and rated the characteristics of 16 schools, correlating these with the amount of damage the schools had received from vandalism.³¹ The results show that high damage schools were located in lower socio-economic areas, with low occupational status of the fathers and high transiency and instability (although not necessarily areas of high delinquency arrest rates). The schools themselves showed the following characteristics: rapid staff turnover; low staff morale; little identification among parents, teachers and pupils with the school; a record of adverse publicity and a bad reputation; dissatisfaction with the administration; obsolete school apparatus; failure to repair broken equipment and over-crowding - all of which was interpreted as a lack of interest in the students' welfare. Overall, there was a general atmosphere of insecurity and a dissatisfaction and a perception by staff and students that the authorities were disinterested. There is no comparable evidence in this country. Press reports and contacts with local authorities indicate that damaged schools are located in roughly similar areas. The schools are often near tower estates and in areas with few play facilities. There is a tendency for the same school to be the target of vandalism for long phases.

In the context of considering the physical and social characteristics of property that is damaged, it is worth noting that much of the real increase in vandalism in recent decades is attributable to the sheer increase in the volume of vandalizable property. In much the same way as the Chicago sociologists recognized that areas surrounding docks and warehouses provided a greater opportunity for theft, we can talk about the "illegal opportunity structure" for vandalism having increased. In most large cities, with rapid slum clearance and housing programmes, there is more property with the characteristics likely to attract vandalism. On housing estates themselves, the overall effect of recent changes has been

31. Goldman, op.cit.

outlined in the following terms:-

In addition to the provision of better facilities for recreation and play, post-war developments have seen an increase in the number of features which lend themselves to damage or attract irresponsible behaviour. These include lifts, laundry and drying cabinets, extensive use of glass on staircases and balconies, the underparts of blocks on stilts, ornamental entrances to blocks, sculptures, play ponds, underground garages, etc. These are desirable amenities but they provide opportunities for misbehaviour which are not present in the same form at older estates.³²

The combination of these physical features, with what could plausibly be called the "anomic" social characteristics of high vandalism areas, suggests a possible pattern behind at least some types of vandalism.

To conclude this section, it should be said that while the homogeneity image is demonstrably false, certain objections could be raised to my attempt to counteract the meaninglessness image. Firstly, it could be said that although meanings and patterns can be uncovered behind most acts of vandalism, there remain some which are so senseless as to defy the search for meaning. Secondly, it could be said that vandalism is meaningful only in so far as one uses a model which assumes all human action to be meaningful. It is certainly true that one comes across acts of vandalism - and violence in general - which appear so senseless, meaningless and wanton that one is tempted to use such labels to conceptualize the behaviour. But it is part of the sceptical approach and has always been part of sociology, to resist this temptation and avoid the nihilation of deviance. The illegal destruction of property might well take place for unacceptable or totally abhorrent reasons, but they are still reasons.

The Vandal as a Yob: Social Characteristics of Vandals

A very pervasive stereotype exists of "the vandal" as a type of person. This stereotype is employed as if it were a causal explanation: structural and situational factors are ignored and the behaviour is explained simply by attributing it to a type of person. Using the homogeneity image, the

32. G.L.C. Report, op.cit., p. 4.

same type of person is seen as responsible for all variations of vandalism and related offences. The following three descriptions were given of vandals active in the areas of football, public conveniences and telephones respectively:-

... the trouble makers are young hooligans who merely use football and excursion trains as an excuse for their stupid behaviour. The same brainless wonders spend their midweek ripping telephone boxes, slashing seats, defacing walls, pushing old ladies off the pavement and pinching fruit from barrows. (Editorial, Daily Sketch, 30/1/67)

... 'Come spring, come the vandals'. The vandals who seem to have spent the winter months wrecking telephone kiosks, smashing railway specials, now prepare to launch their annual attacks on conveniences of Britain. (Circular Letter, C.B.C.S.M., March 1965)

... these are the same bird-brained maniacs who slash railway carriage seats and throw bottles at the football referee and darts at the goalkeeper. (Editorial, Daily Mirror, 6/1/66)

This stereotype can be counteracted by showing that there are types of vandalism with distinguishable situational and motivational variations. The next section - on theories of causation - will deal with the inadequacy of "personality type" conceptions as explanations when compared with structural and situational theories. At present we need to examine the content of this stereotype more closely and describe what is known about its component parts in regard to various types of vandalism.

The dominant theme is that the vandal is similar to the hard-core delinquent type: he is the working class adolescent Yob, the brainless young thug, the uncouth leather-jacketed gang member, the hooligan. He is also - in the criminologist's image - the archetypal member of the delinquent subculture. A subsidiary and less specific theme - which I will distinguish in regard to the Mods and Rockers as the "lunatic fringe" theme - is simply that the vandal is always different, he is always "the other". Thus, football hooligans are not genuine or real supporters, but louts whose behaviour stigmatizes the ordinary, well-behaved majority. Those who break up pubs are not average, decent customers who just want a quiet drink, but young hooligans and, moreover, usually Irish also. The young kids who throw bottles into the ponds of council estates come from the

rougher (or "multi-problem" families. These images function to stress the discontinuity between deviance and normality and heighten the sense of security to be derived from the notion that the deviant is not "one of us".

There is too little research evidence to draw a clear picture of the social characteristics of persons involved in various acts of vandalism. The detection rate is so low, that even if adequate studies of known offenders existed, this information would be incomplete and biased. The following is a summary of what is known of five main social characteristics, sex, age, previous convictions, social class and gang membership.

1. Sex

All official statistics and studies of vandalism³³ indicate that the offenders are almost exclusively male. The number of female offenders is even lower than it is for other types of delinquency. Table 11 shows the proportions of offenders in this country in 1967 according to sex.

Studies of unreported delinquency and contact with victim organizations suggest that the proportion of females is slightly higher. One study, for example, of self-reported offences among middle class boys and girls reports that 71.1% of the boys and 28.9% of the girls admitted to vandalism.³⁴ This difference was greater than for theft and slightly less than for assault. Only one form of vandalism - graffiti - has been reported as being almost as common among females as males. The C.B.C.S.M. survey and other sources indicate that graffiti - and various other forms of vandalism - are nearly as prevalent in female as in male public conveniences.³⁵ Most forms of vandalism, however, remain predominantly male activities.

33. See Clinard and Wade, op.cit., p. 494 and Martin, op.cit., pp. 17 - 19.

34. N.B. Wise, "Juvenile Delinquency among Middle-Class Girls" in E.W. Vaz (Ed.), Middle-Class Juvenile Delinquency, (New York: Harper & Row 1967), p. 183, Tables 1 and 2.

35. Some local authorities complain that graffiti in female public conveniences present even more of a problem because of the use of lipstick and nail files, both of which techniques leave messages hard to remove.

TABLE 11

Malicious Injuries and Malicious Damage to Property: Total Numbers
Proceeded Against According to Sex: Magistrates Courts, England and
Wales, 1967.

<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Malicious Injuries</u>	<u>Malicious Damage</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>%</u>
Male	717	17,627	18,344	94.7
Female	<u>24</u>	<u>995</u>	<u>1,024</u>	<u>5.3</u>
Total	746	18,622	14,368	100.0
<u>Under 17</u>				
Male	331	4,947	5,278	96.3
Female	<u>18</u>	<u>185</u>	<u>203</u>	<u>3.7</u>
Total	349	5,132	5,481	100.0

2. Age

The picture in regard to age is not as clear. Clinard and Wade note a disagreement as to whether the peak age is adolescent or pre-adolescent and correctly suggest that some of this confusion might be due to not distinguishing between different types of vandalism.³⁶ Martin's comparative data from one area (the Bronx) indicates clearly that while most vandals and other delinquents were adolescents, substantially more of the vandals were pre-adolescent. The mean age of his sample of 291 apprehended vandals was 12.94 and that of other delinquents, 14.46.³⁷

On the basis of the 1952 Official Statistics, Mannheim also found that the very young age group was over-represented.³⁸ Using figures for the numbers found guilty of malicious damage, he calculated that the rate for the 8 - 14 group was 2 per 1,000, for the 14 - 17 group just less than 2 per 1,000, and for the 21 plus group less than 2 per 10,000. Table 12 gives the age distribution in the latest year for which figures are available.

36. Clinard and Wade, op.cit., pp. 493 - 494.

37. Martin, op.cit., pp. 19 - 20.

38. H. Mannheim, "The Problem of Vandalism in Great Britain," Federal Probation XVIII (March 1954), pp. 14 - 15.

TABLE 12

Malicious Injuries and Malicious Damage to Property: Proportions
Proceeded Against According to Age: Magistrates Courts, England
and Wales, 1967.

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>% of Total Population</u>	<u>% Contribution to All Offences</u>	<u>% Contribution to Vandalism Offences</u>	<u>No. of Vandalism Offences per 100,000</u>
Under 14	6.5	1.9	12.6	92.3
14 and under 17	4.9	5.3	15.7	154.6
17 and under 21	7.6	15.5	27.3	172.2
21 and over	<u>81.0</u>	<u>77.3</u>	<u>44.4</u>	26.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	

If the two categories of vandalism offences are separated out, it can be shown that the proportionate contribution of the youngest age group to the more serious category - malicious injuries - is greater: for the under 14's, 26.3%; for the 14 and under 17's, 20.5%; for the 17 and under 21's, 20.8%; and for the 21 and over's, 32.4%. It should be noted that in this set of figures, the under 14 group does not include children under 10. The figures thus under-represent the contribution of this very young group which, as other sources indicate, is high.

If the picture from the official statistics is supplemented by ecological and other more specific statistical analyses, vandalism offences appear to reach two peaks, one before 14 and the other in late adolescence. Downes,³⁹ in the East End of London, for example, confirms Power's⁴⁰ suggestion that the peak for hooliganism, disorder and rowdyism offences is reached at about 17, and is concentrated in the 15 - 19 group. This confirms the "adolescent yob" image to the extent that vandalism might be committed in the context of what Downes terms "rowdyism" offences. A re-arrangement of his age group tables, however, shows that the actual offence

39. D.M. Downes, The Delinquent Solution: A Study in Subcultural Theory, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966).

40. M. Powers, "Trends in Juvenile Delinquency," The Times (9/8/62).

of malicious damage itself, over the amount of £20, occurs more frequently in the younger groups: it contributes 6.8% to the offences of the 8 - 12 group; 1.62% to the 13 - 16 group; 1.95% to the 17 - 21 group and 3.13% to the 22 - 25 group. The tendency is for vandalism to be grouped with petty theft in the younger age group.

We would expect to find different age peaks for the various types of vandalism, rather than a common age range. Table 13 differentiates between juveniles and adults in regard to railway vandalism.

TABLE 13

Number of Prosecutions for Railway Vandalism According to Age,
1963 and 1964

<u>Year</u>	<u>Under Malicious Damage Act,</u> <u>1861 (Major)</u>		<u>Under Criminal Justice</u> <u>Admin. Act 1914 (Minor)</u>	
	<u>Juveniles</u>	<u>Adults</u>	<u>Juveniles</u>	<u>Adults</u>
1963	70	18	525	279
1964	71	41	476	266

If the age groups are broken down further, it can be seen that the majority of acts classified by British Railways as "Hooliganism and Trespass" - that is, obstructing the line, interfering with track and signalling equipment, throwing objects or firing shots at trains, short-circuiting electric equipment - are committed by pre-adolescents. The numbers prosecuted for these offences in 1963 were as follows:-

10 - 13 years old :	410
14 - 16 " " :	187
17 - 20 " " :	27
21 and over :	<u>9</u>
Total	<u>633</u>

While core railway vandalism - which excludes damage done by football supporters on special trains - is carried out by a younger age group than the adolescent yob image leads one to expect, the age distribution of those convicted for telephone vandalism is higher. Between 1960 - 1963, some two-thirds of the convictions for damaging telephone kiosks involved people

over 17. These were mainly offences connected with theft, and some offenders had up to 60 similar previous convictions to be taken into account. These figures, of course, leave out many malicious acts of telephone vandalism, which are both less likely to be repeated by the same person and less likely to be detected. The picture of an older age group, with many previous convictions is - as may be expected - repeated in Prewer's sample of adult window-smashers. The average age of the 98 men was 36.9 and they had 73 previous convictions between them, 33 for malicious damage.⁴¹ Although the evidence is somewhat ambiguous in this respect, it is probable that most vandalism to public conveniences - especially writing graffiti - is the work of adults rather than adolescents.⁴²

Hooliganism at football matches, although predominantly associated with adolescents, is by no means exclusively so. The Birmingham Research Group distinguished four groups:- very young boys with no previous record carried away by the excitement of the game; adolescents with no previous records; young men with previous convictions for assault and disorderly behaviour, and (especially in Scotland) older men with a history of drunk and disorderly offences.⁴³ The peak age in their sample of 497 offenders was 15 - 19; there were 164 in this age group, 129 aged 20 - 24, and 92 aged 25 - 29.

As these examples show, differing age groups are involved in the various types of vandalism, and although one can distinguish certain peak ages, the image of a homogeneous age group cannot be sustained.

3. Previous Convictions

I have no clear evidence as to whether vandals tend to repeat the same offence and/or be involved in other offences against property or person. This will vary according to different types of offences: hard

41. Prewer, op.cit., p. 105.

42. I have details of one case in which a women's public lavatory - used almost exclusively by adults - was closed following repeated damage. Women were seen coming out of the building leading dogs on lavatory chains.

43. Harrington, op.cit., pp. 10 - 14.

core railway vandalism committed by young children has a low recidivism rate, acquisitive telephone vandalism a high one, while a large proportion of the Birmingham sample of convicted soccer hooligans (182 out of 497) had previous convictions for various offences.

Figures calculated by McClintock and Avison⁴⁴ on the basis of offenders found guilty in 1962 show that among juveniles, malicious damage was the offence category with the lowest degree of recidivism. As many as 83.2% of juveniles found guilty of malicious damage were first offenders, compared with, say, 56.6% for robbery, 66.7% for violent offences and 69.7% for all offences. For adults, 55.0% of malicious damage offences were first convictions, nearly 20% more than for breaking and robbery offences, but about equal to the average for all offences. These - and more detailed figures⁴⁵ - suggest clearly that for the under 17 group at least, vandalism is not an offence committed by persons with long previous records. Although further research is needed on specific types of vandalism, there is no evidence that vandalism is associated with persistent delinquency or criminality.

4. Social Class

Most studies of apprehended juvenile vandals have indicated that the class distribution is similar to that of delinquency in general, i.e. a concentration in the lower socio-economic group. There was a suggestion, however, in some early American studies⁴⁶ that a disproportionate amount of vandalism compared with other delinquency occurs in middle class areas. In terms of theories such as Cohen's, vandalism could be seen as functioning both for the middle class boy - as a symbolic masculine protest - and for the working class boy as a reaction to middle class standards. We need to examine more closely some subcultural, ecological and self-reported studies of delinquency which throw light on the social

44. F.H. McClintock and N.H. Avison, Crime in England and Wales, (London: Heinemann, 1968), Table 8.7, p. 234.

45. Ibid., Table 8.9, p. 236.

46. Cited by Clinard and Wade, op.cit., pp. 494 - 495.

class distribution of vandalism.

Using various indices of socio-economic status, Martin's study in the Bronx shows clearly that the distribution of vandals and other delinquents uniformly increased as the socio-economic level decreased.⁴⁷ Fifty per cent of both the vandals and the other delinquents came from the deteriorated neighbourhoods of the lowest socio-economic level. There were enough exceptions to this pattern, however, to suggest that vandalism is distributed in a variety of class levels.

The associations between vandalism, class and status are explicitly taken up in another study which attempted to replicate Lander's work on delinquency and anomie and deal with Cohen's status frustration theory.⁴⁸ Because vandalism, in Cohen's view, is the most striking manifestation of malicious, non-utilitarian and negativistic gang delinquency, the authors derive the hypothesis that there would be a stronger relationship between socio-economic status and vandalism than between socio-economic status and delinquency in general. Then, on the basis of Lander's index of anomie in terms of an area's percentage non-white residence and the association between low caste position and status-frustration-type delinquency, they derive a second hypothesis that there would be a higher association between percentage non-white and vandalism, than between percentage non-white and delinquency in general. These hypotheses - the theoretical basis of which need not for the moment concern us - are tested with data (police records and median rents of census tracts) in two American cities: St. Louis and San Diego. The first hypothesis was not proved, i.e. the associations between low rent and vandalism and low rent and general delinquency were not significantly different. The second hypothesis was clearly sustained in one city (St. Louis) and less clearly in the other,

47. Martin, op.cit., pp. 21 - 25.

48. William Bates, "Caste, Class and Vandalism," Social Problems, 9 (Spring 1962), pp. 349 - 353 and William Bates and Thomas McJunkins, "Vandalism and Status Differences," Pacific Sociological Review, 5 (1962), pp. 89 - 92.

and by controlling the variables it was shown (again, more clearly in St. Louis) that vandalism is more likely to be associated with per cent non-white than with low rent. The authors interpret these findings as suggesting that the caste break in America is more predictive of vandalism than the income break. They admit, though, that the findings may be peculiar to St. Louis where the negro population contains a large number of recent migrants housed in disorganized conditions.

Martin's data do not corroborate these findings and another recent ecological study, in an Indianapolis County Court area, produced exactly opposite findings: tracts with higher proportions of negroes were unrepresented in the vandalism figures.⁴⁹ Another finding from this research (based on juvenile court referrals) was that, although there was an overall higher amount of vandalism committed by juveniles from the lowest income census tracts, the juveniles from the higher income tracts were over-represented for vandalism when compared with their expected under-representation for all offences.⁵⁰ Offences involving property damage, but no permanent material gain, such as vehicle taking, trespass and vandalism are - in contrast to, say, theft and personal violence - more frequently committed than would be expected by children from high income areas. A similar picture comes from a study of a middle class gang in a semi-suburban community: although the members were not involved in much conventional delinquency such as house-breaking and street fighting, vandalism was one of their chief pastimes.⁵¹

49. Roland J. Chilton, "Middle Class Delinquency and Specific Offence Analysis," in E.W. Vaz (Ed.), op.cit., p. 98.

50. Ibid., pp. 95 - 96.

51. Andrew Greeley and James Casey, "An Upper Middle Class Juvenile Gang," American Catholic Sociological Review, 24 (Spring 1963), pp. 33 - 41. The targets for this vandalism were almost always local churches and schools which, the authors suggest, represented the adult Establishment against which the boys were reacting, even more than they would in a working class area.

Turning now to self-reported studies, it is clear, as I have already indicated, that vandalism, along with most types of delinquency, is more evenly distributed through the social class structure than official records indicate. Unfortunately, not only are these numerous studies contradictory in themselves, but it is also not always clear from the data whether vandalism is reported significantly more than other offences by middle class juveniles. Most of the studies which conclude that there is little relationship between self-reported delinquency in general and socio-economic status,⁵² also show that high percentages of randomly selected populations admit to various vandalism offences. Depending on the sample, the technique of data-collection and the description of the offence, there are variations in the exact proportion admitting to vandalism: in one sample (Short and Nye) 60.7% admitted to "deliberate property damage", in another (Clark and Wenninger) an average of 22% in four subsamples admitted to the specific offence of "throwing rocks, sticks or any other thing in order to break a window, or street light or anything like that." In some samples there is almost no social class difference in admission of vandalism, in others there is some difference.⁵³ In all these, vandalism ranks very high - only below such acts as taking and driving a car without a licence, very minor theft, violation of liquor and gambling laws - among offences which show little class difference or have unexpectedly high frequencies outside working class groups.⁵⁴

-
52. For example, Short and Nye, op.cit.; J.P. Clark and E.P. Wenninger "Socio-Economic Class and Area as Correlates of Illegal Behaviour among Juveniles," American Sociological Review, 27 (December 1962), pp. 826 - 834; Ronald D. Akers, "Socio-Economic Status and Delinquency Behaviour: A Re-Test," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1 (January 1964), pp. 38 - 46 and H.L. Voss, "Socio-Economic Status and Reported Delinquent Behaviour," Social Problems, 13 (Winter 1966), pp. 314 - 324.
53. In Akers' sample, 69.2% of the unskilled working class group compared with 43.3% of the professional/business group admit to "damaging or destroying others property". In the light of these figures, his comment that there are no significant class differences on this offence is odd. (op.cit., p. 43.)
54. See, also, for detailed break-downs according to age and frequency of offence, Vaz's study of a sample of middle-class adolescents in Canada: E.W. Vaz, "Middle Class Adolescents: Self-Delinquency and Youth Culture Activities," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 2 (1965), Table XII, pp. 64 - 65.

Without going into the general controversies about self-reported studies, Gold's point, that studies using confidential personal interviews bring out greater social class differences than studies using check-list methods, is relevant to vandalism.⁵⁵ He finds a greater tendency for higher status adolescents to report "trivia" including sometimes as much as 50% non-chargeable offences. Middle class youngsters are more likely to classify as deviant and report under the heading of "purposely damaging property" such things as breaking somebody's pencil and writing their names on a school desk.

What is needed is a breakdown - using official records, observations or self-reporting techniques - according to the type of vandalism and the situations in which it occurs. At the moment, all we can say definitely about the social class distribution of vandalism is (i) that it occurs more widely throughout the social structure than recorded statistics and the public stereotype indicate, (ii) that this distribution is more apparent in regard to vandalism than it is for many other offences, (iii) nevertheless, most types of vandalism - as is true of most types of delinquency - are concentrated in the lower socio-economic class.

5. Gang Membership

Although the gang is an integral part of the vandalism stereotype, there is no evidence at all that vandalism constitutes a major or even significant part of gang activity. Criminologists talk of vandalism as the archetypal gang activity, yet strangely enough, with the exception of Thrasher's early work, empirical description of gangs contains little or no reference to vandalism. In some English descriptions of delinquent sub-cultures - for example, by Mays, Downes and Willmott - incidents of vandalism are recounted, but their frequency or significance appears to be

55. Martin Gold, "Undetected Delinquent Behaviour," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 3 (January 1966), pp. 27 - 47, and "On Social Status and Delinquency: A Note on Voss's Article," Social Problems, 15 (Summer 1967), pp. 114 - 116.

slight.

The only unambiguous evidence on this question comes from Miller's intensive study of gangs in "Midcity".⁵⁶ He reports that property damage was of relative unimportance: it ranked 45th out of the 60 forms of behaviour and sentiment relating to violence recorded in the two year study of seven gangs. Vandalism was one-sixth as common as assaultive behaviour. As the study indicates that violent crime as a whole - including vandalism - was neither a dominant preoccupation nor a dominant form of criminal activity, it is safe to conclude, from this data at least, that vandalism is not a significant feature of gang activity.

Vandalism is certainly more frequently committed in a group situation than by isolated individuals, and all studies indicate that it is even more of a group offence than is other delinquency. But the nature of the group, whether a peer group of three or four or a crowd walking through a town after a football match, is far removed from the reality of the delinquent gang.

To summarize this section on the social characteristics of vandals, it can be said that while many features of the adolescent Yob image are present, others cannot be borne out. Vandals are almost exclusively male, there is a peak in late adolescence and they tend to be working class. But there are significant other age groupings particularly in pre-adolescence; some vandals at least are not working class and the offence does not appear to be associated with persistent delinquency or criminality or to be a feature of gang delinquency. Vandals do not constitute a homogeneous class any more than vandalism is a homogeneous form of behaviour.

Vandalism as Deliberate, Determined or Drift: Causal Theories

To the extent that causal theories of vandalism are based on the assumption of homogeneity and a distorted image of the actor, they must be

56. Miller, op.cit., p. 100.

incorrect. At best, they can make statements on a rather general level; such as, vandalism "results from frustration and aggression" or "is caused by a lack of respect for property." Such statements are too general to be of any use, or are simply tautologies. They give no clue as to why particular types of property should be damaged or why particular persons should be involved.

In classifying vandalism according to the subjective meaning of the act to the actor and (to a lesser extent) in uncovering some of the correlations behind vandalism, some lines along which causal theories could be developed have already been indicated. It is not the aim of this chapter to develop such theories; I would merely like to discuss some of the "grand theories" through which society tries to understand vandalism, and indicate - where there is a basis for doing so - the putative or spurious elements in these conceptions and some possible alternatives to them. I will concentrate on two sets of conceptions: in the one, which represents, perhaps, more the layman's view, vandalism is seen simply as deliberate, volitional behaviour; the actors are free, although (in some versions of this theory) affected by a vague social malaise. In the other conception, more the professional's view, but increasingly used by laymen, the behaviour is seen as wholly determined, either in being the product of some form of psychological disturbance or of social forces. This second set of conceptions, in other words, uses one or other variant of positivist explanations. I will contrast both these sets of explanations to an image which recognizes the spontaneous and situational factors in vandalism, the setting in which it occurs and the social processes which are involved in the action. This is an image, in other words, which is closer to Matza's picture of drift. It is also an image in which the meanings actors give to their acts are not dismissed as mere "rationalizations" such meanings and reasons, in fact, provide the vocabulary of motives through which the behaviour should be primarily understood.

1. Vandalism as Deliberate

In this, the common sense or obvious conception of vandalism, the behaviour is seen simply as deliberate, intentional and wilful. In a situation of free choice, the actor perversely chooses evil rather than good. Much as the original Vandals destroyed property "for its own sake", so their contemporaries behave "simply for the hell of it". There is no need to explain their behaviour in terms other than the intentional desire to destroy. As one contributor to a symposium on vandalism expressed it:

... wanton and vicious destruction of property both public and private by teenage hoodlums reveals no purpose, no rhyme, no reason. Theories of latent aggressiveness, paternal hostility, projection against authority, frustration, rejection, lack of love - none of these can possibly furnish any reasonable clue to the meaning of such senseless and useless conduct ... These are actions based on a calculated contempt for the rights of others ... The plain fact is that such vandals are fully aware of the nature of their action and are as completely normal mentally as juveniles who do not engage in such conduct.⁵⁷

The "useless" and "senseless" images have already been commented on: what is significant in the present context is how these images lead on to an assumption that the behaviour is voluntaristic and outside the realms of conventional causal explanations. Leaving aside other objections, it can be seen that such conceptions - which were evident among victim organizations and in the mass media - cannot deal with the traditional criminological questions: why do some take part in vandalism and with greater frequency than others? And why do rates of vandalism change?

Without altering the basic conception of vandalism as deliberate, attempts to explain, for example, increases in vandalism are made by invoking the presence of some vaguely specified social malaise. There is a breakdown in discipline, a lack of inculcation of individual responsibility, a decline in the respect for the property of others, or simply conditions inherent in modern life conducive to vandalism.⁵⁸ Frequently in the mass

57. J.P. Shalloo, "Vandalism: Whose Responsibility?", Federal Probation, XVIII (March 1954), pp. 6 - 7.

58. See, for example, Chester C. Scott, "Vandalism and Our Present Day Pattern of Living," Federal Probation, XVIII (March 1954), pp. 10 - 12.

media and in reply to interview questions about why vandalism occurred or was increasing, statements would imply that, given the social malaise, vandalism was inevitable. As one councillor expressed it, "It seems to be the general trend, doesn't it?"

To the extent that the voluntaristic model and the idea of "general trends" are causal explanations at all, their specific limitations are twofold:- (i) a large amount of vandalism is not deliberate and intentional at all, but largely spontaneous and unplanned. Some, at least, of that part which is deliberate and intentional is not arbitrary destruction for its own sake, without rhyme or reason, but specific and directed, for example, in tactical, acquisitive or vindictive vandalism; (ii) although global factors, such as breakdown in discipline and loss of respect for property might, if their existence could be demonstrated, have a causal relationship to vandalism, they are not specific enough to explain the various types of vandalism, why one person should be involved rather than another, or the relevance of age, sex, social class and similar factors.

Before turning to the deterministic models which do attempt to meet this second group of objections, it should be remembered that the notion of drift implies an actor midway between total freedom and total determinism. Some element of choice needs to be retained, and it is not inconsistent to reject the deliberate model and also see that individuals can be in situations where they destroy or damage other people's property simply because they want to.

2. Vandalism as Determined

These are the explanations which contain all the characteristics Matza attributes to positivist criminological theories. The criminal is fundamentally different from the rest of the population and his action is constrained. Almost all the variations of positivist theories of delinquency as a whole have been applied to vandalism. There are two main versions, psychological and sociological.

(i) Psychological Versions: In these versions the vandal is seen as a type of person. He is aggressive, impulsive, destructive, unable to tolerate frustration. These traits are thought to explain his behaviour and the explanations are sometimes extended to see the behaviour as a product of personal pathology; to quote again from the Federal Probation symposium:

Vandalism, like other types of pathological behaviour, represents an outlet for aggression and feelings that have not been solved in a healthy or acceptable manner. It is usually an expression of deep unrest and a need to react with destruction of property or a creation of unhappiness in order to lessen the feelings of unrest. It is the safe way of those who fear retaliation or discovery to express their aggression through acting out.⁵⁹

There are many more specific psychological explanations to be found in or derived from the professional literature. These range from orthodox psychoanalytical explanations, to the association of vandalism with various diagnostic categories, particularly that of the psychopathic personality, to more obscure explanations such as the effect of suppressed anger caused by the denial of mourning among adolescents who have lost a parent.⁶⁰

There is a strong tendency among the general public to explain the apparent irrationality and senselessness of vandalism in terms of psychological disturbance; the reasoning clearly being: "if someone acts in this senseless way, he must be mad." From mass media reports, it would appear that vandalism, together with certain sexual offences, is more likely to receive the label of 'mental illness' than other types of delinquency. In the Northview survey (see Table 35) two vandalism offences - destroying school property and placing stones on a railway track - were ranked third and fifth respectively in a list of 15 offences as being thought likely to be associated with emotional disturbance. It must be stressed that - among the general public at least - the use of psychiatric labels is high only

59. H.L. Lippman, "Vandalism as an Outlet for Aggression," Federal Probation XVIII (March 1954), p. 5.

60. Geoffrey Gorer, Death, Grief and Mourning in Contemporary Britain, (London: Cresset, 1965).

relative to other offences. It is not nearly as pervasive as the volitional model.

Particularly emotive forms of vandalism, such as destroying religious property or placing objects on railway lines, were more prone to be explained in psychiatric terms, although the mad label is also sometimes given to more pervasive and invisible forms. The assumption of madness is shown - admittedly in a caricatured form - in the C.B.C.S.M. survey which suggested that anyone convicted of vandalism for the first time should "be liable to examination by a psychiatrist and if convicted twice such an examination should be compulsory with a sojourn in a mental establishment."⁶¹

Psychiatric labelling is important in obscuring and discrediting the motives in certain types of vandalism. This is seen particularly clearly in the case of ideological vandalism. If one's opponent is labelled as mad, it means that one has to take him less seriously. An example of this was the reaction to a series of incidents at Canterbury and York Cathedrals in October, 1965. Three days after the Archbishop of Canterbury had made a speech supporting the use of force by Britain if Rhodesia were to declare unilateral independence, the word "Peace" was daubed on the altar and some tapestries of Canterbury Cathedral and bibles and other property damaged. The ideological implications of this act were obvious, yet it was widely labelled as either "... the work of thoughtless hooligans" (spokesman for the Archbishop quoted in the Times 30/10/65) or the action of an individual "maniac". When, 24 hours later, red paint was sprayed on the lectern of York Minster, the initial reaction was again in terms of psychiatric labelling: "It must have been the work of a madman ... no one in his senses would do that sort of thing." (Archbishop of York).

There is no evidence that these or other types of ideological vandalism

⁶¹ C.B.C.S.M. Survey, op.cit., p. 21.

which receive the mad label are associated with mental illness. Circumstantial evidence indicates, to the contrary, that often organized groups with articulate ideologies are involved.⁶² In the one instance of such vandalism where substantial research findings are available, that of the 1959-1960 swastika daubings in America, all the researchers concerned explicitly repudiate the "crackpot" theory of causation.⁶³ This is not to say certain psychosocial characteristics were not identifiable: in both of Deutch's two groups, ideological (belonging to neo-Nazi groups) and non-ideological, there were anti-Semitic or rabid segregationist attitudes, a high incidence of broken or incomplete families and families that were isolated, displaced, rootless and marginal. The attitudes were those of dogmatic, rigid groups, frustrated in social mobility and outside the mainstream of American life. The Stein, Martin and Rosen study distinguished between wanton acts of the play type, committed by younger children and vindictive vandalism of the anti-Semitic type, associated with an older group. The latter was characterized by more social and personal pathology (poor school adjustment, absence of father figure, inadequacy) than the wanton group, but did not correspond to the classic Authoritarian Personality Type. To find certain clusters of psychosocial characteristics, however, is not to establish some version of psychiatric determinism. These researchers repudiated the tendency of psychiatrists, social workers and others concerned with the phenomenon, to ignore neighbourhood, inter-group and ideological factors and to see the behaviour as symptomatic of emotional conflict or

62. There are, of course, exceptions to this. One interesting example which may be quoted is of a highly articulate ex-Oxbridge student who was committed to Broadmoor for smashing the High Altar Cross in a famous Cathedral. A letter he writes (from Broadmoor) neatly illustrates Laing's point about the perception by the "mad" person that the label pinned on him serves a political function. "... I broke the gilded cross of the Golden Calf of the Establishment ... and then underwent a mock farce trial at the Old Bailey ... where I was certified as suffering from a grave mental illness and delusions - of course, I was, I had to be. I didn't share other people's hallucinations, particularly the one of neo-serfdom enforced and preached by Mammon's machine."

63. See particularly Deutch, op.cit., and Stein et al, op.cit., Chapters 2 and 4.

manifestations of neurosis. As one police department described it, "the work of nuts and cranks".⁶⁴ To think of the behaviour in such individualistic terms was to cloak the fact, apparent from all research: that anti-Semitism itself was the problem.

Returning to the more conventional types of juvenile vandalism, there is no evidence that it is to any great extent associated with emotional disturbance. In Martin's subsample of 27 juvenile vandals who could be classified in these terms, 4 were found to be disturbed, 5 were classified as essentially law-abiding and 18 as subcultural vandals. All of them lived in economically deprived homes, in under-privileged and delinquency prone neighbourhoods.⁶⁵ Bearing in mind that these were offenders already referred to the Juvenile Court, it is likely that the proportion of 4 out of 27 (14.8%) very much over-represents the incidence of emotional disturbance among those who commit vandalism.

My experience in child guidance clinics, which I confirmed in interviews with three psychiatrists, indicates that vandalism is a very rare reason for referral. There is no evidence that it is - as is sometimes thought - the first sign of a delinquent or disturbed personality and hence needing immediate action. One comprehensive study, based on a thirty-year follow-up of 524 referrals to a child guidance clinic, indicates to the contrary that vandalism (together with certain rare sexual symptoms) was one of the few anti-social behaviour types referred that did not predict sociopathic personality. In fact, of the 24 anti-social symptoms classified, vandalism was the only one common symptom neither related to a specific psychiatric illness nor predictive of any psychological disturbance as an adult.⁶⁶

64. Ibid., p. 96, 181 - 182, 104.

65. Martin, op.cit., Chap. 3.

66. Lee N. Robins, Deviant Children Grown Up, (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins Co. 1966), pp. 147 - 151.

It is possible that adult vandalism, which is more likely to be committed by individuals acting alone, rather than in a group or sub-cultural situation, is more often associated with emotional disturbance. In Prewer's sample of 98 window breakers, sent to an adult prison, 5 were diagnosed as schizophrenic, 4 as arterio-sclerotic deterioration, 2 as epileptic, 4 as marked depression, and 19 "appeared to justify the title of psychopathic personalities".⁶⁷ In very few of the cases is it apparent, though, that these conditions actually caused the window-breaking. In 1967 the number of adult malicious damage offenders dealt with by a Hospital Order under S.60 of the Mental Health Act, 1959, was 80 - 1.1% of the total number of adults found guilty of malicious damage.

I have deliberately selected evidence for any positive associations with emotional disturbance. A more comprehensive review of all sources available must conclude that the bulk of vandalism, and certainly juvenile vandalism, has no causal connection at all with emotional disturbance.

(ii) Sociological Versions: The sociological versions of determinism have somewhat firmer foundations than the psychological, although both are subject to the same sort of limitations counterposed by Matza's picture of delinquent drift.

The concentration of the core types of vandalism among working class boys can be explained along the lines of several of the conventional sociological theories. A plausible emphasis is that placed by the early Chicago school - Shaw, McKay, Thrasher, Tannenbaum and others - and their later working class culture counterparts - such as Mays in this country - on vandalism as growing out of the traditions of certain neighbourhoods. This would particularly apply to the peak in the younger age group where vandalism is part of random play activity, rationalized as being part of a game and motivated by curiosity and competition. The action is facilitated by

67. Prewer, op.cit., p. 105.

traditions which regard certain types of property, such as derelict houses and bomb sites, as fair game. It is beyond my scope to discuss all the situations which might fit this picture; one example may be quoted from a recent community study in which a 15 year old boy recalls the various "stages" of vandalism he passed through:

When you're a little kid, you smash up the things people chuck on the bomb sites, like old baths, old prams, old boxes and that. And motor cars - there's always old motor vans on the bomb sites that the kids smash up. At first they think that the bits they pull off are going to be useful for something, but when they get them off there's always something wrong with them, say some bracket won't come off, so they do some more smashing up. It goes in crazes. After that we used to smash up builder's boards and "House to Let" notices. We didn't do it very much, but I know for a time we was pulling up those "House to Let" boards, and we used to dump them in the canal or in the Victoria Park Lake. I don't know why we did it; it was for a giggle.⁶⁸

This stress on delinquency growing out of neighbourhood traditions, would also have to take into account more specifically, differential social class attitudes to property. It may be argued that middle class children develop a higher symbolic attachment to property and certain studies of class differentials in socialization⁶⁹ point to greater tolerance of property destruction within lower working class families (for example, breaking toys) and environmental factors conducive to vandalism: playing in the streets, more deteriorated property in the area.

The element of malice in later vandalism - seen in the graduation of Willmott's boy from breaking things more or less spontaneously, to deliberately dumping signs "for a giggle" - seems more plausibly explained in contemporary versions of subcultural theory. These theories suggest that vandalism has some sort of protest function, being directed against the symbols of middle class society. Although there is little to support Cohen's very close association between vandalism and gang delinquency, much juvenile

68. Peter Willmott, Adolescent Boys of East London, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966).

69. See, for example, B.M. Spinley, The Deprived and the Privileged, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953).

vandalism will readily fit into the general subcultural framework. Two-thirds of Martin's group of convicted vandals were classified as sub-cultural: all but one of them were involved in other delinquent activities, all were members of groups with varying degrees of organization.⁷⁰

Vandalism, in other words, appeared to be just one facet of delinquency. Vandalism is not, however, a core gang or subcultural activity and isolated incidents not specifically prescribed by group norms are more common than incidents which are part of a "delinquent way of life", the sociologist's equivalent of the psychologist's "delinquent personality".

Paradoxically, support for the conception of vandalism as having a symbolic protest function is given by studies of middle class delinquency. The type of explanation given in one such study⁷¹ - although factors are cited such as an inadequate father figure, poor academic performance, the anomie and frustration of a nouveau bourgeoisie suburb - points to the symbolic attack on adult establishment property. Some recent studies of middle class communities⁷² attribute vandalism to buildings such as Y.M.C.A. and school as a response to boredom and perception by adolescents that the community was not designed for them and that adults were hostile or uninterested.

Various interpretations of the findings from research on the swastika incidents point to the relevance of sociological concepts similar to those used in explaining the more conventional types of vandalism. Although all these studies stress three specific factors - predisposing attitudes (minority group tension, social distance), a triggering incident and the role of the mass media - some explicitly invoke a Cloward and Ohlin type of opportunity theory.⁷³ There is a combination of learned means,

70. Martin, op.cit., pp. 46 - 71.

71. Greeley and Casey, op.cit., p. 40.

72. H.J. Gans, The Levittowners, (London: Allen Lane, 1967), pp. 206 - 216.

73. See Stein et al, op.cit., and Stein and Martin, op.cit.

including the legitimation of minority group property as an acceptable target for aggression and the absence of other readily accessible outlets (the relative absence of delinquency in these neighbourhoods means that this particular illegal opportunity structure is missing).

Returning to more conventional vandalism, it appears that, in regard to the older age peak indicated by the English statistics, the symbolic protest conception is less readily applicable than Downes' type of theory which emphasizes the dissociation from educational and work goals and the seeking of alternatives in the realm of leisure. This type of vandalism committed often in a large group situation and in the context of more general "rowdyism", of which the Mods and Rockers phenomenon is a recent example, fits well into the notion of delinquency as manufactured excitement.

Explanations along sociological lines - only some of which I have quoted - seem more plausible than psychological, partly because they are more comprehensive and at least are able to take into account variations in age, social class, area and the nature of the property that is destroyed. They are defective in that they present an overdeterministic picture which predicts too much vandalism and makes too direct a link between structural variables and individual action. Situational and spontaneous factors are underplayed, there is no concept of deviance as a process and grand causal frameworks are constructed at the expense of understanding what the behaviour means to the individual.

3. Vandalism as Drift

Contrasted with explanations of vandalism as deliberate, on the one hand, and determined, on the other, are explanations which stress situational factors, take into account the subjective meaning of the act to the actor and recognize the social processes involved in the act. These explanations although not exactly identical to Matza's concept of drift, come closer to this picture than to other strands in contemporary

theorising about delinquency. These are explanations which are (or would be, because so few exist) couched in the language of symbolic interactionism and answer the sort of sceptical questions posed by transactional writers in regard to deviance as a whole. These explanations are at the social psychological or situational level and are therefore insufficient in so far as they do not take into account the sociological or psychological pressures that may be involved in giving rise to deviance in the first place.

Wade's description of the social processes involved in juvenile vandalism - based on interviews with 50 vandals aged 13 - 17 - comes closest to the sort of conception missing from other accounts.⁷⁴ It is in itself inadequate as an explanation of vandalism and is specifically problematic in that Wade ignores much vandalism which is tactical, vindictive or in some other way very different from the type of spontaneous vandalism he concentrates on. He begins by accepting that much property destruction by juveniles has "social, cultural and ecological determinants"⁷⁵ but devotes his attention to describing the processual development of vandalism and its spontaneous nature in the group situation in which it invariably occurs.

Wade emphasizes that the elements in the setting or context in which the act takes place need to be examined; these include definitions about what victims or targets are acceptable, and images about the act as being fun, a prank, a "giggle", or a good joke. These definitions provide rationalizations for the act before it occurs and neutralize feelings of guilt. Another element in the setting is the opportunity structure: the presence, for example, of abandoned houses in the area. Five stages in the act of vandalism are distinguished by Wade.⁷⁶

74. Wade, op.cit.

75. Ibid., p. 95.

76. Ibid., pp. 99 - 108.

In the first stage, "waiting for something to turn up", the chance to commit vandalism presents itself in a "sitting around doing nothing" or a play situation. The destruction might seem incidental to the play activity or even, initially at least, be an inadvertent result of such activity. In the second stage, "removal of uncertainty" (the exploratory gesture) the unstructured situation becomes more structured when vandalism is suggested to the group as an activity. A cue-taking situation occurs which leads to the next stage, that of "mutual conversion". After, perhaps, various incidental acts and exploratory gestures, the individual accepts the idea of vandalism because of group pressures to conform; such as threats to prestige, manliness and courage. The significance of these pressures and the picture of vandalism as a dare to avoid being called "chicken", emerges from many of the interview extracts quoted by Wade. There is a tendency to minimize the damage done and to excuse the offence on the basis of an inability to face the scorn of one's peers. So far, the pressures are very similar to those described by Matza as facilitating the drift to delinquency.

In the fourth stage, "joint elaboration of the act", the behaviour amplifies. Initial stimulation leads to further acts of vandalism, the group might go beyond its original intention and break all the windows in a building instead of just one. This type of mutual excitation, inter-stimulation, circular reaction or group contagion is especially prevalent if competitiveness is involved. Wade talks about the behaviour at this stage gathering its own momentum and getting out of control. The final stage, "aftermath and retrospect" is one in which the individual evaluates his act; this depends on his motive and again the ability to rationalize much vandalism as play is important. If the act was vindictive in nature, this stage is accompanied by a sense of satisfaction and malicious enjoyment and might be justified in terms of one of Sykes' and Matza's well-known "techniques of neutralization"; for example, "they had it coming to them", "that's all they deserve after what they did to us". The boy has probably

absorbed society's stress on utilitarian action, and feels ashamed of his senseless behaviour, but although he might recognize the act as wrong or delinquent, the peer group or subculture provides him with mechanisms for reducing guilt.

Clearly the type of account offered by Wade has limitations: it overplays the spontaneous factors, underplays the amount of conscious choice involved and does not fully spell out the structural contingencies (such as social class, neighbourhood, opportunity structure) which set limits to the behaviour. Nevertheless, all accounts of vandalism I have seen would support the case for visualizing the behaviour as an outgrowth of group interaction and consisting of a series of successive responses which build on each other and which take place in certain specifiable social and cultural situations.

The public and professional explanations of vandalism tend, on the whole, to ignore situational factors. The significance of these factors, however, emerges not only from subcultural and processual accounts such as Wade's - which might be accused of deliberately selecting them out - but from other perspectives on motivation and other types of vandalism. Clark's sample of undergraduates, for example, asked to retrospectively list their reasons for involvement in vandalism, mentioned the following: hostility against a specific individual or situation, pressure of the crowd situation (mentioned by nearly all), desire for adventure and the general satisfaction in the act itself ("... the sheer enjoyment of breaking a pane of glass; it is the sound I think which is a stimulating factor").⁷⁷

Studies of vandalism connected with football matches - throwing objects during the game, destruction in the streets or on trains after the game - highlight the importance of two sets of situational factors.⁷⁸ The first is the crowd situation itself in which - although explanatory concepts

77. Clark, op.cit., p. 174.

78. See Harrington, op.cit., Chaps. 5 - 7.

such as "crowd psychology" have a dubious status - there is a clear tendency towards heightened suggestibility, the loss of a sense of identity and personal responsibility in the anonymity of the situation, a feeling of omnipotence and invulnerability. Being carried away under these conditions is very similar to the stage of "Joint Elaboration" described by Wade. A second set of situational factors - the importance of which is stressed against, for example, type-of-person explanations even by the Birmingham Group which consisted mainly of psychiatrists - revolves around what actually happens during the game. Definite associations are demonstrable between episodes of hooliganism and disturbances on the field (outbursts of bad temper, fouls, arguments with the referee), a poor standard of refereeing with many disputed decisions and success or failure of the team, especially relative to its position and status. Clearly, these associations are not straightforward causal ones, but they can serve crucial triggering-off functions or provide the social context in which the drift to illegal behaviour is facilitated. The delayed reaction by elated or frustrated supporters in the streets after a match - the occasion on which most damage is done - takes place in a situation which provides a ready vocabulary of motives for the action. The following quote from a football referee illustrates the significance of situational factors:

Even a respectable middle class supporter subjected to the combined experience of seeing the team he supports robbed by a combination of unfeeling providence, an incompetent referee and a villaneous opposition can come very close to senseless violence.⁷⁹

Of course, the mere listing of such factors is as inadequate for explaining football hooliganism as is a purely processual account of the act of juvenile vandalism. For one thing, convicted soccer hooligans tend not to be "respectable middle class supporters" but working class in origin. The problem needs to be understood in terms of the social position of the bulk of the supporters, the historical traditions of the sport and regional variations.

79. Quoted in Harrington, op.cit., p. 15.

Situational explanations concentrate on the setting of the stage, the lighting, the lines and the props; they are less concerned with how the actors got onto the stage in the first place. It is, nevertheless, possible - through using, for example, a concept such as drift - to attempt to do justice to both levels of explanation. The transactional critique of delinquency research in general and the specific problems inherent in the deliberate and deterministic models of vandalism in particular, point to the need for future research and theory on the causes of vandalism to take into account the situation, context and meaning of the behaviour.

In terms of the labelling perspective, it is also important for further research to discover what the possible effects of contact with law-enforcement agencies might be. This might lead to a change in (to use Wade's terms) the retrospective evaluation of the act: a negative self image develops in which guilt, shame and remorse predominate. On the other hand, the very ease with which vandalism can be rationalized, suggests that the label will seldom "take": nothing is stolen, no one was hurt, it started off as a game, the victim was anonymous and impersonal. In addition, rationalizations may be facilitated by a perception of the societal ambiguity in regard to vandalism; for example, in the fact that it is tolerated or condoned on certain occasions and in certain settings. Clearly, whether the label takes or not is dependant on many contingencies. The most important of these might be subcultural support, reference group identification, previous socialization, prior involvement in delinquency and former contact with official agencies.

PREVENTION AND CONTROL

This chapter will deal with the societal control culture in regard to vandalism; that is, the nature of the organized social response to vandalism as a type of crime and as a social problem. It is easier to identify the dominant aims of the official control culture than it is to trace the different ways in which individuals respond to vandalism. Often private responses are more inconsistent and ambivalent than the public responses of punitiveness and repression which are encapsulated in the control culture or voiced from the moral barricades.

These responses are affected by at least the following factors: the social situation of the offence (for example, if it takes place on a ritual occasion); the type of community in which it takes place (for example, whether rural or urban); the sort of motivation attributed to the offender; whether the offence is carried out by an individual or group; the age of the offender (vandalism by very young children might be excused as "play"); the social class of the offender and the responder; the amount of damage; the nature of the damage and the type of property destroyed (for example, whether the property is sacred or profane); the possible consequences of the damage; the relationship of the responder to the property and to the offender.

Because of these and similar factors - as well as the general issues about the recognition and labelling of vandalism discussed in Chapter 3 - private responses to vandalism show wide variations. At the one extreme there is the refusal to label certain illegal forms of property destruction as vandalism at all or the overt encouragement of certain forms for ideological or aesthetic reasons. At the other extreme there is straightforward punitiveness and in the middle there is ambivalence and inconsistency, shown, for example, in adult nostalgia for the pranks and escapades of their youth.

The common basis for the official control culture, however, could not be other than the assumption that vandalism is an undesirable form of behaviour which must be eradicated or at least controlled within manageable proportions. This chapter will deal with the variations which arise from this assumption and the ways in which it is modified by the problems presented by specific types of vandalism. I will not deal fully with the problems of evaluating the effects or effectiveness of these various control measures, except in so far as these effects have consequences other than those intended.

The following are the main approaches to prevention and control which can be distinguished. There are by no means mutually exclusive - although in some cases they do incorporate contradictory conceptions about the problem - and are often advocated or used in various combinations:-

1. Defeatism: What Can You Do?
2. Deflection: Understand and Channelize
3. Utilitarian Prevention: Protect and Detect
4. Education and Publicity: Bring the Lesson Home
5. Deterrence and Retribution: Clamp Down Hard
6. Primary Prevention: Strike at the Roots

Defeatism: What Can You Do?

Many forms of vandalism are seen as endemic to particular situations or settings and the damage is simply written off as being inevitable. Defining vandalism as a type of rule-breaking, it can be seen that these forms are covered by many of the conditions under which institutionalization takes place. Particularly important are licenced and incidental vandalism.

The damage is seen as not worth bothering about, either because each incident is trivial (although the cumulative cost may be high), or because enforcement and prevention measures are impossible to apply or cost more than the actual damage. Under certain conditions the damage itself may be looked upon with tolerance or amusement; "they were just

having fun", "it's youthful exuberance", "we also used to do it when we were young". On the whole though, defeatism does not imply any approval or condonation of the behaviour. It is rather an attitude of resignation to its existence: "It's bad, but what can you do?", "we've just got to grin and bear it." These attitudes derive not only from the practical difficulty of doing anything about the problem, but from rationalizations such as "it used to be worse".

Almost all victims of vandalism react to some damage in a defeatist fashion. Local authorities - as we saw - are particularly prone to this sort of reaction unless they are stirred by moral enterprise. The L.G.I.O. and C.B.C.S.M. surveys explicitly condemned the "don't care attitude" among local authorities and many such victim organizations adopt specifically defeatist policies. For example, there are separate votes in annual budgets to cover expected damage to parks, bus shelters, street signs and so on and the costs will be taken into account in levying the rates. Sometimes contractors, when submitting tenders for house building, will add £100 per dwelling to cover the costs of vandalism or else a half of the contract sum will be allowed to contractors to cover damage.

In some cases the licencing of vandalism is more explicit, as when organizations hiring dance halls or rooms in pubs have to pay a certain amount of danger money. In 1967 an agreement was reached between British Rail and the National Federation of Football Supporters Clubs whereby Clubs chartering special trains would be subject to a clause agreeing to responsibility for damages up to £900. Although this was suggested as a possible way of ending vandalism, there was a clear acceptance by both parties that a certain amount of damage was to be expected.

In some situations the defeat is more literal. After continued attacks on particular targets - for example, public conveniences, park benches or old buildings - the organization concerned will simply give up any attempt at prevention or detection of the offenders and not bother to

repair the property. (Such property is then almost totally wrecked and then left alone.) In other cases the facilities that are damaged - such as liquid soap containers or towels in public conveniences - are withdrawn. Damaged public telephones are often left unrepaired for long periods (or else repaired only so that emergency calls can be made) but this is as much due to shortage of labour and equipment, as to defeatism.

Deflection: Understand and Channelize

A more active and complicated response is not simply to accept the presence of vandalism, but to try to understand this presence and use this understanding to deflect or channelize the behaviour into what are perceived as safer, harmless or constructive alternatives. This understanding is usually based on the use of some psychological concept such as the "destructive impulse" or the "urge to destroy" or else on more sociological concepts such as the need for "outlets" for childhood or adolescent excitement, "high spirits" or the "need for adventure".

Deflection may take the form of literally providing substitute targets for vandalism. It has long been a fairly orthodox practice among psychoanalytically oriented child psychotherapists, for example, to deal with a child who is doing damage by giving him materials which one does not mind him destroying. A more widely applicable derivation from this theme is the encouragement of destructive play in certain types of schools and playgrounds. One variation of this is the erection by some local authorities of "scribbling walls" in playgrounds, prominent places on council estates and youth and community centres. These are large walls with various drawing materials provided. This method has also been used for adults, with an interesting combination of defeatism and deflection, in the form of graffiti boards. Blackboards or white formica boards (in some cases actually labelled "Graffiti") have been installed in the toilets of pubs and hotels in order to divert writing from the walls on to something easier to clean. The messages are erased after closing time or a period

of a few days.¹

A more broadly based method of preventing vandalism is the use of adventure playgrounds and similar schemes. These measures are again based on the notion of providing harmless outlets for needs that would be otherwise expressed in vandalism. There is no unambiguous evidence for the effectiveness of such measures in reducing vandalism, although most sources indicate a correlation between inadequate play facilities and vandalism. Mycroft notes that a number of councils mentioned that, while play facilities on estates tend to reduce vandalism among the resident children, this effect is neutralized by drawing in "marauding youth" from other neighbourhoods.² The G.L.C. report cites evidence from one estate of supervised adventure playgrounds reducing the extent of vandalism.³

Another variation of the deflection approach is based more on the assumption that vandalism is partly attributable to lack of identification with the property that is destroyed. Recommendations following from this view include the use of children as "tree wardens" on new estates, arranging for children to look after trees or beds of plants or (as is done in some New Towns) naming personal trees after children. This sort of method has been suggested - together with forms of "creative vandalism", such as clearing up rubbish heaps and breaking up dumped old cars - by libertarians as being the most useful non-punitive response to vandalism.⁴ One of the most fully developed of such schemes is the City of Birmingham Tree Lovers' League. This was founded by a local Alderman who felt that children would not damage trees if they became interested in them. Each time a tree is planted a ceremony is arranged during which a badge of membership of the

1. For details on the use of graffiti boards see Freeman, op.cit., p. 78.

2. Mycroft, op.cit., p. 21.

3. G.L.C. Report, op.cit., p. 4.

4. See, for example, J. Ellerby, "Notes on Vandalism," Anarchy 61 (March, 1966), pp. 65 - 75.

League is given. Competitions are arranged and a magazine called the "Tree Lovers League Bulletin" is published. The Secretary of the League claims that the scheme has been effective in reducing vandalism to trees at least over a period of six years, but it is, of course, more difficult to evaluate the more general effects of such schemes.

The simple provision of better facilities is a variant of the Understand and Channelize approach to the extent that dirty and badly kept property is seen as likely to encourage vandalism. The suggestion that maintaining property in a decent condition is one of the best ways of preventing much vandalism is agreed upon by most local authorities and bodies such as the Ancient Monuments Society, the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, the Ecclesiastical Insurance Office and others responsible for maintaining public property.

Utilitarian Prevention: Protect and Detect

One of the most widespread approaches to preventing vandalism is the use of utilitarian technical methods. The emphasis is on devising techniques, often highly original and ingenious, to protect property from vandalism, to warn off the prospective offender or to increase the chances of his detection. These methods are less often conceived in terms of rooting out potential offenders and bringing them to justice, than on more pragmatic grounds, like maintaining essential services such as telephones, saving the public from unsightly defacements or any inconvenience and saving the taxpayer or ratepayer money. The overlapping aims of protection and detection are achieved through strengthening of equipment and the use of warning signs (for protection), giving rewards for information and "bugging" property (for detection) and using guards, patrols, caretakers and other types of surveillance measures (for both protection and detection). These methods are not mutually exclusive, and are used by large organizations, such as public bodies, in various combinations with each other.

The most favoured approach, although the most expensive one, is to

keep the property concerned under guard or supervision. In the L.G.I.O. survey, local authorities asked about the measures they used to prevent vandalism, listed:- appeals to the police for extra supervision (289); special park patrols (79); resident caretakers (29); attendants on duty (21); and dog patrols (23). Among individual local authorities contacted, increased supervision tended to be the most popular method of prevention. On council estates supervision is most often carried out by resident caretakers. The G.L.C., in concluding that "the burden of control must fall on the Council"⁵ advocates increased supervision not just through more frequent patrolling, but by recruiting a "better calibre" of staff as Resident Estate Officers, porters and caretakers. It was also suggested that some staff be used specifically for control and prevention duties in regard to vandalism. In other types of local authority property, personal supervision is likewise regarded as being the most effective measure; for example, "the only practical solution to vandalism in public conveniences is to have attendants present during the hours of opening."⁶

Special police patrols are more often advocated than actually used, although, for example, in certain areas of Lancashire, the "mobile beat policing" scheme was systematically employed to prevent vandalism among other types of crime. It was claimed that in the first five months of the pilot scheme in 1965 the number of cases of wilful damage was cut by more than half and the cost reduced to a sixth. Another type of police patrol which one council claimed to organize was the use of secret police: "anonymous men picked for their toughness" who would patrol parks and streets at night.

Official surveillance by groups other than the police is often advocated and used by local authorities. Mobile patrols are used on parks,

5. G.L.C. Report, p. 6.

6. C.B.C.S.M. Survey, p. 18. The report also mentioned the need to increase the status of the lavatory attendant by increasing his wages and making his position more like that of a hospital orderly. The new title of "Hygiene Warden" is suggested.

estates and areas surrounding schools. In Birmingham, park keepers (called "park rangers") on motor bikes were employed for a time. In Sheffield a private security company was hired to carry out anti-hooliganism patrols. In Liverpool 85 men in the parks police force were given walkie talkies: vandals were to be faced with helmeted police who would call up reinforcements with dogs. These police were given the same powers (for example, of arrest) as the city police. Dog patrols are another favoured technique, particularly by local authorities and building firms. Many councils use guard dogs - usually trained Alsations - to patrol parks at night. Martin reports that the Parks Association of New York City recommended the use of dogs "to flush vandals from the city parks".⁷ Some more bizarre forms of patrolling have been recorded; for example, the threat by a zookeeper in Northants after fences were broken and birds injured, to use patrols of lions, tigers and leopards.

A final technique of supervision is the use of volunteers. These are usually called "vigilante squads" or "local citizens foot patrols" and (in one case) "spotters groups". These groups were often very well organized, tended to arise in response to a specific incident or series of incidents of vandalism and were reported more often from rural than urban areas. In some cases members of the council took turns to patrol at certain times of the night. Sometimes vigilantes would be organized to protect private property: in one case, a vigilante squad patrolled a golf course with Alsation dogs and were armed with No. 8 irons "to smash any vandals attacking the course".

Another protective method, used in addition to surveillance, is physically strengthening or protecting the property itself. This method - as is the case with most other utilitarian approaches - is designed for theft as well as vandalism. Techniques include boarding up property under construction; the use of strong fittings; greasing main water pipes;

7. Martin, op.cit., p. 120.

installing unbreakable glass; designing buildings in such a way that there is the minimum amount of glass and other vandalizable property; building concealed drain pipes and using burglar proofing or barbed wire fencing. These techniques are often ingenious (for example, the Commonwealth War Graves Commission have, in some cases, substituted fibre glass for bronze swords and other objects of war memorials to prevent acquisitive vandalism) and involve complicated design (the C.B.C.S.M. for example have collected examples of special vandal-proof equipment.)⁸

At other times the measures are not so much carefully planned as desperately resorted to: the parks committee in a Kent town erected a fence and post around playground equipment but these were stolen or damaged after the first night. Then steel pins were driven in up to five feet depth and the equipment wired to them, but the pins and wire disappeared. Even after chains were welded, the property was broken or removed. In other more obvious cases the erection of certain protective devices seems to attract vandalism in the sense of offering a challenge. In some cases, the methods resorted to are so desperate that they may present new problems: one rural district council proposed to use "vandal-proof paint" - paint that never dries - on signposts and walls in a National Park. This sort of dilemma is illustrated in other ways in the attempts to design vandal-proof public lavatories and telephones. Proposals to build lavatory doors low enough for the attendant to observe and prevent acts of vandalism, are countered by the fact that this would remove the user's privacy, while proposals to build telephone kiosks without any glass at all, were countered by the risk (whether realistic or not) that "sexual malpractices" would take place in the privacy of the kiosk.

Of all organizations using technical protective measures, the General Post Office has been the most enterprising. Various devices are experimented

8. C.B.C.S.M. Survey, op.cit., pp. 23 - 24.

with to reduce each kind of damage and, if effective in a trial area, they are made available for use in other areas where local managers anticipate a particular need. Various devices used include steel stranded cords, other stronger materials, steel plates instead of glass at the bottom of the kiosk, burglar alarms and steel plating of the coin box. Strengthening of the coin box is a particularly significant measure in the light of the increase in acquisitive vandalism following the introduction of the S.T.D. systems: this measure, more than any other, was responsible for reducing this type of vandalism. A special "anti-vandal phone box" was designed in 1968; this had a three-quarter length panel of toughened glass on three sides to give maximum visibility from the street.⁹

Many organizations use various types of warning signs to protect their property from vandalism. These signs range from posters giving straightforward information about the legal penalties for anyone convicted of vandalism, to more specific exhortations not to commit vandalism. Examples of the former type are to be found next to railway lines, outside buildings being constructed and on the walls of the London Underground. Examples of the latter type are, notices affixed to telephone kiosks, such as "In case of illness or accident, your family may need this telephone. Please don't damage it." The effectiveness of such signs is not altogether clear: often the poster itself is damaged and in at least some areas there is evidence to suggest that a warning notice on a telephone box actually attracts attention and increases the amount of vandalism.

The aim of detecting the offender, as opposed to warning him off and cutting down the risk of damage by installing protective measures, is met

9. During the "epidemics" of telephone vandalism, area managers and the Head Office of the G.P.O. were inundated with suggestions from the public on how to deal with the problem. These included: using live electrified apparatus; charging a fee to get into the kiosk; an automatic device which would lock someone into the kiosk if anything was damaged; bombs which would blow the offender up; the use of tokens so that there would be no money in the coin box and a whole range of alarm systems.

by the same surveillance techniques used for protection. In addition, use is made - invariably with very little success - of offers of rewards for information about acts of vandalism, or general appeals to the public to "keep their eyes open" or to "have a go" at the offender. A novel attempt at both protection and detection was the construction by an Ayrshire village council of public toilets and two telephone kiosks outside the local police station. The measure failed, however, to reduce any vandalism.

Various alarm systems have also been introduced, again with most success by the G.P.O. Details of these systems are kept secret but consist of variations on the use of warning lights on top of the kiosk which flash when equipment is damaged or messages which are transmitted to the nearest police station. Experiments have also been conducted on the feasibility of using close-circuit television in telephone boxes. Alarm systems have also been tried in bus shelters. One Urban District Council has installed a special type of glass in some of its bus shelters: when the glass is broken a signal flashes to the police station alerting a special "anti-vandal patrol". Schools, particularly in America, have used various types of alarm or "bugging" systems, such as hidden microphones in crucial places of the building.

These various methods of protection and detection are usually used in combination with each other. Schools, for example, might have special security guards, an alarm system and hidden microphones or television cameras. In the 1964 anti-vandalism campaign run by British Railways, use was made of reward posters, the concentration of railway police patrols on selected routes and the increase of dog patrols in local black spots. In regard to football vandalism, a wider range of utilitarian techniques have been used or advocated to deal with the peculiar problems raised by the crowd situation; these include:- setting up barriers or constructing moats between the spectators and the field; increase of police and stewards; plain-clothes policemen mingling with the crowds; warning notices or appeals

over the public address system; banning all beer, milk and other bottles from the grounds; banning flags and banners; the formation of vigilante squads; changing the design of the ground to give the spectators less access to the field and the police easier access to the spectators; stricter police control in dispersing the crowd and measures to increase public support of the police.¹⁰

Obviously, the type of technique chosen depends on the demands of the situation and although measures such as increased supervision and alarm systems are fairly generally applicable, others are more specific: for example, the attempt, by some cinemas in "tough districts", to prevent damage to the screen (particularly during club films), by commencing the seating several rows back from the screen. In other situations, vandalism seems to evoke highly innovatory sorts of responses. One licensee in Rotherham decided to draw up a "Rogues Who's Who" - a blacklist of trouble-makers to be circulated among his fellow licensees. He urged them to keep a camera under the counter and to photograph troublemakers to be added to the rogues' gallery. Similarly, the Vicar of a new church at Barrow-in-Furness decided to compile a "picture dossier of vandals in action". A teenager seen trespassing on the site of the church would be photographed by the Vicar and a warning was issued to parents "Keep your children off the site or my picture dossier will be handed to the police". (A local police comment was that "anything which prevents vandalism is to be commended").

Clearly, a separate research project is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of these various measures. The one general point that might be made is that these measures are often very expensive and although they are primarily conceived as a way of saving the victim money, the cost of vandalism is often less than the cost of the preventive and detective

10. See Harrington, op.cit., Chap. 8 for a consideration of these and other preventive measures.

measures.

Education and Publicity: Bring the Lesson Home

The basic philosophy behind one approach to prevention and control is that if only people were more aware of the seriousness of the vandalism problem - its financial cost to the community, the potential physical dangers it presented, its threats to cherished values - then they would do something about it. The responsibility for action lies with the community, particularly informal agents of social control such as teachers and parents. The role of the victim organization, the government, the welfare agency, the mass media, is to educate children (directly, or indirectly through the school and the home) to realize that vandalism is their problem. It is their duty to refrain from acts of vandalism, to persuade others not to commit vandalism, to report acts of vandalism and to co-operate with the police. Through one or other means of education and publicity the lesson must be brought home.

This approach was basically the one used by organizations attempting - as described in Chapter 4 - to define vandalism as a social problem. These campaigns, usually run by individual local authorities, very rarely went beyond the stage of vague appeals for greater community responsibility and co-operation in dealing with vandalism. In other cases, more specific measures were recommended, some of them of the deflect and channelize type, others directed towards greater detection and others calling for the imposition of more severe legal penalties. The educational techniques used included posters drawing attention to the damage, talks in schools by council officials, policemen or social workers and various types of exhibitions to increase public awareness. I will describe three of the more original and best organized of these local authority campaigns, paying particular attention to the most ambitious one, the Birmingham "Stop Vandalism Week".

A typical educational campaign was that organized in Gateshead in 1966.

The Council initially decided to approach prevention through the schools, and the Civic Pride Committee organized an essay competition among school-children on the subject of how to prevent vandalism. The list of suggestions that emerged is of interest if only to indicate that the measures arrived at by schoolchildren are not particularly different from those advocated by adults: either members of the public or those with specialized knowledge, experience and responsibility:-

- (1) Repair of damage to be carried out by offenders.
- (2) Cost of damage to be paid by offenders.
- (3) More Youth Clubs to be provided so that young people have more to occupy them.
- (4) Formation of a special Youth Corps to prevent vandalism.
- (5) Young Citizens Courts to try offenders.
- (6) More Clubs for young people mainly for voluntary service to the community.
- (7) Use of hidden cameras.
- (8) More plain-clothes policemen.
- (9) More guard dogs.
- (10) Adverse publicity for vandals in press and on television.
- (11) More co-operation from the public.
- (12) Concentration on educating the next generation against vandalism.
- (13) Emphasis on creative work and gardening so that young people become more interested in creation than destruction.
- (14) The re-introduction of stocks and the pillory as a deterrent to vandals.
- (15) Devices on telephone box doors so that they cannot be entered freely.
- (16) Talks by 'pop' stars against vandalism.

The essay competition was followed up a year later by an exhibition staged in co-operation with the G.P.O., British Railways and the local bus company. The exhibition, which ran for three weeks, consisted of items of equipment and fittings damaged by vandals and photographs and mock-ups of various sorts of damage. Emphasis was on the cost of vandalism to Gateshead

(£12,000) per year which was compared in the publicity handouts to the equivalent sum with which the Council "... could provide four to five families at present without any housing accommodation or living in very poor housing conditions with a new home." The fact that the "ordinary man and woman" was paying for the damage in the rate levy was stressed, as well as the physical dangers of vandalism: "See evidence of the destruction of your emergency services which could cost a life - your life!! " (from a leaflet advertising the exhibition). Civic pride was also stressed in the slogan "Beat Vandalism and Take a Pride in Your Town". Although the exhibition was well attended and attracted favourable publicity, the Council has not been able to provide evidence of any long-term preventive effect.

A similar approach was used in Chertsey in 1965. The Chairman of the U.D.C. organized a tour of the town by a lorry "loaded with examples of wanton damage such as coin boxes, basins and pans from public conveniences, broken gutters, a seat and a mock-up of a house with broken windows". The Chairman sat in the driver's cab with a microphone and asked the public to co-operate in stamping out vandalism. He told them of the extent of the damage and said that if they saw anyone carrying out these acts they should either try to stop them or call the police. Again, there was no clear evaluation of the success of the campaign:

As to whether the campaign has had any effect is difficult to say - but at least thanks to the Press and T.V. publicity local residents have been talking about the problem and saying how bad it is. That at least is one return for our efforts.¹¹

As is apparent from these and other attempts at evaluating similar projects, the educative aim of creating a greater problem awareness is often primary and the question of whether the amount of vandalism is, in fact, reduced is left unresolved.

In Chapter 4 some attention was paid to the context in which the

11. Letter from Mr. R. Lowther, Chairman of the Chertsey U.D.C., (22/1/66).

Birmingham "Stop Vandalism Week" was organized. It was clear that this campaign was of the Bring-the-Lesson-Home type; in the words of the General Manager of the Parks Committee:

The purposes of the campaign was to focus the attention of the whole city on the enormous cost of the damage done by vandals which in the case of Corporation property alone amounts to some £50,000 per year and to find ways and means of reducing this onerous burden on the community.

The stress on community awareness and responsibility was expressed in these words by the local newspaper: "... the general public will be asked to realize that the 'they' who are expected to deal with problems such as vandalism are really 'us'" (Birmingham Post 6/1/67). Community organizations such as social and youth clubs, voluntary organizations, trade unions, various industrial, commercial and professional bodies and political parties were drawn into the campaign and more than 650 organizations filled in forms giving details of publicity outlets and facilities they could offer. The 600,000 publicity items distributed included 395,000 leaflets, 15,000 hanging cards, 9,500 posters, 31,000 vehicle window stickers, 100,000 stamps for sticking on letters, 20,000 lapel badges, etc. The campaign's slogan was "If you lend a hand, We can stop vandalism", and the publicity items bore variations of this slogan and suggestions of how the community could help to stop vandalism: the need for parents to impress upon their children how futile it is to wreck other people's property, the responsibilities of youth workers and teachers, the need to co-operate with the police, etc. A specimen copy of one leaflet may be found in Appendix D.

The week was launched with an inaugural meeting opened by the Lord Mayor in the Council Chamber. A large "Stop vandalism" exhibition was organized consisting of pictures of broken windows, smashed lavatory seats and other results of vandalism. Letter writing and poster competitions were organized in local newspapers and the campaign received wide local and national publicity. The estimated cost of the campaign was approximately £5,000. Again, it is obvious from the statements of those associated with the campaign that its success was defined primarily in increasing the

awareness of the problem. As Table 16 shows, it is dubious whether there was any long-term effect in reducing the amount of vandalism in Birmingham,¹² at least when one compares the year before with the year immediately following the campaign. In fact, mainly because of the large increase in the category "Housing Management" (council estates, clearance areas, etc.), vandalism cost the council about £10,000 more in the year after the campaign.

TABLE 14

Comparative Costs of Vandalism to Departments of Birmingham Corporation,
1966 to 1967.

	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>
Airport	£100	£230
City Architects	Cost borne by contractors - no record	
Baths	Negligible	Negligible
Building	£616	£557
Childrens	Nil	Nil
Civil Defence	Nil	Nil
Education	No cost figures kept but estimate similar figure to 1967	Approx. £5,000
Fire and Ambulance	974 malicious calls	925 malicious calls
Estates	Unable to supply figures	
Housing Management	£18,235	£26,374
Public Libraries	No records kept	
Markets	Nil	Nil
Municipal Bank	Figures not available	
Museum and Art Gallery	Figures not available	
Parks	£2,300	£2,931
Public Health	£329.14.6d. up to Nov.	£961.10.0d. to Nov.
Public Works	£3,628 (4,398) items	£4,423 (5,483 items)
Restaurants	£10	£5
Salvage	Nil	Nil
Treasurers	Nil	Nil
Transport	Unable to split figure between accident, damage and vandalism.	
Water	Negligible	Negligible
Welfare	£222	£65.7.5d. plus 51 in- stances of damage - costs not yet known
TOTAL	£30,440.14.6d.	£40,546.17.5d.

12. One short-term effect which embarrassed the organisers was the theft an hour after the exhibition opened of 800 campaign lapel badges bearing the slogan "I am lending a hand to stop vandals".

If one adds to this figure the £5,000 which the campaign cost and takes into account the possible preventive effects of other measures used extensively in Birmingham over the same period (particularly protection and detection techniques such as Burglar Alarms in schools and day nurseries, strengthening of equipment, Park Rangers patrolling the parks and security patrols and guard dogs in other buildings), one can only conclude that the preventive effects of such education and publicity campaigns are negligible.

Of other victim organizations, British Railways were the most consistent advocates of the education and publicity approach. They used most of the other approaches as well and devoted more care and attention to preventing vandalism than any other organization. Their Public Relations Division ensured that educational messages reached the widest possible audience and regular and informative press releases were issued about the state of the problem. A major Anti-Vandalism Campaign was launched in February, 1964; security patrols were increased and rewards of £25 were offered for information leading to the conviction of vandals. Posters announcing this offer went up on stations and railway property throughout the country. Press announcements of the campaign emphasized the safety hazard in railway vandalism, the inconvenience and loss of public goodwill because of delayed trains and the costs - which would have to be borne by the public - of making good the damage.

Besides these publicity campaigns, British Railways also used less obtrusive and more sustained educational techniques. These were considered by the Public Relations Officer to be of more value than "general exhortations" and were used, it should be noted, as early as 1957 - well before the vandalism scare of the Sixties. The techniques were directed at schoolchildren, particularly the age group most responsible for the core types of railway vandalism, the 10 - 14 year olds. The safety aspects of railway vandalism were stressed throughout, rather than threatening punishment and retribution.

The following are some of the educative techniques used:-

1. Issuing a "teaching aid wallet" to schools every two years. The material does not constitute a direct appeal for railway safety, but is designed to promote interest and pride in the Railways, in the belief that one doesn't injure property one is proud of.
2. Giving lectures and showing films to schoolchildren which emphasize the dangerous consequences of vandalism.
3. Lectures on railway safety (similar to those on road safety) given in schools by clowns and other entertainers.
4. Lectures at Women's Associations and Mothers' Unions, again stressing the safety message: "Don't let your child play on the line, this is what might happen ... "
5. School essay competitions (for premium bonds) in which the theme is railway safety.
6. Placing a strip cartoon "Nights of the Road" in children's newspapers and comics. In the cartoon, one character gets electrocuted tampering with railway equipment.
7. In certain areas (particularly after the Elm Park incident in 1965) enlisting the help of children at Saturday morning cinema clubs by asking them to report signs of vandalism to the police. In these same areas engine drivers and railway police visited hundreds of schools to talk about railway safety.
8. Showing, over a period of six months at the height of the railway vandalism wave, a special film at all Saturday morning juvenile film shows of the Rank Organization. This film with a railway safety theme featured a leading pop group and in conjunction with it the Board ran a national railway safety competition.

In carrying out these campaigns, British Railways were very much aware of the standard public relations problems involved, especially the possible competition from other publicity with a different message and the need to aim at a specific audience. These problems are illustrated in the following extracts from departmental documents:-

The Board's efforts at education have not been helped by certain types of commercial publicity ... (for example) picture cards included in packets of bubble gum purchased by children, illustrating incidents of railway sabotage with headings such as "train wreck kills 125 soldiers" and describing how the deed was done. Similarly, the showing of two films "Lawrence of Arabia" and "The Train", both of which display graphic acts of railway vandalism, has undoubtedly done something to vitiate the railway safety campaign. It would be ideal if one could pinpoint any section of the community as being particularly responsible to direct the maximum effort at that section ... but the small minority responsible for most of this particular type of hooliganism is the stoniest of stony ground.

The educational techniques used are directly influenced by the victim organization's perception of the nature of the audience, that is, their images of the typical vandal. This, again, might be illustrated by quoting from a British Railways memorandum which distinguishes three groups for aiming a poster campaign at:- firstly, younger children who need to be encouraged to take pride in the railways; secondly, "the weaker element of hooligans who probably indulge in such reprehensible practices because of the gang instinct or fear of the gang leader". (For this group the appeal could be aimed at either "persuading them to assert their independence" or "dissuading them from doing anything which might hurt their friends and relations, or their favourite pop stars"); thirdly, "the hard core of hooligans", the objective here is to "frighten them off by fear of punishment or injury". A clearer indication of the influence of stereotypes and images on the design of prevention and control measures is a programme prepared for British Railways by a commercial advertising agency. Extracts from this are to be found in Appendix E.

It is difficult to assess the general effectiveness of education and publicity campaigns. In the case of railway vandalism there was a clear reduction in the years following the campaign. What proportion of this reduction is attributable to the campaign and not to the other measures used at the same time (increased surveillance, new protective and detective devices, deterrent sentences, etc.) is impossible, however, to estimate. In general, one can say that general exhortations and direct publicity appeals, such as those used by the local authorities, are of little use and are less valuable than the more unobtrusive techniques such as those used by British Railways. There is, indeed, suggestive evidence that publicity in itself might have the opposite effect to that intended. In interviews with representatives of British Railways, the G.P.O., local authorities and other victim organizations, doubts were invariably expressed about the value of publicity. The fact that vandalism occurred in recognizable waves and that highly reported dramatic incidents (such as the Elm Park accident)

were immediately followed by similar incidents in the same area, suggested the operation of the sort of contagion or amplification effect which I will pay direct attention to in regard to the Mods and Rockers phenomenon. In the only extended research on this effect in regard to vandalism - the studies of the 1959-1960 swastika epidemic - it was clear that publicity was critical in triggering off and channelling the behaviour. The fact that the publicity did not "cause" attitudes that were already there and that it was generally hostile rather than approving, does not remove the need for taking its unintended consequences into account; to quote one study of the phenomenon: "Newspapers and other media showed what could be done and how it could be done and that the behaviour could represent defiance without too much chance of the perpetrators being caught."¹³

These unintended effects have been demonstrated mainly in regard to ordinary mass media publicity; it is not known whether more considered, educational and publicity measures, consciously designed to prevent vandalism, will have the same effect.

Deterrence and Retribution: Clamp Down Hard

Throughout the peak periods during which vandalism received the most attention as a social problem, the call to "clamp down hard" on the behaviour was the most prominent. The belief that stronger and more effective methods of deterrence would solve the problem was very rarely questioned and was held by those who advocated other approaches as well, such as Education and Publicity or Detection and Protection. It was only the more forceful adherents of the Understand and Channelize approach who found the Clamp Down Hard position to some extent irreconcilable with their own. Specific deterrent measures were advocated for different types of vandalism, but the general tendency was to support heavier fines, custodial sentences such as detention centres, corporal punishment and various schemes for restitution or compensation.

13. Stein, et al, op.cit., p. 171.

The major legal acts which cover vandalism are the Malicious Damage Act (1861), the Criminal Justice Act (1914) and the Malicious Damage Act (1964) which amended certain provisions of the 1914 Act to enable magistrates courts to deal summarily with offences where damage does not exceed £100 (instead of £20). The vast majority of vandalism offences - about 99% - are, in fact, dealt with summarily: about 3% of these are indictable offences (Malicious Injuries to Property) dealt with summarily, the rest are in the non-indictable category "Malicious Damage". On the basis of the 1967 Official Statistics, Table 15 shows the proportions of those found guilty receiving the main types of sentences:

TABLE 15

Sentences Given to Persons Found Guilty of Vandalism Offences, 1967.

		Percentages receiving main type of sentences							
Type of Offence	Total Found Guilty	Conditional Discharge	Probation	Fine	Attendance Centre	Detention Centre	Approved School	Borstal	Imprisonment
I. <u>Indictable: Malicious Injuries to Property</u>									
a. Magistrates Courts	527	18	16	45	7	2	3	-	6
b. Assizes and Quarter Sessions	133	6	17	27	-	4	-	2	44
II. <u>Non-Indictable: Malicious Damage to Property</u>									
Magistrates Courts	16,037	13	7	67	1	1	1	5	

It can be seen from this table that the dominant type of sentence for vandalism offences is fining. The conviction that for certain types of vandalism this sentence was not strict enough, was stated clearly in an editorial in the Justice of the Peace and Local Government Review (9/4/66) which also may serve as a general statement of the Clamp Down Hard position:

Vandalism: We make no apology for reverting to this topic. The problem has reached a stage of growth at which it is no exaggeration to say that it is a test for our system of justice. If our Judges and Magistrates cannot stop it, no one else can. We believe that our Judges and Magistrates can and will stop it and we hope and believe that they will not be satisfied by what the Lord Chief Justice has described as 'footling fines'. The sooner it is realized by these young vandals that detection involves detention, the sooner the public may expect the protection to which they are entitled.

It is difficult to assess exactly what proportion of victim organizations or the general public would subscribe to such sentiments. It is clear, however, that during the research period, the dominant ideology in the mass media could be expressed in these terms. Most victim organizations as well - at the same time as admitting their own responsibilities for prevention - were influenced by the pyramidal conception of the problem, to shift the main burden of responsibility elsewhere, particularly in the direction of the courts. Their attitude was: "We can do so much but it's for the police and the courts to really solve the problem." I will outline the main deterrent policies used by some of the main targets of vandalism.

(i) Railways: Although educational and technical measures were widely used, at the peak during which railway vandalism was problematic there was a general consensus that deterrence, particularly through certainty of conviction and stiffer penalties, was the best solution. At various times British Railways Board advocated higher fines for offences such as stone throwing, trespass and malicious damage. The special problems associated with outbreaks of vandalism to football specials also gave rise to demands for stronger punishments.

The courts during this period were very much influenced by public demands and a number of exemplary sentences were passed. In one case, two brothers aged 16 and 12 were sentenced to 5 and 3 years' detention respectively for putting a number of steel plates on a main railway line. The boys were seen and the plates removed before a large passenger train reached that part of the track. On Appeal, the sentence on the older brother was reduced to 3 years and the younger committed to the care of

the local authority. The Lord Chief Justice remarked that with this offence becoming so prevalent, it was no wonder that the Recorder had felt that a deterrent sentence was necessary.¹⁴

(ii) Football: The case of football hooliganism was cited as an example of the tendency to place responsibility for the problem on to the official control system. It was also the area in which the Clamp Down Hard approach had its strongest adherents. The press and administrators of the sport, frequently called on the police to be more diligent in arresting offenders, criticized the courts for being lenient and demanded legislation to increase maximum penalties. The Minister with special responsibility for Sport was (together with the Secretary of the Football League) the most vocal in the demand for stricter penalties. After an incident in January, 1966, he suggested that "... offenders should be ordered to a detention centre (sic) during the match hours instead of being given a small fine". This particular method - sending offenders to attendance centres on Saturday afternoons or banning them from home team matches - was, in fact, widely used by many courts.

The announced increase in the 1967 Criminal Justice Bill of maximum penalties for common and aggravated assault was heralded as being a way to deal with football hooliganism. In an interview at the time (Daily Sketch 4/4/67) the Minister commented: "My department has had several discussions with the soccer authorities and the penalties for this kind of offence have been increased at their request. This Bill ... is now before the Commons." Later in that season the Minister revealed the "Government Blueprint for the War on Soccer Hooligans"; this consisted of exhortations for heavier sentences, including imprisonment, to be imposed, for the courts to make use of their new powers and for sterner police measures: "What we need are the kind of police offensives which tackled the Mods and Rockers flare-ups at the coast" (quoted in Daily Sketch 8/5/67).

14. See Times Law Report (8/11/65).

(iii) Telephones: Vandalism to public telephones was again very much responded to in terms of the Clamp Down Hard approach. Unlike the case of football hooliganism, though, the call for deterrence came much less strongly from the victim organization than from the official control system itself. The demand for and use of maximum penalties, particularly prison and Borstal, was prominent in those offences where money was stolen from a coin box, the type of telephone vandalism with the highest detection rate. These sentences - classified legally as forms of theft but conceptualized as part of the vandalism problem - are not reflected in the vandalism figures in Table 15. The following cases are selected at random from the beginning of 1966 - a peak period in the escalation both of sentences and this type of offence - to illustrate the definitions used in the control culture.¹⁵

January, 1966: A 20 year old unemployed man was sentenced at Thames Magistrates Court to 6 months' imprisonment for attempting to steal from a telephone coin box. The magistrate said to him: "In some areas about 80% of the telephone boxes are smashed to smithereens. This has got to stop. When someone doing it is caught they are not going to be let off by this court. They will be sent to prison. These telephone boxes are required by people in an emergency".

January, 1966: At Inner London Sessions an appeal was considered from a 22 year old man with no previous convictions against a sentence (from the Thames Magistrates Court) of 3 months' imprisonment for attempting to steal money from a telephone kiosk. The man was drunk, had gambled away his wife's Christmas club money and wanted to replace it. The Chairman told him, "You are earning good money which you gamble away, and then you tackle telephone boxes, an offence which is absolutely rife. This has to be dealt with by condign punishment and we think the sentence is inadequate". The court doubled the original sentence.

January, 1966: In the Colchester Magistrates Court 4 boys aged 17 - 19 sentenced for breaking and stealing sums totalling £32 from telephone kiosks, were told by the Chairman, "You have turned yourselves into enemies of the people".

January, 1966: In the Court of Criminal Appeal the Lord Chief Justice refused leave to appeal by a 19 year old legless boy against a Borstal sentence for stealing from a telephone kiosk. The court sympathized with the boy (who had lost both legs in an accident at the age of 8) but had to harden its heart and uphold the sentence. There was too much wrecking going on, and this had

15. These cases were all originally taken from the national and local press. Some are summarized and commented on in two leaders in Justice of the Peace and Local Government Review, "Telephone Kiosks (19/2/66) and "Enemies of the People" (9/4/66).

to be stamped out. Locking offenders up was necessary. "This court will uphold any substantial sentences given for these offences."

February, 1966: The Chairman of the Inner London Sessions, imposing sentences of 18 months' imprisonment and borstal training on a 22 year old and 18 year old who had attempted to steal money from a kiosk, told them, "These offences are absolutely rife. At a time emergency calls are required to be made, due to people like you, the telephone kiosks are out of action. The law therefore takes a grave view and sentences must be severe."

On two occasions during this period, the Lord Chief Justice made influential speeches recommending deterrent sentences for telephone vandalism. Opening a new court in February, 1966, he suggested that judges and magistrates should decide to give sentences of detention for telephone vandalism.¹⁶ At the Annual Conference of the Justices Clerks Society in June, 1966, he cited examples such as the Post Office frauds and the Notting Hill disturbances as successful uses of general deterrence, and went on:

Assaults on the police and damage to phone kiosks can also be stamped out to a very large extent if J.P's tacitly agree among themselves that it is going to be a case of detention of one form or another on every occasion.

The most sustained campaign of deterrence, with sentences from 6 months to 3 years' imprisonment, was conducted by the Recorder of Birmingham during the same period. In June, 1966, opening Birmingham Quarter Sessions, he claimed that the policy of heavier sentences which he had announced in December, 1965, had resulted in "the virtual cessation of this type of offence". It was stated that almost all the city's 1,800 kiosks were in service, compared with 1,200 five months previously. The Recorder was congratulated by the Lord Mayor of Birmingham, ("Your efforts have succeeded almost beyond belief") and was hailed by the press as "the iron man in Britain's battle against the rising tide of crime". He went on to announce that having won this battle his next target was burglars

16. See comments in Justice of the Peace and Local Government Review (9/4/66); The Magistrate (March, 1966) and Criminal Law Review (March, 1966), pp. 129 - 130.

who would face life sentences if they appeared before him.

All the methodological problems of evaluating preventive measures in general and deterrent sentences in particular, apply to these and other examples in the field of vandalism. In regard to railway vandalism it would seem that the sustained educational campaigns stressing the safety aspect, together with greater vigilance, were more responsible in reducing the incidence of vandalism - particularly among young children - than any deterrent measures. In regard to football hooliganism, the most general conclusion one can draw is that no measure was successful. The lack of effectiveness of the government "blueprint" was indicated by the fact that in the subsequent two seasons (1967/68 and 1968/69) there was a marked escalation in the amount of soccer hooliganism. In each case the sequence was the same: the season opening with appeals from those concerned with the game for better behaviour, disturbances, punishments, more appeals and more disturbances. As each season began statements and headings such as the following would appear: "... another season opens with depressingly familiar outbreaks of crowd violence ..." (Daily Telegraph 27/8/67) and "Violence is all part of the game now" (Times 7/10/68). In the current season (1968/69) vandalism associated with soccer shows no sign of diminishing and was the subject of new Clamp Down Hard measures announced by the Home Secretary.

The much acclaimed success of the Recorder of Birmingham in cutting down telephone vandalism is, on closer inspection, not altogether unambiguous. At exactly the same time as the deterrence campaign was announced, the G.P.O. began to armour-plate its S.T.D. boxes in Birmingham. The cash containers from the old push button boxes were reinforced and welded to the new boxes. This measure - applied to about a third of the boxes - made it virtually impossible to take the cash away without removing the whole kiosk. Other utilitarian measures used included the improvement of the lighting in the kiosk, the transfer of some kiosks to more conspicuous places, the installation of alarms in some kiosks and

more regular collection of the money. Without decrying the Recorder's campaign, spokesmen for the G.P.O. were convinced that these measures were the most significant in decreasing the amount of telephones out of order due to vandalism.¹⁷

For all types of vandalism the control agents and mass media were caught up in the dilemma already drawn attention to: the continual oscillation between claims that the recommended control measure had worked and, on the other hand, that the problem still existed and demanded continual vigilance. During 1966, for example, the public received the following picture of the war against telephone vandalism:

January: G.P.O. statements and newspaper editorials stress the severity of the vandalism problem. The threat is posed of the whole public telephone system breaking down.

February: Stories appear in the press about a Secret Eye device which has caught hundreds of vandals. The Daily Mirror (14/2/66) announced that "An end to the war against phone box vandals may be in sight."

March: More optimistic statements in the press: the peak in the war against phone box vandals is over.

June: Statements more pessimistic now, figures quoted to show that problem is still rife. The Lord Chief Justice calls for deterrent sentences to finally curb the problem. This speech welcomed and the press cite the example of Birmingham as evidence that long prison sentences are beginning to take effect.

December: The end of the vandalism wave is hailed: "Turning point in War on Vandals" (Evening Standard 20/12/66). The measures have been successful - but the problem is still with us: "Telephone vandalism does, however, remain a very acute and contemptible problem in the capital ... Whatever the cause of the brainsick phobia every effort must be made to stamp it out. At last the stiffer sentences seem to be having a deterrent effect and the G.P.O.'s precautions are producing results. But no one may feel satisfied with the present situation until this vicious practice has been eliminated." (Evening Standard (22/12/66).)

Members of the public might understandably have received a confused picture of the progress of the war. In the first place, throughout this period incidents of telephone vandalism were taking place throughout the country virtually independently of claims that the problem had been solved. Then, even on the figures supplied by those claiming victory, the overall

17. For a general account of the effect of protective measures see the Post Office Journal, The Courier, (May 1967).

decline in vandalism in particular areas was not spectacular. According to an Evening Standard "survey" at the end of 1965 "nearly one-third" of the London S.T.D. boxes were out of action except for emergency calls. According to the same paper, a year later when the war was supposed to have been won, the proportion of telephones out of order was, in fact, 21%, not a dramatic decrease. A week after this report (2/1/67) the Evening Standard under a headline "The Wreckers" reported that in the South-West area of London over a third of the S.T.D. boxes were out of order except for emergency calls. The acclaimed successes of control policies during 1966 were certainly not evident on the national level. In Bradford in February, 1967, it was reported that a telephone box a day was being put out of action and in Glasgow in June, 26% of the telephones were out of action. A major factor contributing to the public's confusion in evaluating the success of control measures (and of understanding the extent of the problem) is the waves of fashion in the mass media reporting of phenomena such as vandalism. Thus, incidents of soccer hooliganism might be heavily publicized and acts of telephone or railway vandalism not reported at all, giving the impression that control measures had succeeded in suppressing the problem.

The mainstream only of Clamp Down Hard measures have been mentioned. Vandalism, along with various crimes of violence and sexual offences, also evokes more innovatory and melodramatic retributive responses among a minority. The use of public ridicule and punishments such as the stocks was, for example, suggested on a number of occasions. A town councillor in Somerset, who suggested that the stocks should be brought back for teenage vandalism, was quoted as saying:

I said this with my tongue in my cheek, but I had dozens of calls from local residents who congratulated me on the idea and who even offered to help put some stocks up. (Daily Mail 7/12/65)

The Sheriff of Norwich (Sunday Telegraph 31/7/66 and personal letter 7/9/66) defended the use of stocks in the following terms:

... the type of individual who commits motiveless acts of wanton aggression or damage will tolerate (with little deterrent effect) supervision by probation, monetary penalty or even a short term

of imprisonment, but in common with most of our compatriots abhors ridicule or to be held in contempt by his fellows.

A more frequent variation of the punitive response to vandalism is in the direction of restitution rather than retribution. Various schemes were put forward to compensate the victim for the cost of damage. Many local authorities - including Birmingham during its "Stop Vandalism Week" - suggested that parents should be made liable for damage carried out by their under-14 year old children.¹⁸ Local authorities have also suggested that such sanctions be used outside the legal system, for example in obtaining compensation from parents in council housing.

Other extra-legal sanctions used include banning offenders from swimming baths, sports fields, youth clubs or play centres. Some local authorities have suggested the evicting of tenants whose children are responsible for vandalism: the G.L.C. report considered that there is no more effective sanction than transfer or eviction and that this "valuable disciplinary measure" which is only used as a last resort, could be used more frequently.¹⁹

Primary Prevention: Strike at the Roots

Deriving from^a pyramidal conception of the social problem and a causative theory which posits a deeply rooted social malaise at the base, one approach to prevention and control stresses the futility of any measures which do not "Strike at the Roots" of vandalism. The vandal is seen as operating in a society which, in the Durkheimian sense, does not set any limits to his behaviour. Even if we fully utilize technical measures of prevention - which we are obliged to do to protect the community - or develop more effective methods of deterrence - which again we are obliged to do for self-protection and to see that justice is done -

18. For a legal comment on the powers of the magistrates court to order compensation for damage, see The Magistrate XXII, 7 (July, 1966), p. 93.

19. G.L.C. Report, op.cit., pp. 5 - 7.

these attempts will only touch the surface of the problem.

The actual implications for prevention and control that stem from this approach are not altogether clear. As will be seen in some responses to the Northview survey, they consist of vague recommendations to stem the tides of permissiveness, to counteract the breakdown in the family life, to instill in parents and teachers a greater sense of responsibility and to generally strike at the roots of the malaise: the home, the school and the permissive society. In fact, the approach to the prevention of vandalism (and other social problems) envisaged in such public conceptions leads on to few, if any, policy implications.

Sociological variants of attempts at the primary prevention of vandalism are not clearly distinguishable from approaches to delinquency prevention as a whole. Martin begins his discussion of the prevention of vandalism by stating that "juvenile delinquency, including juvenile vandalism, cannot be understood unless it is related to the total social matrix within which it occurs".²⁰ He then goes on to review measures such as curfew laws, the punishment of the delinquent's parents, utilitarian measures such as dog patrols and alarm systems and finally what he calls the "more sagacious proposals that have been made for preventing delinquency".²¹ These include general welfare programmes, more specific schemes such as the Chicago Area Project and ordinary control and preventive techniques such as probation, child guidance clinics and detached worker projects. His final conclusion, after noting the specific approaches that may be needed for the three types of vandals he distinguishes, (Essentially Law-Abiding, Disturbed and Subcultural), is that:

The prevention of vandalism and other types of delinquency must involve good law-enforcement and good individual treatment and custodial care. But more importantly, it must also involve community-centred approaches to delinquency prevention.²²

20. Martin, op.cit., p. 109.

21. Ibid., p. 121.

22. Ibid., p. 136.

The type of community centred approaches he recommends involve taking into account the situational elements in vandalism, for example, racial tension in the case of some ideologically inspired vandalism, and measures of the Understand and Channelize type for dealing with play vandalism.

Future research on the prevention and control of vandalism should be directed not only to evaluating the effects and effectiveness of these six approaches but also to making more explicit the link between them and various conceptions and images of the nature of the problem. These conceptions and images are as integral a part of the control culture as the techniques and apparatus which put them into effect. It needs to be shown which approaches fail because, on the one hand, of factors such as inadequate resources, technical difficulties and conflicts between control agents and, on the other, a refusal to understand the problem, or a misunderstanding of it based, for example, on conceptions such as those of homogeneity and meaninglessness.

PART III

ATTITUDES TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY:

THE NORTHVIEW SURVEY

CHAPTER 7INTRODUCTION

This section of the thesis deals with the second point of entry in studying the societal reaction to deviance: the level of the official social control system which identifies, labels and processes those destined to occupy deviant - in this case, delinquent - roles. These chapters present the results of a survey carried out in a London Borough (to be called "Northview") between Summer 1965 and Summer 1966. The purpose of the survey was to obtain the views of a selected sample of respondents, on some issues raised by the transactional perspective on delinquency. The general rationale for studying reaction at this level has already been spelt out; I will now examine this rationale in more detail, describe the group whose views are being considered and cite relevant research which could be used for comparative purposes. The chapter will conclude with a description of the research design of the survey.

The Control System

Our basic starting off point is that deviant behaviour has to be conceptualized in terms of a sequential model. Transactional-type research has been concerned with the dual processes of how types of behaviour are labelled deviant or problematic and how types of actors are given deviant identities. The Vandalism section and Becker's work on the Marijuana Tax Act, for example, dealt with the first of these processes: how do particular types of rule-breaking become defined as fully-fledged social problems? The second process was considered, for example, in Kitsuse's study of the way in which homosexuals are labelled. He distinguished three stages: identification, definition and treatment, corresponding roughly to Erikson's stages of confrontation, judgment and placement.

It is theoretically possible for every member of society to be involved in this process, at least in the early stages when the deviant is identified and his acts reported. It becomes clear, though, when looking at any one

type of deviance - say, juvenile delinquency or mental illness - that some people in society are in positions which make it more likely that they will act as identifiers, definers, or, in some other way, processors of deviants. More important, the consequences of their intervention will be of much greater significance for the deviants' subsequent careers than will be any intervention by ordinary members of the public. The "manifest control structure"¹ of society involves a network of highly differentiated roles, in some of which - for example, parents, teachers, friends - social control is only one of the many functions and demands. Other roles, however, are functionally specific and in complex societies are part of a specialized apparatus of social control. Within this apparatus there is further specialization according to the various aspects of social control (such as prevention, diagnosis, treatment or punishment) and some roles, such as the Mental Welfare Officer or the School Attendance Officer are highly specific. I will refer to this apparatus as the "official control system" and to the people who occupy positions within the system as "official control agents".

Cohen and Short have suggested that this system can most usefully be viewed as a "flow chart"² - a "complex network through which deviants and potential and suspected deviants may be transported, as it were, various distances and along various routes, in the course of which they undergo processing of various kinds."³ There are a number of ways in which this system can be studied, the most conventional of which is by analysing the characteristics of its constituent organizations.

Under this heading, for example, would fall the vast literature on the formal and informal social systems of the prison. One might also study the characteristics of the control agents themselves, for example, the

1. Cohen, (1967), op.cit., p. 40.

2. A.K. Cohen and J.F. Short, "Juvenile Delinquency," in Merton and Nisbet (Eds.), op.cit., p. 119.

3. Cohen, (1967), op.cit., p. 40.

recruitment and career patterns of probation officers or policemen. For our purposes, however, there are two more important groups of questions that need to be asked:-

(1) What are the processes by which movement is regulated within the flow chart? In other words, on what bases are decisions made and action taken which result in the movement of the deviant from one stage to the other?

(2) What are the immediate and long term effects of these decisions and actions on the deviant; particularly the unintended effects?

Although there is a great deal of information on the control system - for example, on the workings of the courts and prisons - which could help towards answering these questions, little research or theory has been guided towards these problems by such models as the flow chart. Goffman's notion of the "moral career of the mental patient" is perhaps closest to this type of orientation.⁴ He distinguishes three stages in the mental patient's career: the prepatient phase, the inpatient phase and the expatient phase. Irrespective of the psychological beginning of the individual's illness, the social beginning of his career as a mental patient is when he offends against some interactional context, and action taken about this leads to his hospitalization. His subsequent transition to an inpatient and finally to an expatient status is dependent on a number of career contingencies which include his socioeconomic status, the visibility of his offence and also organizational factors such as his proximity to a mental hospital and the type of facilities available.

Goffman's "career contingencies" correspond closely to the guiding principles which Matza suggests govern the decisions and dispositions of the juvenile court.⁵ Some of these principles, for example, the "principle of offence" refer to properties of the deviance, but others, for example, the doctrines of parental sponsorship and residential mobility, are perfect

4. Goffman, (1961), op.cit., pp. 127 - 169.

5. Matza, op.cit., pp. 125 - 135.

examples of the way in which organizational factors become career contingencies. Matza is suggesting that behind the mystique of individualized justice, the delinquent's career is really being channelled by such bureaucratic principles.

Both Goffman's and Matza's perspectives on the control system conform to a conception of deviance, as behaviour organizationally processed as deviant.⁶ Matza's view is preferable, in that he allows the deviant to see what is happening to him; his delinquent is not the passive victim of an organized conspiracy which Goffman's mental patient sometimes resembles. Indeed, it is the crux of Matza's argument that it is the delinquent's very perception of what is happening to him that provides him with the motivation to continue his career. The delinquent learns the rationalizations - the conditions permissive to "drift" - from the very system controlling him.

Scheff's theory of mental illness as partly a social role in which societal reaction is a crucial determinant of entry into and perpetuation of, is supplemented by two studies of official decision-making procedures. The first deals with the legal and psychiatric screening of persons alleged to be mentally ill before they are hospitalized, and the second, the decision to release patients from hospitals. Both studies lend support to his major argument that "at the present time, the variables that afford the best understanding and prediction of the course of 'mental illness' are not the refined etiological and nosological features of the illness, but gross features of the community and legal and psychiatric procedures".⁷ These "gross features" correspond to Goffman's career contingencies and include such factors as the mental health official's diagnostic presumptions (e.g. "when in doubt, diagnose illness"), automatic work-load procedures and the number of hospital beds available.

6. See Kitsuse and Cicourel, op.cit.

7. Scheff, op.cit., p. 29.

Like Goffman, Scheff does not consider explicitly how the deviant perceives these contingencies. This issue falls under the second group of questions proposed and will also not be dealt with in the present research. In other words, we are asking "what effects the workings of the control system?" before asking "how are these workings seen by the deviant and how do they effect him?" The first of these research tasks can be accommodated within a descriptive study such as the present one, while the second would need, in addition, a longitudinal or experimental design.

Having narrowed down the area of interest of the survey, we will now suggest directions for research, concentrating specifically on juvenile delinquency rather than the abstract field of deviance.

The considerations which agents in the delinquency control system take into account or are exposed to, with or without their awareness, are not different in form to the rationalizations and reasons behind decisions and actions in any bureaucracy. These consist of a mixture of statutory laws, principles (often mystifications), precedent, tradition, intuition and prejudice. Few of these reasons are made explicit, and many control agents - particularly those who have absorbed the social work ideology - are prone to the judgment that "every case is different". Consequently, it is virtually impossible to unravel every variable that effects decisions - in that sense social workers are right when they say that "everything matters". The following list represents a loose, and by no means exhaustive, classification of the more important types of variables that might be involved in regulating the flow in the delinquency control system:-

(1) The nature of the delinquent: information about the delinquent himself constitutes the most obvious set of variables, and the one which positivist criminology has concentrated on to the virtual exclusion of all others. If one accepts Matza's assumption, the permeation of the

psychiatric and social work ideologies into the administration of juvenile justice has led to a situation in which the nature of the delinquent is held to be the sole, actual and desirable basis for disposition. We need empirical research to validate this assumption and - more important - the crucial part of Matza's argument, which is that this ideology is a mystification and that the real bases for dispositions are quite different. In any event, we would like to know to what extent factors such as the delinquent's socioeconomic class, family background, personality, etc., are, in fact, taken into account.

(2) The nature of the delinquent act: information about the offence itself was the bulwark of the classical view. It is obvious that, despite the inroads of the positivist revolution, the principle of offence still remains a major factor in the workings of the control system. Information about the nature of the offence other than the variable of severity (the "punishment fits the crime" principle) is also important. Such variables include those discussed with reference to vandalism: visibility of the offence, information about the offence, extent of the offence type, etc.

(3) The control agent's conception of delinquency: this is perhaps the least explicit set of variables which may effect the flow through the system. Yet these variables are crucial: before the control agent can act, he must define the situation and this definition in turn depends upon his conception of the problem. He not only categorizes the child as delinquent or non-delinquent but draws upon his own attitudes and beliefs to further label the offender or the offences. Thus, the child may be "disturbed", "a spoilt brat" or "just a thug"; his action may be "just high spirits", "deliberately vicious" or "a symbolic attempt to be recognized". Such definitions, as Cohen and Short point out, involve interpretations and diagnoses, and, hence, aetiological assumptions which the control agent is often unaware of.⁸

8. Cohen and Short, op.cit., p. 120.

These conceptions and attitudes may be divided into four main types:-

- (a) General orientation to the problem of delinquency (for example, is it perceived as a threat?);
- (b) Ideas about the causes of delinquency;
- (c) Image of the "typical" delinquent;
- (d) Ideas about how to deal with the problem, including ideas about prevention, treatment or punishment.

(4) Other characteristics of the control agent: under this heading would fall the range of factors which indirectly effect the control agent's handling of the individual delinquent or effect his conceptions of delinquency. Hypotheses about the precise effects of these characteristics could be derived from the general literature on the relationships between social class, personality, occupational membership, attitudes, etc.. These characteristics could be divided into three types:

- (a) formal sociological characteristics: age, sex, socioeconomic class (absolute and relative to the delinquent), recruitment, training and professional identification, etc;
- (b) attitudinal and personality factors: authoritarianism, dogmatism, political attitudes, etc.;
- (c) opinions on subjects connected with juvenile delinquency. Such opinions can potentially draw on a vaster range of connected subjects than can many other social issues. Although opinions on issues such as racial minorities and foreign policy are complex, they are specific in the sense that, while opinions on other areas may be functionally related (e.g. on the F-scale), they do not overtly overlap in terms of content. Juvenile delinquency, on the other hand, impinges on all sorts of subjects: "the break-up of the family", "working mothers", "the younger generation", etc.

(5) Characteristics of the Organization: these would include some of the variables under categories (3) and (4) to the extent that these are characteristics of the organization and not individual control agents. Each organization builds up a perspective on the delinquent and a fixed - often

rigid - set of rules governing how he should be handled. These include unwritten traditions and rationalizations - for example, on how to deal with the delinquent who shows a lack of respect to the control agent - which are taken for granted within the organization. They also include pressures such as the need to make a show of one's job to justify one's position. Organizational norms and attitudes to other agencies also govern whether the delinquent is handled by the agent confronting him, or whether he is passed on to a superior within the agency or else referred to another agency.

(6) Characteristics of the community outside the official control system: Cohen and Short have drawn attention to the fact that although dispositions might depend on strict legal requirement, within the legal framework and particularly at an early stage of the flow chart "... the question of who becomes involved in the legal machinery of the courts depends largely on community concern and community power structure."⁹ Under this heading would fall pressures placed on correctional agents by community leaders, government agencies, and the mass media.

In addition to these six sets of variables, there are the more general patterns in the societal reaction to deviance which transactional writers have identified and which are discussed elsewhere in the thesis. These include the tendency towards the attribution of spurious deviation, the influence of folklore and myths about the deviant, the differences in the quality of information about the deviant and the social distance between society and the deviant.

Research on the six variables is fragmentary and lacking a clear theoretical orientation. Studies on the penal system often over-simplify the workings of the flow chart by obscuring the difference between policy and administrative changes on the one hand and attitudinal changes on the other. They often take at face value the rhetoric which the system uses to

9. Ibid., p. 121.

justify itself. There is a need for further research on the simple descriptive level (for example, on the views of control agents about the causes of delinquency) as well as the analytical level: how does each variable effect the flow system and how is each related to the other? Inter-correlations of this sort could conceivably yield an information matrix which will predict how a particular agent (or agency) will react to a particular type of delinquent (or delinquent act). In exploratory research such as the present, it is obvious that not every one of these areas can be covered, even at the descriptive level. In the event, it was decided not to concentrate on any one area in depth, but rather to design the survey to explore as large a field as possible, indicating possible further lines of enquiry.

The Northview survey concentrates to some extent on the third group of variables, as this is perhaps the most neglected field of research.¹⁰ Most studies of the control system focus on the first and second group; for example, correlating length or type of sentence with type of offence or type of offender. Few of these studies deal with the other variables, the exception being certain studies of sentencing which take into account the nature of the community in which the court is located (i.e. the sixth set of variables).¹¹ There are virtually no such sentencing studies in this country, at least, on the juvenile courts.

At an important early stage of the flow system, the potential deviant's encounter with the police, a fairly substantial body of literature has been built up on the selection of the delinquent. Some recent studies of police encounters with juveniles deal explicitly with variables such as community characteristics and features of the delinquent other than his offence, which

10. Besides being relevant to questions about the control system, research on attitudes to delinquency could throw light on a totally neglected but important side issue: how successful have criminologists been in communicating their knowledge about delinquency to practitioners?

11. For example, R. Hood, Sentencing in Magistrates Courts, (London: Stevens and Sons, 1962).

effect initial selection and treatment;¹² other studies have focused on organizational traditions which govern the channelling of delinquents into the next stage of the system.¹³ One important such tradition - which Scheff calls "typification in diagnosis" - concerns the control agents' stereotype of the "typical" or "normal" offender.¹⁴ One study, unique of its kind, deals with a single case of law enforcement in a small community and actually chronicles the stages through which the police and other community agencies identified and labelled a particular individual as criminal.¹⁵

Such studies on contingencies effecting the official response to the delinquent are all extremely relevant. It is difficult, however, to find material exactly comparable to the present survey, especially on the third set of variables, control agents' attitudes. Few studies deal with the attitudes - as opposed to the policies - of individual agents and fewer still compare the attitudes of different agents along the same dimensions.¹⁶ Dienstein¹⁷ and Dearing and Capozzola¹⁸ have reported very small-scale studies comparing the beliefs about delinquency held by selected groups of control

-
12. For example, I. Piliavin and S. Briar, "Police Encounters with Juveniles," American Journal of Sociology, 70 (1964), pp. 206 - 214 and Werthman and Piliavin, op.cit.
 13. For example, J.H. Skolnick and J.R. Woodworth, "Bureaucracy, Information and Social Control," "A Study of a Morals Detail," in Bordua, op.cit., pp. 99 - 136.
 14. See D. Sudnow, "Normal Crimes: Sociological Features of the Penal Code in a Public Defenders Office," Social Problems, 12 (Winter 1965), pp. 255 - 276.
 15. W.J. Chambliss and J.T. Liell, "The Legal Process in the Community Setting," Crime and Delinquency, 12 (October 1966), pp. 310 - 317. Their conclusion, using this case study method is that "... organizational considerations ... determine who is defined by the community as a deviant." (p. 317)
 16. After the Northview research was completed, Wheeler's collection of papers - including studies on the police, child guidance clinics and streetcorner workers - appeared. One study, on ideologies of different control agents, is directly comparable: S. Wheeler et al, "Agents of Delinquency Control: A Comparative Analysis," in S. Wheeler (Ed.), Controlling Delinquents, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1968).
 17. W. Dienstein, "Interprofessional Defferences in Beliefs about Juvenile Delinquency," J. Crim. Law., Criminol. and Pol. Sci., 51 (1960)pp. 79-80.
 18. K. Dearing and T. Capozzola, A Survey of Professional Opinions on Juvenile Delinquency (Mimeograph, Dept. of Institutions, State of Colorado; undated).

agents. In this country, Eppel and Eppel have surveyed the views of "some adults in authority" (Probation Officers, Magistrates and Youth Leaders) on issues affecting young people in general.¹⁹ Findings from these studies - as well as some research on the general public's attitude to delinquency - will be cited where applicable.

Controllers, Caretakers and Entrepreneurs

Having specified the line of enquiry to be followed, we must now pay more attention to the type of group whose views are being surveyed. Although for certain purposes it is convenient to accept the provisional distinction made earlier between "official control agents" and others, it is not entirely satisfactory to include in this survey only the official control agents. For one thing, it is not as straightforward as it might appear to define this group operationally; certain groups, such as child care officers and other social workers, may only be involved peripherally in the control system. More important, other roles entirely outside the system are involved in regulating the flow of deviants. At an early stage, teachers, youth leaders and employers may be directly instrumental in starting the delinquent's career by defining and reporting his activities. At a later stage - for example, in giving evidence or submitting written reports to the court - they play a role in labelling the child and hence effecting his subsequent movement. A headmaster's report - say, that "Smith has always been a well-behaved boy whose parents have been co-operative and interested in his progress. I am sure this is an isolated incident ..., etc.." - is a crucial career contingency. At the terminal points of the flow chart - for example, at what is called "after-care" - employers may also play a crucial role.

In a sense, then, anyone who comes into contact with the potential or "actual" delinquent and knows or does something about this, is involved in the control system. He defines, accepts and perpetuates the delinquent

19. E.M. and M. Eppel, Adolescents and Morality, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966), Chap. 2.

role. Cohen and Short define this group as "non-official correctional agents":²⁰

Anybody outside the formal official correctional system who 'sizes up' another person thought to have committed a delinquent act, who defines the situation and then does something about it (sends him to the principal's office, calls the police, advises parents to take the boy to a child guidance clinic) is making a correctional decision.

For research purposes, this definition of "non-official correctional agents" has little operational value. It is clear, however, that within the framework suggested so far, there are grounds for studying the views of groups other than official control agents. Most transactional writers have attempted - usually in passing - to classify the group whose views are of importance in the processing of deviants. They have all distinguished groups who are somehow controllers - in Lorber's rather vague definition: "the formal and informal agents of social control who ferret out, define and do something about a certain kind of activity."²¹ These classifications are different, because each focuses on a different control function, but they overlap and include similar groups of people.

Goffman talks about the mental patient's perception of a "betrayal funnel", made up of "the circuit of agents and agencies that participate fatefully in his passage from civilian to patient status."²² These agent roles include the patient's next of kin or members of the public who might act as complainants, and also a group of mediators: "the sequence of agents and agencies to which the prepatient is referred and through which he is relayed and processed on his way to the hospital."²³ These include police, clergy, G.P's, lawyers, social workers and teachers, who are then succeeded by the staff of the hospital. Matza pays attention to a similar group,

20. Cohen and Short, op.cit., p. 122.

21. J. Lorber, "Deviance as Performance: The Case of Illness," Social Problems, 14 (Winter 1967), p. 302.

22. Goffman, (1961), op.cit., p. 135.

23. Ibid., p. 136.

although he is less concerned with the unofficial mediators outside the system, than with the officials who man the system into which the delinquent comes into sporadic contact. Matza's system though, includes representatives of the school, social work and the ministry, as well as the police and the courts. These are people who "... have a community licence to sit in judgment."²⁴ Elsewhere, Matza refers to them as "overseers"²⁵, and notes an interesting characteristic of this group; with the exception of judges, they are all marginal professions, e.g., teachers and social workers.

Becker, whose interest is in the general process whereby rules are generated and enforced, distinguishes a somewhat different dimension of social control: that of moral enterprise.²⁶ Of his two related species of moral entrepreneurs, rule creators and rule enforcers, it is the second which interest us most and correspond closest to the controllers and overseers. These enforcers are the professionals and officials who run the organizations set up to ensure that the rules are obeyed. Unlike the rule creator - or 'moral crusader' - the enforcer may have little stake in the content of the rule. The way in which he enforces the rule - and he is usually given a great deal of discretion in this - depends on professional and organizational factors, priorities built up in response to the work situation. Becker sees the official's enforcement activity being conditioned by two interests: "first, he must justify the existence of his position and, second, he must win the respect of those he deals with."²⁷ In any event, there is a selective process whereby the label of deviant may be affixed to a person for reasons extraneous to his behaviour. It should be noted that these enforcers are important not only for their day-to-day work in the control system, but for their crucial role is disseminating the images and

24. Matza, op.cit., p. 137.

25. Ibid., p. 139.

26. Becker, (1963), op.cit., Chap. 8.

27. Ibid., p. 156.

stereotypes which affect control decisions made by others. As will be seen in regard to the Mods and Rockers, for example, public statements made by magistrates lay the basis for subsequent labelling processes.

Leaving aside now the transactional perspective, we find, in four entirely different areas of interest, paths which point to the existence of a group somewhat similar to the controllers. The first is the applied interest in delinquency prevention. The bulk of sociological work on delinquency, where it makes practical proposals at all, advocates a community-directed approach to the problem, as opposed to changes at the psychological or familial levels. This would be one logical extension of a line of theory stretching from the early Chicago school and the social disorganization and culture conflict approaches, to present opportunity structure theory. Although many sociologists are opposed to this type of "applied sociology" on the grounds that the real changes have to be made at the level of the macro-social system and that neighbourhood programmes merely leave the status quo intact, most would agree that these types of programmes (involving rehousing, changes in school curricula, job opportunity projects) are more promising than, say, psychological treatment schemes or Glueck-inspired programmes. Most theories, they accept, must lead them to such a conclusion.

In the present context, the importance of this conclusion is that success of any community programme must rest heavily on the shoulders of key people in the area. A policy cannot be imposed from above without the understanding and co-operation of the people responsible for carrying out decisions and transmitting information. This is one of the key tenets of community organization; a social work method not particularly popular in this country, perhaps because the word "community" carries pejorative American connotations of groupiness and togetherness. One must start where the community is - and this means knowing where it stands, in terms of attitudes, opinions and knowledge.

Martin and Fitzpatrick - in one of the few textbooks that pay any attention to this problem²⁸ - identify the type of groups that are important in the neighbourhood for the prevention and control of delinquency. These groups, for whom they use Gans' term external caretakers, include teachers, policemen, social workers, probation officers, youth leaders, psychiatrists. They are sent from the outside world to help, manage, treat and restrain people (usually poor) who are in trouble or who are likely to get into trouble. They watch over their clients and cases and represent the values and interests of the outside culture. They are to be distinguished from the internal caretakers, who also provide care and service but belong to the same culture as the local residents - relatives, peers, neighbours, local clergy, local shopkeepers, local politicians. Although both the internal and external caretakers are important from the community organization perspective, it is the view of the external caretakers - who correspond closely to our "controllers" and Matza's "overseers" - to which we will be paying more attention.

The second perspective is again an applied one, and derives from the opinion often expressed in social work in general and in regard to the social services for children and juveniles in particular, that progress is impeded by lack of communication, overlapping, or overt conflict between the various agencies working in the field. The conflict may not be a simple one between the so-called punitive approach on the one hand (as represented, say, by the police) and the "soft" social work approach on the other, but within the social work field itself. As anyone who has worked in this field would testify, social work is an institution riddled with vested interests, pressure groups and conflicting ideas about purpose and method. All this, combined with the amateur-professional dichotomy and the hierarchies created by differences in professional training, has made the goal of an integrated social service very distant. Communication between various agencies is often

28. J.M. Martin and J.P. Fitzpatrick, Delinquent Behaviour: A Redefinition of the Problem, (New York: Random House, 1964), pp. 96.

very low and it would seem relevant to find out just how much they are talking a common language and to what extent theoretical knowledge has permeated into their vocabulary and ideology. All control agents - particularly those belonging to the "helping and enabling" professions - base their actions on a more or less explicit set of assumptions about human behaviour. If a new ideology (e.g. sociological determinism) or policy (e.g. "family courts") runs counter to their own, changes within the system will be blocked and interagency conflict heightened.

From a case study of the fate of a delinquency prevention programme in one city, Miller has concluded that it is just these sorts of factors that impede any progress.²⁹ His description of the various delays, breakdowns, conflicts and final stalemate, over a period of six years, supports his thesis that for most of the agencies concerned with delinquency, the adoption of ideologies and policies which might reduce delinquency, would seriously threaten the institution's viability. Because of differences in institutional philosophies, "... a significant proportion of energy potentially directable to delinquency reduction is, instead, expended in conflict between institutions".³⁰ These conflicts, Miller suggests, are more important obstacles to successful programmes than lack of knowledge. Various areas of conflict which Miller identifies (e.g. differences in conceptions of the etiology of delinquency, of the disposition of the delinquent and of approach priority) will be covered in the Northview survey.

The third perspective from which the views of controllers are important, is that of subcultural theory, particularly in Cohen's formulation. A central argument in this theory is that the working class boy's perception and experience of the middle class morality and status system leads to a reaction formation. The delinquent response involves an inversion of an

29. W.B. Miller, "Inter-institutional Conflict as a Major Impediment to Delinquency Prevention," Human Organization, 17 (Fall 1958) pp. 20 - 23.

30. Ibid., p. 22. For further implications of this study, see W.B. Miller et al, "Delinquency Prevention and Organizational Relations," in Wheeler (Ed.), op.cit.

alienating and frustrating set of values. This value system is not experienced by the boy in abstract, but presented to him by representatives of the middle class world. Matza and others have justifiably criticized Cohen for identifying this value system with an oversimplified version of the Protestant ethic and it is also not always clear who these middle class representatives are. On one level, Cohen talks about the middle class norms being exemplified and applied by:

... what we shall loosely call "middle-class" in contrast to "working-class" people, that is by middle-class parents, teachers, social workers, ministers and church workers, by the adults sponsoring and managing settlement houses, Boy Scout troops, and other agencies for organized and supervised recreation, and, to a considerable extent, by middle-class children.³¹

Later on, though, Cohen talks about the norms of "people who run things in politics, business, religion and education" and of "the distinguished people who symbolize and represent the local and national communities with which the children identify."³²

It is clear that Cohen is talking about two different dimensions - the on-the-spot application and exemplification of middle class norms (particularly by the school, which Cohen pays the most attention to, and other controlling or caretaking agencies) and the more remote dimension of power, the people who run things at the policy level. Whichever dimension we focus on, however, an interesting set of theoretical questions appears: how do these people conceive of their function in relation to the group they are controlling and how do they perceive and explain behaviour which, if the theory is correct, is a direct threat and assault on their values?

A final perspective on the controllers is related to Cohen's dimension of power and middle class morality in the broadest sense. In Chapter 1, we saw that non-absolutist definitions of crime accounted for the fact that the

31. A.K. Cohen, (1955), op.cit., p. 86.

32. Ibid., pp. 86 - 87.

values protected in the criminal law were ultimately those of the dominant group in society. Vold presents the extreme formulation of this viewpoint, but Sutherland and Cressey also allow for the factor of power: the first element in their definition involves the protection of a value "which is appreciated by a group or part of a group which is politically important." Conceptions of crime and delinquency which ignore the dimension of power, but concentrate on community tolerance levels, also see that it is the tolerance level of certain sections of the community which is really important. Wilkins, for example, in his continuum of acts which have to be defined as good or bad by the community, represents the crucial cutting point as it may be perceived by "the normal middle-class citizen."³³

The groups concerned with this dimension of control, again overlap considerably: Wilkins' "normal middle-class citizens", Sutherland's "politically important" group, as well as Ranulf's "middle-class conscience"³⁴ and Becker's "rule creators" contain similar groups of people. For different reasons, it is relevant to find out something about the attitudes to delinquency of each of these groups.

The following chart summarizes this section by listing the various social control functions and agents identified, and giving examples of each category. The Northview sample will consist of a selection of some members of the community who perform one or more of these functions. Most groups in the sample fall into more than one category. Besides the criterion that they possess one or more of the characteristics identified, the selection of groups for the sample was dependent on their accessibility in Northview and the resources available for contacting them. The sampling method will be described below. Although we are interested in functions other than control (e.g. moral enterprise), the sample group will be referred to simply as controllers.

33. Wilkins, op.cit., p. 48.

34. S. Ranulf, Moral Indignation and Middle Class Psychology, (New York: Schocken Books, 1964). Ranulf more especially identifies the "dis-interested tendency to inflict punishment" as being strongest among the petit bourgeoisie or lower middle classes.

FUNCTION

GROUPS

EXAMPLES

1.	Formal Social Control. i.e. functionally specific roles within the official delinquency control system: punishment, treatment, allocation, formal labelling, placement.	Official Correctional Agents [Cohen and Short] Formal Controllers [Lorber] Rule Enforcers [Becker]	Police, magistrates, institutional personnel probation officers.
2.	Informal Social Control - "sizing up", ferreting out, defining, reporting, doing something about, identifying, judging, channelling, funelling.	Non-Official Correctional Agents [Cohen and Short] Informal Controllers [Lorber] Mediators [Goffman]	Teachers, headmasters, some social workers, youth leaders, ministers of religion, family doctors.
3.	Formal and Informal Control [i.e. combining above two categories]	Overseers [Matza] External Caretakers [Gans]	As in [1] and [2]
4.	Rule Creation, moral enterprise, protection of interests	Rule Creators [Becker] Politically important groups [Sutherland and Cressey]	Local and national politicians, members of high status profes- sions [e.g. law]
5.	Upholding, representing or exemplifying middle class morality	Middle Class [Cohen] Middle Class Conscience [Ranulf] Normal Middle Class Citizens [Wilkins]	High status business or professional groups, religious, educational leaders.

(1) Sample

The sampling universe of "controllers" is a subjectively defined category and has therefore no known size on which to base sampling fractions. It is equally impossible to allocate exact weightings to each of the occupational subgroups in the category. Consequently, a method such as proportionately stratified random sampling could not be applied. A mixed sampling method was used in which ten occupational groups were selected according to the criteria outlined earlier and individuals within the groups drawn randomly for the final sample (either directly or within further sub-classes). The ten original occupational groups consisted of six directly connected with the official delinquency control system or with young people in general (headmasters, magistrates, social workers including probation officers, youth workers and police) and four others (business leaders, local councillors, religious leaders and lawyers).

The area chosen for the survey was "Northview", part of one of the thirty-two London Boroughs created by the London Government Act. When the first pilot interviews were carried out (at the end of 1964) and when the sample was originally drawn, Northview was still a separate County Borough, and for purposes of the survey, this is the area on which generalizations are based. Although it is undergoing rapid development, Northview is a mainly residential area with a population of over 250,000. The Council has been "Ratepayer" controlled for many years and represented by Conservative members for virtually an unbroken period until a recent General Election, when a Labour member was elected in one constituency. The social class distribution tends to be slightly skewed towards the upper end of the scale. The crime and delinquency patterns are not very different from those in areas of comparable size and social characteristics. The delinquency rate has increased steadily since 1955, and in 1964 the rate of Delinquency plus Care or Protection Cases stood at 16 per 1,000 of the school population.

Although other incidental information about Northview will be given, it is difficult to give more details without revealing the area's identity. With the exception of political and socio-economic characteristics (which might be evident among the magistrates and councillors) the sample would appear to be representative of controllers elsewhere in the country. Given the deficiencies of the sampling method, though, and the limitation of the sample size by the fact that all interviews were done by one person, generalizations from the results should be made with caution.

Of the ten groups originally selected for the sample, one of the most important, the police, could not be included because of a refusal to co-operate.³⁵ The response rate for another group - councillors - was so low that although they are included in the final sample, their numbers are too low for meaningful comparisons between occupational groups. These councillors who are also magistrates are included in the magistrates group. Table 16 shows the numbers interviewed in the final sample. In presenting the survey findings, members of the groups will be identified by the code letter indicated in the Table and by a number indicating the order in which they were interviewed; thus, "M.9" would be the ninth magistrate interviewed.

The overall response rate of 72.3% (nearly 80% if the group of councillors are left out) is considerably higher than that obtained in surveys on a similar population, as might be expected from the fact that these surveys used a mailed questionnaire. Dearing and Capozzola report a response rate of 53% from a sample of police, social workers and judges in Colorado;³⁶ Eppel and Eppel from a group of all London Juvenile Court Magistrates, Probation Officers and members of two major organizations of

35. In a letter from the Home Office Research Unit - to whom the original request for permission to contact some police officers in Northview was made - I was informed that the Commissioner of Police at New Scotland Yard felt that "the demand on the time of policemen would be too great." (sic)

36. Dearing and Capozzola, op.cit.

Youth Leaders, the incredibly low response of 23.0%³⁷ and Musgrove, surveying the views on adolescents of a general group of adults in a Midland town, a 32.4% response.³⁸

TABLE 16

Numbers and Occupational Group in Northview Sample

<u>Group</u>	<u>No. Written to or approached</u>	<u>No Reply</u>	<u>Refusal</u>	<u>Final No. Interviewed</u>
Businessmen (B)	14	1	1	12
Councillors (C)	18	12	3	3
Doctors (D)	22	10	2	10
Headmasters (H)	25	1	1	23
Lawyers (L)	20	4	3	13
Magistrates (M)	17)	-	4)	13)
Magistrates and Councillors (MC)	7) 24	-	1) 5	6) 19
Ministers of Religion (R)	20	5	2	13
Social Workers (S)	22	-	-	22
Youth Workers (Y)	19	1	-	18
Total	184	34	17	133

The following paragraphs indicate briefly the way in which individuals were selected for each group and the composition of the groups in the final sample:-

Businessmen: Names selected randomly from a list of Officers of the Northview Chamber of Commerce and another list (supplied by the Secretary

37. Eppel and Eppel, op.cit., p. 32.

38. F. Musgrove, Youth and the Social Order, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964), p. 100.

of the Chamber of Commerce) of firms who employ large numbers of young people. Final group of 12 included 8 Managing Directors, 3 Personnel Managers and 1 Welfare Officer.

Councillors (including Councillors who are also Magistrates): Names selected randomly from lists of Councillors on the Children's, Health and Welfare, and Educational Committees. Of the 9 in the final sample, 5 were Conservative and 4 Labour.

Doctors: (i) 3 names selected randomly from list of Assistant Medical Officers of Health and School Medical Officers. All 3 in final sample. (ii) 19 names of G.P's selected from local N.H.S. Executive Council list by controlling roughly for socio-economic characteristics of area of practice; 7 of these in final sample, 3 from largely middle class areas.

Headmasters: All names selected randomly from list provided by Chief Education Officer, controlling for type of school and socio-economic characteristics of area. Final group of 23 included 10 Primary School Headmasters and 13 Secondary School (3 Grammar, Voluntary Aided or Maintained; 2 Secondary Technical; 8 Secondary Modern).

Lawyers: (i) 14 Solicitors drawn randomly from names in the Law List, 1964, as members of the Law Society, practising in Northview: 8 of these in final sample. (ii) 6 Barristers selected randomly from list given by Clerk of the Peace for the local Commission Area, of Barristers active in the area: 5 of these in final sample.

Magistrates: (i) 17 names selected randomly from a list given by the Clerk to the Justices. Of the 13 in the final sample, 7 were on the Juvenile Panel. (ii) 7 names selected randomly as in C. Of the 6 in the final sample, 4 were on the Juvenile Panel.

Religious Leaders: Names selected randomly from a list of religious organizations in Northview compiled by the Central Library. Controlling for denominations, the final sample of 13 was made up of Church of England(6);

Roman Catholic (2); Methodist (3); Baptist (1); Salvation Army (1).

Social Workers: This is the most heterogeneous of the groups and attempts to generalize from the group as a whole should be made with great caution. Some members of the group, such as Health Visitors, while performing social work functions, do not identify with professional social workers; some groups, such as N.S.P.C.C. Officers, are over-represented and others, particularly Child Care Officers, under-represented. Subdividing the group according to types of agencies, the 22 in the final sample consisted of:- Social Worker in Guild of Social Service (1); Social Workers in Association of Moral Welfare (2); Child Care Officers (2); N.S.P.C.C. Officers (3); Health Visitors (4); Probation Officers (4); Mental Welfare Officers (3); Social Workers in Health Department, including psychiatric social workers (3).

Youth Workers: This is again a heterogeneous group containing full-time professionals and part-time amateurs, Boys Brigade Leaders and the Manager of a teenage coffee bar/club. Their only unifying factor is frequent contact with young people in leisure settings and some measure of authority over them. Using random selection with each sub-type, the final sample of 18 consisted of the following:- coffee bar/club manager (1); Youth Employment Officers (2); Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. leaders (2); Boy Scout Leaders (2); Boys' Brigade Leaders (4); Other Voluntary Club Leaders (4); Full-time Professional Leaders employed by Local Authority (3). The formal sociological characteristics of the sample are summarized in Table 17. Other characteristics of the controllers (for example, self-perception, relationship with other agents, degree of community participation) will be discussed when presenting the findings.

(2) Methods of Data Collection

The main data-collecting instrument was a schedule (reproduced in full in Appendix F) administered to each respondent in a personal interview. All respondents were first contacted by letter, a standard form of which is reproduced in Appendix G, and interviews were carried out in their home

TABLE 17Social Characteristics of Northview Sample

1. <u>Sex</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Male	109)	81.9
Female	24)133	18.1
<hr/>		
2. <u>Age</u>		
20 - 29	7)	5.3
30 - 39	23)	17.3
40 - 49	37)133	27.8
50 - 59	44)	33.1
60+	22)	16.5
<hr/>		
3. <u>Marital Status</u>		
Married	109)	81.2
Single	20)133	15.0
Other (Div./Wid./Sep.)	4)	3.8
<hr/>		
4. <u>Number of Children</u>		
None	15)	11.3
One	23)	17.3
Two	46)133	34.6
Three	25)	18.8
Four +	4)	3.0
Not Applicable	20)	15.0
<hr/>		
5. <u>Full-time Occupation of</u> <u>'Voluntary' Controllers*</u>		
Not Applicable	98)	73.7
Professional	19)	14.3
Middle-Class, Non-Professional	11)133	8.3
Skilled Working Class	5)	3.7
Unskilled Working Class	-)	-
<hr/>		
6. <u>Father's Occupation</u>		
Professional	46)	34.6
Middle Class, Non-Professional	43)	32.3
Skilled Working Class	23)133	17.3
Unskilled Working Class	10)	7.5
No Reply, Don't Know	11)	8.3
<hr/>		
7. <u>Socio-Economic Status of Respondent</u> <u>and Father Compared</u>		
Same	65)	48.9
Respondent Higher	55)133	41.3
Respondent Lower	2)	1.5
No Reply, Don't Know	11)	8.3

* Includes:- (Magistrates, Councillors and Voluntary Youth Workers).

or place of work.³⁹ The length of interviews ranged from thirty-five minutes to two-and-a-half hours, but the average was fairly consistent at about eighty minutes. Some pilot interviews, as well as four interviews in the main sample, were tape-recorded; in all other cases responses were recorded verbatim in "Speedwriting".

Various sections of the questionnaire were pre-tested and then discussed with a group of nineteen trainee Probation Officers and another group of eleven W.E.A. students (all middle class). The full questionnaire was piloted in Northview on the Principal Probation Officer, the Youth Service Organizer, the Youth Employment Officer, the Secretary of a large Youth Organization (who was also a Juvenile Court magistrate), an Education Officer from the Health Department and three Head Teachers. Data from some of these interviews, (identified by the Code X.1, X.2, etc.), will be used for qualitative purposes.

The schedule was designed to yield intensive and qualitative rather than quantitative data and to cover several content areas rather than one. The questions were mixed in form, consisting of open-ended questions with probes, multiple choice questions and scaling techniques. Although the interviews were not entirely non-directive - forced choice questions, for example, were always asked in standardized form - they were carried out with some flexibility, and correspond closest to a "focused interview". In certain areas, for example, relating to the respondent's own handling of delinquency, the questions were different for each occupational group. Each

39. The incidental advantage of interviewing respondents such as youth leaders and headmasters in their work situation was being able to occasionally observe the gap between views expressed and actual practice - an advantage not very consoling to the positivist who believes in "hard" survey data. Not only views, but even "facts" were contradicted. A Headmaster (X.6) had just finished telling the interviewer that he had never had any trouble in the school with vandalism, even things like writing dirty words on the black-boards or lavatory wall were almost unheard of, when his secretary walked in to announce that some boys were throwing stones at the headmaster's car. Another subsequent chance encounter with someone knowing the area confirmed that vandalism of various sorts was common in this school.

group had their own particular involvement with the subject matter and the questions had to be modified accordingly. As this is an exploratory study, the aim throughout the data collection and analysis was to obtain the maximum possible amount of material "around" the subject. If new issues were raised during the interview, these were followed up even if it was known that they would not yield comparative data.

The content of the questions derives directly from the theoretical issues discussed earlier. (A number of items in Question 7, as well as the format of Questions 13 and 14, were taken, with some modifications, from an interview schedule used by Stanton Wheeler in an uncompleted survey of control agents)⁴⁰ The following are the nine main content areas:

1. Orientation to youth - how are young people in general perceived; what communication difficulties exist with them; what problems are they thought to have (Questions 1 - 3).
2. General orientation to delinquency - in what terms is delinquency perceived; what types are perceived to have increased; how is the problem to be handled (Questions 4, 5).
3. Ideas about causation - what are perceived to be the most important causes of delinquency (Questions 6, 7).
4. Images of delinquent - are all delinquents thought to be alike; what is the image of the "typical" delinquent (Question 8).
5. Attitude to Mods and Rockers - initial reaction to this behaviour as a type of delinquency; how it is perceived; what specific methods of control and prevention are favoured; (Questions 8 - 12).
6. Reaction to different types of delinquency - perception of individual delinquent acts in terms of their seriousness, the degree of their determination by psychological or social factors and their appropriate treatment (Question 13).
7. Factors affecting decision-making - what factors influence decisions by controllers (Question 14).

40. The aims of the survey were originally described in Current Projects in the Prevention, Control and Treatment of Delinquency (Spring 1962), p. 473. A copy of the schedule was obtained when the Northview interviews were being planned. I am grateful to Dr. Wheeler for sending this to me and for giving permission to adapt two of the questions. Some of the results of his research on a sample of police, judges and probation officers have now been published in Wheeler et al, op.cit.

8. Ideas about control and prevention - opinions about the Juvenile Court; favoured types of prevention and attitudes to various preventive agencies (youth clubs, schools, psychiatry) or preventive methods (prediction) (Questions 15 - 17).

9. Attitude to community control - respondent's own perceived role in regard to delinquency control; relationship with other agencies (Question 19).

In addition to the 133 formal interviews, advantage was taken of other contacts, made during the survey, to discuss some of the questions. Such contacts included groups of teachers met informally in staff rooms and colleagues of social workers and youth leaders. In addition, a file was kept from both local weekly newspapers for the year 1965, covering items involving members of the sample or other controllers. Such items included reports on the meetings of relevant Council sub-committees, speeches on prize-giving days by headmasters, sermons by ministers and statements from the bench by magistrates. Although this is difficult for reasons of confidentiality, future studies might find it interesting to compare views expressed in the "situation of interview" and in public. Other documentary sources consulted were the minutes of Council meetings and annual reports of the Principal Probation Officer, the Clerk of the Justices and various social work agencies.

(3) Methods of Analysis

Three methods of analysis are possible:- (i) the total distribution of responses on each question; (ii) inter-interview comparisons (i.e. correlations between responses and variables such as occupation, age, sex, social class, etc.) and (iii) intra-interview comparisons (i.e. what responses tend to correlate with each other). The main method used will be the first type; the cells are too small to make many correlations - particularly in the second type - very meaningful. In the absence of such statistically meaningful correlations, some inferences will be made about possible patterns of the second and third type.

CHAPTER 8ATTITUDES TO YOUTH

This chapter covers the responses to those questions (Section A of the Schedule, Numbers 1 - 3) on the controllers' opinions and attitudes about young people in general. This area is important because we might expect stereotypes about young people and attitudes to the "younger generation" to effect how deviance in this group is handled. Members of the sample such as headmasters and youth leaders, are in daily contact with young people, and the way they perceive their charges is difficult to separate from their perception and handling of delinquency. There is not only the general halo effect by which adolescence and delinquency tend to be perceived by adults as being parts of the same problem, but also possible specific effects such as that of social distance between the controller and the deviant.

These questions are directed at finding out how these adults feel about young people: do they evaluate them positively or negatively? Can they communicate with them? Do they understand their problems? Although there is much polemic and speculation about these questions, there is almost no empirical evidence.

General Orientation

Question 1 deals with the overall feeling tone towards young people. It was found in pilot interviews that a straightforward question like "what do you think about young people today?" was less valuable than asking the respondent how he thought young people today had changed from the previous generation. Probes were then directed at establishing what he felt about any such changes. The replies were long and complex, but could be divided, as shown in Table 18, into six clear categories: two negative, two positive or sympathetic and two neutral.

TABLE 18

Evaluation of Changes in Young People

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Percentage of Responses*</u>
1. Negative Internal	33	24.8
2. Negative External	33	24.8
3. Positive Internal	11	8.3
4. External Pressures	14	10.5
5. Neutral	30	22.6
6. No Change	12	9.0
	<u>133</u>	<u>100.0</u>

* Unless otherwise stated, all percentages are correct to one decimal place.

In the first category - Negative Internal - respondents perceived real negative changes within young people. They did not mention environmental changes; the beast itself had become worse. Young people today were more aggressive, arrogant, demanding, immoral, anti-authority. The tone of the more moderate of these replies was simply unsympathetic, the extremes were overtly hostile, punitive and rejecting. There was no question among these respondents of the reality of their perceptions: "These things are not value judgments, they're facts" (L.9, a barrister). The changes that were found objectionable varied, but the general tone of disapproval was constant:

They're a bloody menace; this is a sweeping statement, but I'll stick to it ... They're aggressive, dogmatic, would-be superior. They've got their own damn teenage world, a large spending capacity and everyone laying it on for them. (D.1)

They are quite uncontrolled ... they do what they like ... I think they are going mad . (M.1)

Up to ten years ago you wouldn't see them going round with unkempt hair, deliberately untidy appearance, wearing odd trousers and jackets ... all this is spreading. (H.6)

Their sense of values have deteriorated, loyalty to the school is dropping, their manners are deteriorating. (H.17)

We are all falling over backwards to help them express themselves, but they've got nothing to express ... They are completely aimless and aggressive ... they have so much money that their values and standards have just fallen and they worship the God of Mammon (sic). (H.23)

The same proportion of replies fall into the second category, Negative External. Their tone was equally disapproving, but focused on changes that had occurred outside the individual. These changes were either negative in themselves (less family discipline, "coddling by the Welfare State") or neutral (affluence, more leisure time), but the results were the same: objectionable attributes. The theme was one we will come across again: the swing of the pendulum. Things had loosened up so much these days, that people will soon start to realize that we must restore to society a sense of discipline and authority. There is now no sense of purpose, no moral standards, no outlets, the young are in a void. Many of these respondents drew attention to the greater affluence and leisure of the young, to the absence of national service ("If you take the war away there's no moral restraint, no discipline" - B.7) and to the role of the government in taking away authority (usually defined as the right to administer corporal punishment) from policemen and teachers ("It comes from the top, from the government" - R.12). These respondents were impatient with attempts to sympathize with young people's efforts to cope with these external changes:

They use this excuse about the Bomb, and there being no more future any more and therefore one should be able to do what one likes. But this is all a load of baloney. (C.3)

The small number of respondents in the Positive Internal category saw only changes which they approved of: young people today were more self-assured, mature, idealistic, tolerant and sophisticated. Changes which the first two groups had disapproved of - like fewer inhibitions, less respect for authority - were accepted or welcomed.

The fourth, again, small group of respondents (14), in the External Pressure category, replied in terms closest to the conventional sociological stereotype of adolescents. The dominant feeling tone is sympathetic - if not as unambiguously favourable as the previous category - and is the polar opposite of the Negative External category, in that the changes perceived are not only seen as resulting in new problems for young people, but are

conceived of as increases in pressures, rather than releases of restraint. The pressures mentioned are those of commercial exploitation, adult rejection, uncertainty of status, and the anxiety problems created by an other-directed society. Most responses implied that in the face of such pressures one would be justified in expecting more adolescent problems than there were:

There's new pressures on them and so much more is expected of them ... there's more confusion ... it's so much tougher to live ... I am amazed by the depth of thought some youngsters show. (H.2)

The respondents in the Neutral category tried to strike what they saw as a realistic balance. Although they mentioned the same attributes listed in the Negative and Positive categories, these cancelled each other out, and were not expressed in the context of an explicit value judgment. The supposedly greater freedom and money that young people have, were changes seen to have negative and positive consequences. One Secondary School Headmaster (H.19), for example, welcomed some changes in regard to attitudes to authority:

They want to know why in regard to authority - the old sergeant major approach just doesn't work, one must reason with them. They respect someone who they believe has earned their respect, not just out of the authority of his position.

On the other hand, he was worried that greater affluence had made young people too materialistic and cynical. The final category of 12 respondents refused to be drawn into generalizations about young people or were adamant that there had been no real changes. Superficialities, such as fashion, had changed, but "underneath" young people were the same. The emotional tone of these replies was neutral.

Combining categories 1 and 2, it can be seen that almost exactly half of the sample (49.6%) evaluated young people negatively. This proportion was fairly evenly distributed among the occupational groups, with the exception of the Businessmen (83.3%) and the Lawyers (54.0%) who were above the mean, and the Religious Leaders (40.8%) and Youth Workers (33.4%) who were below it.

There was a slight, but not statistically significant¹ tendency for the two negative categories to be used by a larger proportion (60.5%) of the respondents of working class origins.² The effect of social class - which cannot properly be measured in a sample as unrepresentative as the present one - is more apparent, as Table 19 shows, in regard to social mobility. The tendency for upwardly mobile respondents to evaluate young people more negatively is significant at the 10.0% level.

TABLE 19
Evaluation of Young People According to Respondents'
Social Mobility

<u>Evaluation</u>	<u>Mobility</u>	
	<u>Upward</u> <u>(N = 55)</u> <u>%</u>	<u>Same</u> <u>(N = 65)</u> <u>%</u>
Negative (Categories 1 and 2)	56.5	46.2
Positive (Categories 3 and 4)	22.0	15.4
Neutral (Categories 5 and 6)	22.5	38.5

As might be expected, evaluation of young people is affected by the adult's age. Table 20 shows a clear tendency for negative attitudes to increase with the respondent's age, although the 20 - 29 age group is too small to permit any generalizations and the 30 - 39 group is an odd exception, being more negative than the 40 - 49 and the 50 - 59 groups. Within the sample at least, the age factor alone is not a clear predictor of attitudes to young people, although the fact that nearly 80% of the 60+ respond negatively is striking.

1. In most cross tabulations that could be done, cells were too small for the calculation of Chi-squares and other tests of significance. Rough tests of significance were obtained by using the Zubin monograph as recalculated by Oppenheim. See A.N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement, (London: Heinemann, 1966) Appendix III.
2. As the number of respondents from Unskilled Working Class backgrounds was so small (see Table 17) the two working class categories are combined for purposes of analysis.

TABLE 20

Evaluation of Young People According to Respondent's Age

<u>Evaluation</u>	<u>Age Group</u>				
	<u>20-29</u>	<u>30-39</u>	<u>40-49</u>	<u>50-59</u>	<u>60+</u>
	<u>(N=7)</u>	<u>(N=23)</u>	<u>(N=37)</u>	<u>(N=44)</u>	<u>(N=22)</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Negative	28.5	56.6	35.2	47.9	77.3
Positive	14.3	21.7	18.9	22.6	9.1
Neutral	57.2	21.7	45.9	29.5	13.6

The content of the changes - as opposed to the tone - can be roughly indicated by listing the specific traits mentioned (Table 21). This list must be treated with caution for two reasons: firstly, the attributes were mentioned in response to an open-ended question and different frequencies would obviously have been obtained if each attribute were presented to the respondent to agree or disagree with. Secondly, the attributes are really only meaningful in the context in which they were discussed. The attribute of self-expression, for example, was not always welcomed:

Their greatest desire seems to be for self-expression, but they have no regard for the quality of the self that is being expressed. (R.9)

This list could best be regarded, then, as a "projective" response, and the question might more usefully be asked in future research by including these items as part of a check-list.

Communication

The issue of intergenerational communication warrants special attention because of its importance in both popular and scientific writing on the subject of adolescence. The conventional view - held by Sunday Colour Supplement writers and professional sociologists³ alike - is that the older generation cannot understand or communicate with the younger

3. For a stereotypical example, see J.B. Mays, The Young Pretenders, (London: Michael Joseph, 1965) especially p. 167.

TABLE 21Ways in which Young People Today are Thought to have Changed from
the Previous Generation

less respect for authority	45
more free from control; less disciplined	44
more affluent	42
lower standard of morality	21
more self-reliant, independent	17
more mature	15
more spoon-fed, expecting others to do things for them	15
more sexually promiscuous	8
more dishonest	8
less inhibited	8
more living in the present, immediate gratification	6
more irresponsible	6
less respect for property	5
more greedy for money, materialistic	5
more self-assured; healthier physically; less care for own appearance; more influenced by own group; greater need for self-expression; more exhibitionist; publicity) conscious.	4 each
more selfish; more aggressive; more demanding; more insecure; more articulate; less able to concentrate.	3 each
less considerate; more sophisticated; more purpose- less; drifting; more distrustful of hypocrisy; longer hair.	2 each
more cynical; more responsible; more idealistic; less value on money; less polite; more pleasant; more dogmatic; more guilt feelings; more ambitious; more inflated idea of own importance; worse handwriting; more tolerant; more noble; more honest with them- selves; worse manners; more adventurous; more searching for identity.	1 each

and that this gap in communication is steadily widening. It is also assumed, as a corollary, that this gap restricts adults' ability to tolerate adolescent misbehaviour. How true is this stereotype of the intergenerational gap and how aware are our respondents of it?

It was clear from the pilot survey, that there are two dimensions to this awareness: firstly, does the controller in his own social role as youth worker, teacher or parent, experience difficulty in communication? And, secondly, how aware is he of communication as being a general "social problem"? The question was first asked in terms of the respondent's own role and work situation and then in regard to the general issue. Combining these two dimensions, the responses could easily be coded into the four logical categories as shown in Table 22 (a). Table 22 (b) indicates the frequency of responses along each of the two dimensions separately.

TABLE 22 (a)

Awareness of Communication as a Personal Problem and as a General Social Problem

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. No problem for self; unaware of social problem.	26	19.5
2. No problem for self, but aware of social problem.	39	29.3
3. Problem for self and aware of social problem.	53	39.9
4. Problem for self but unaware of social problem.	5	3.8
5. Don't know, can't generalize.	<u>10</u>	<u>7.5</u>
	133	100.0

TABLE 22 (b)

	<u>Problem</u>	<u>No Problem</u>
Self	43.7%	48.8%
Others	69.2%	23.3%

Nearly half the sample, then, were not aware of communication with young people as being a problem for themselves. For those who also did not see it as a social problem (Category 1), the whole issue seemed almost irrelevant. Contrary to the stereotype, some of them felt that

communication problems had decreased:

... they are more articulate than the immediate post-war generation. If anything, it's easier to get through to this generation. (L.11, a 40-years-old barrister).

A somewhat larger group (Category 2) felt that communication was indeed a social problem of some seriousness for adults, but thought that in their own roles, they had overcome the problem. Many of these respondents claimed that they could bridge the intergenerational gap because they possessed a peculiar insight into young people or an ability to communicate. They blamed adults for not trying or saw the issue in terms of age differences within the older generation:-

My parents and their generation cast every youngster into the same category. They can't understand the changes in the last twenty-five years in technology, entertainment and so they blame things on the youngsters ... At 38, I perhaps still feel certain things I did when I was young. (C.2)

But it is not just a question of age differences. A Junior School Headmaster in his Fifties (H.2) felt that he had no problem, but spoke about the parents "who tend to forget what they were like when they were young". He described how he has to re-assure parents, who demand that he "does something about" their children's problems, that these problems are part of growing up, and that the parents went through them themselves. This intolerance is responsible for the fact that "... half the teenage problems are caused by the adult attitudes."

These respondents, then, do not "explain away" the communication gap, but conceive of themselves as having some special ability or position to bridge the gap. This self-conception tended to make them evaluate the difficulties others had in extreme and condemnatory terms. All the professional youth workers generalized at great length about the defects in other adult attitudes to youth:

Adults, if not apathetic, really dislike them ... they resent and envy young people's freedom they are right out of touch. (Y.13)

Most adults show a lack of interest or open hostility ... You get this in the Management Committee: they don't know how to approach the boys at all. The boys often feel that by their dress they are victimized by adults and they develop a persecution complex ... Even when the Executive Committee meeting is held at the Centre the members rush off and don't see the boys. Most of them are terrified of the boys: their background is so different. They don't know how to approach the boys, they don't know how to open a conversation. (Y.14)

Often though, the ability to communicate was conceived in fairly superficial terms. One Vicar, for example, although hostile towards the "rough lot" who gatecrash the church youth club (describing them as "bolshie" and "uncouth") felt he could get on with them because he was a "good mixer" and "adaptable". He had, however, to use ploys such as wearing trousers with narrow bottoms.

Category (3) - nearly 40% of the sample - conformed most closely to the sociological stereotype. Two extreme statements were provided by a 50-years-old solicitor and a 55-years-old Grammar School headmaster:-

There is an absolute gulf between teenagers and the people who could assist them if this gulf didn't exist and make them less objectionable ... There is absolutely no bridging of it at all: youth clubs, church clubs, scouts, can't really bridge the gap ... The gap is getting wider as the youngsters are getting less and less disposed to co-operate with the community. They are setting themselves up in opposition. They seem to be idealistically opposed to the rest of us; we have so little in common. (L.6)

We seem to be living in two different worlds; we don't speak the same language. (H.16)

It is clear from these replies that, unlike in the previous category, the onus for solving the communication problem is placed on the adolescents. They are "less disposed to co-operate" or "setting themselves up in opposition". As a Secondary School Headmaster (H.7) put it, "They revolt against the definitions of things by older people. They just put the barriers up."

Although "putting the barriers up" was the theme of this category, not all these respondents saw the barriers with such clarity. Another

Secondary School Headmaster (H.13) expressed this uncertainty:

The really difficult thing is to find out whether one has got through to them: there's this difficulty in a Secondary Modern: they can't tell us because they find it difficult to express abstract ideas.

Although communication with adolescents obviously occurs in a different context for each of the occupational groups, there was a common theme - particularly among the groups who have a counselling role - of bewilderment, frustration and, sometimes, hurt that their attempts to "get through" were not reciprocated:-

It is difficult and I don't know why ... I get angry about this ... they don't think and they don't listen; they can't carry out the simplest instructions. (H.20, a Grammar School Headmaster).

You can spend hours talking to them but you feel you are getting nowhere. They have their own opinions, their own set ideas and you can't interfere with them. They don't realize we're trying to help them ... they don't seem to listen. (S.9, a N.S.P.C.C. workers for 14 years).

Teenagers coming to see me always think that the doctor is allied with the parents and because there is such a big gulf between parents and youngsters, they think we don't understand either. (D.3, a 47-years-old G.P.)

I've met one or two probation officers who stand out because they are able to communicate in a way we can't. It's really like walking on a tight rope: if you put a step wrong you've lost them. (S.19, a 43-years-old Probation Officer).

This feeling of "walking on a tight rope" was experienced by others in their role as parents:-

We find that we've got to constantly examine our approach ... sometimes you can talk and talk and not get through ... it's a struggle to find the right way. (M.C.6)

The very small number of respondents (5) in the fourth category (the reverse of the second) conceived of themselves as having some special handicap (of age, personality or background) in communicating with young people. A 37-years-old Boys' Brigade leader (Y.5) for example, said:

I often feel that I'm not quite in the same world as they are ... I'm a bachelor and when they talk about girl friends, I don't know what to say to them or how to advise them; I've never had a girl friend.

These responses reveal in general that the problem of inter-generational communication and its ramifications in regard to attitudes towards adolescents, is far more complex than the popular and sociological stereotypes indicate. In terms of sheer numbers, communication is simply not experienced as a problem by nearly half the sample (see Table 22 (b)). Admittedly, a direct question about whether communication is felt to be difficult might give a false picture of the extent of the problem: the respondent's own conception of his ability to communicate might be at too superficial a level. How many working class adolescent recipients of the "Swinging Vicar" approach, for example, would feel that this is meaningful communication? Again, there might be a type of "false consciousness" in that some adults are so out of touch, that they are unaware of it. The very fact, though, that adults perceive of communication in different terms is a factor usually overlooked.

There are obvious differences between the various occupational groups. Table 23 indicates the proportion of respondents in each group who perceive communication difficulties in their own role (combining Categories 3 and 4 in Table 22 (a)).

TABLE 23

Awareness of Communication as a Problem According to Respondents'
Occupation

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>No. in Group</u>	<u>No. aware of Problem</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Businessmen	12	5	41.7
Doctors	10	6	60.0
Headmasters	23	11	47.8
Lawyers	13	1	7.7
Magistrates	19	10	52.6
Religious Leaders	13	8	61.5
Social Workers	22	10	45.5
Youth Workers	18	4	22.2
Average for whole group			43.7

These crude frequencies, however, should not be taken to indicate that one group is "better" at communication than another. Rather, each in its own encounters with young people interprets communication in a different way. Looking at the two groups who are least aware of communication problems - Lawyers and Youth Workers - it is apparent that they reach this position for very different reasons. The lawyers tend to perceive of communication as simply "getting on with the chaps". Like the businessmen, another low-awareness group, most adolescents they come across are either from their own socio-economic group or in an employee relationship. As B.7 put it: "I'm on good terms with the lads in the office. I understand what they want." A Barrister (L.10) simply extended this ethic to the adolescents he defends in court:

However bolshie they are towards each other, they're somehow all right if they know you're playing for them; then they're quite friendly really.

For the Youth Workers, on the other hand, communication comes easily because they believe they have a special understanding of young people. Typically, they believe that others do not have this (10 out of 18, i.e. 55.5% fell into Category 2 compared with 29.3% for the whole sample).

If one now looks at a group which has a high proportion expressing communication difficulties, there is again a different set of role expectations. For the Religious Leaders, for example, the problem was not one of "getting on with the chaps" but "putting across a message".

Besides the occupational variable, one might expect age differences within the sample to effect ability to communicate. Table 24 shows that there is a marked tendency for an awareness of communication problems to increase with age; this is seen more clearly if we combine Categories 3 and 4: the personal problem increases from 0% to 30.5% to 40.5% to 54.5% to 54.6% of each respective age group.

TABLE 24

Awareness of Communication Problems According to
Respondents' Age

<u>Category</u>	<u>Age Group</u>				
	<u>20-29</u>	<u>30-39</u>	<u>40-49</u>	<u>50-59</u>	<u>60+</u>
	<u>N=7</u> <u>%</u>	<u>N=23</u> <u>%</u>	<u>N=37</u> <u>%</u>	<u>N=44</u> <u>%</u>	<u>N=22</u> <u>%</u>
1. No problem for self, unaware of social problem	-	13.0	27.0	18.2	22.7
2. No problem for self, but aware of social problem	100	43.5	21.6	22.7	18.2
3. Problem for self and aware of social problem	-	26.0	40.5	50.0	45.5
4. Problem for self but un- aware of social problem	-	4.5	-	4.5	9.1
5. Don't know, can't generalize	-	13.0	10.8	4.5	4.5

These proportions, however, indicate little more than tendencies: neither age nor occupation alone is a determinant of communication ability and the sample size is too small to observe the interaction of these and other variables (for example, social class and sex). Communication is also related to other attitudinal variables. For example, as might be expected, the respondents who had communication problems were significantly more likely to have evaluated young people negatively in Question¹₁: 62.1% as opposed to 49.6% for the whole sample.

Awareness of Adolescent Problems

In this question, respondents were asked to assign a scale value to each of nine potential adolescent problem areas. They were asked not whether these areas were important social problems, but whether they thought these areas were experienced as problems by young people. Table 25 shows the average scale values assigned to each item.

TABLE 25Perception of Importance of Various Adolescent Problems

<u>Problem</u>	<u>Average Value*</u>
(a) Overcoming shyness	2.9
(b) Getting enough money	2.7
(c) Choosing right occupation	2.8
(d) Becoming independent of parents	3.1
(e) Finding moral code	2.7
(f) Sorting out feelings about sex	2.7
(g) Getting recognition and status from society	2.8
(h) Overcoming boredom	3.7

* Scale:	No importance at all	1
	Very little importance	2
	Some Importance	3
	Much Importance	4
	Very great importance	5

Leaving aside differences between the items - which besides the boredom problem, were not very great - one is struck by the overall low assigned scores, suggesting that the respondents do not rate any of the problems as being particularly important. There is one complication which makes these scores less meaningful on their own: the tendency - also apparent in the first two questions and on which I shall comment later - for respondents to perceive very clear differences between the young people they are in contact with and "the rest". This means that they could not generalize their attitudes - hence their scores - to all young people. This point cannot be too strongly emphasized. Whatever sociologists may write about "the" adolescent problem or "the" teenage culture, or whatever assumptions the commercial world may make about "the" teenage market, most people in contact with adolescents see very little homogeneity at all. Although it was stressed to respondents that they should try to generalize about "most young people" it is possible that not all of them understood the same thing by this phrase.

In order to pursue this matter further, the last fifty respondents were probed specifically on their perceptions of differences among young people.⁴ These replies - as well as general interpretative comments made by the whole sample about each problem area - can best be looked at by analysing each item separately. This gives a better understanding of the question than the scale scores in Table 25, although it has less quantitative value because (although all comments were recorded) not all respondents made comments. Those who did, tended to be negative and it is for this reason, not any bias towards painting the sample as unsympathetic, that mainly negative comments are quoted.

(a) Overcoming Shyness: This was not perceived as a particularly important problem, and received the score of 2.9 mainly because few respondents thought it of no importance and many (57 out of 133) gave it the intermediate score of 3. There were no significant class or age differences, although one group, the Businessmen, gave it a higher rating. Shyness was only seen as a problem in special contexts: the Personnel Manager of a large firm (B.2) spoke in terms of problems caused by the impersonality of the organization and, in a similar context, B.9 commented "what looks like self-assuredness is often an attempt to mask shyness". A Youth Worker (Y.7) commented "ours is an extravert world. This is a real problem for them."

(b) Getting Enough Money for Clothes and Entertainment: This item received the lowest average score: 66 respondents (i.e. nearly 50%) giving it a weighting of 1 or 2 (little or no importance); these respondents' comments were identical: "It's easy come, easy go", "they look upon it as a right", "they just accept it", "they take it for granted as a right and in fact they think that life owes them more." (S.2, a Children's Officer). "The expect the money to be there. Even among the poorer ones and the coloured immigrants, there is little feeling of a struggle for money." (H.13)

4. There was more time during the interview for this, because in the last fifty interviews Questions 13 and 14 were not read out but left for the respondents to return by post.

Comments on this item reveal the central weakness of any scaling technique: the same score can mask different attitudes and the same attitudes can be expressed in different scores. For example, a score of 5 ("Very Great Importance") did not usually mean that money was perceived as a struggle for all or any adolescents, but that they had so much and were so avaricious, that they were always looking for more.

Surprisingly, this was not a problem area in which great differences between social classes were perceived. The tendency was to see either all young people as having enough (or too much) money and therefore not worrying about it at all, or all of them as being materialistic and greedy for more. As one Female Juvenile Court Magistrate graphically expressed it:

They all see this. The Benenden set want to be like Princess Anne; the yobs want their leather jackets. (M.C.4)

Although these might have been expected, there were no significant relationships between the controller's class, age or social mobility and his scores. The social workers were notable in giving the lowest weighting to this item: an average of just less than 2.

(c) Choosing the Right Occupation: Again, the average scale score of 2.8 and the fact that 60 respondents (45.1%) scored a 1 or 2 indicate that this problem is given a low priority. The majority of respondents spoke about the greater occupational choice available to young people: "With full employment, they know they can get a job, so it's not a problem." (B.5) Young people did not think about the suitability of the job except in terms of going for the easy money. This "couldn't care less" attitude was contemptuously described by the Staff Controller of a large Department Store:

You get these schoolchildren coming on a tour of the shop. They show no great interest in careers or anything ... They don't understand what's involved. They just can't wait for their free orange juice. You should see them: standing around with moronic looks. (B.11)

It is clear that this stereotype applies to lower class youths. The grammar school, career-oriented boy did find this a problem, but the early

leaver, the O-level type, just doesn't think about it: "... he is completely unaware; he just must be directed by the master into something that fits his capabilities" (B.7) or, as D.1 put it, "the average scruffy teenager doesn't think in terms of a future."

The remaining half of the sample who did see this as a general problem often did so for the very same reason that the others did not see it as a problem; namely, the (supposedly) greater range of occupational choice available. For them this did not mean that young people had no problem because they could do what they wanted, but that this meant a greater bewilderment and other difficulties. This last group - in which Youth Workers were most prominent, tended to point to deficiencies in the Youth Employment Service and the organization of careers advice in school.

(d) Becoming Independent of Parents: This was again an item which the modal number of respondents (52, i.e. 38.3%) rated as being of "some importance". Those that saw it as a more important problem, expressed this in the standard cliches about teenagers' desire for freedom and independence. Those who did not see it as a problem, more interestingly, again revealed how very different attitudes can lie behind the same objective score. This response can apparently mean:- (i) that parents give in so easily that adolescents don't experience independence as a problem or (ii) that independence is taken for granted or (iii) that young people don't want to be independent; "I don't understand this, they all love their parents." (Y.3, a working-class Scoutmaster) or, more subtly: "Their desire for independence is only superficial; they really don't want to get rid of their mother's apron strings." (H.13)

(e) Finding a Satisfactory Code of Moral Standards: The first point of interest about this item is that 37 (i.e. 27.7%) of the sample explicitly interpreted "moral" as referring to sexual morals. As not all respondents were probed on this, the proportion making such an interpretation is probably higher: perhaps nearly 40%. This is in sharp contrast to the

3.5% in the Eppels' sample to whom morality specifically connoted sexual morality.⁵ The Eppels lay great stress on this small percentage and the fact that most (63%) of their sample interpreted "morality" in social humanitarian terms laying stress on such ideas as community responsibility. In view of the unrepresentativeness of their sample it would seem unjustified to conclude that morality has acquired this new connotation; even those in the Northview sample who did not give morality a sexual connotation, did interpret it with traditional religious overtones.

Whatever its meaning, morality is clearly not seen as an important problem for young people. 55 respondents (i.e. 41.4%) judged it of little or no importance and only 5 (the lowest number for any item) judged it as being of very great importance. The comments of those who gave it a low priority could be summarized in the words of one Personnel Officer (B.2) who gave morality a sexual meaning: "they take it as it comes", or, more graphically by a 60-years-old Mental Welfare Officer (S.11) who had worked for 43 years in the social services, "They don't think about it; it just comes and goes like measles." These respondents were sceptical of any attempt to characterize adolescence as a period of soul-searching or identity crises:

People say that they're looking for something, searching but I don't know. I think there is a general falling off in moral behaviour and they present this thing as an excuse. (C.3)

Those who did see morality as a problem for adolescents, were respondents who were self-consciously moral entrepreneurs themselves, or actually dealt professionally with morals, namely, the Religious Leaders. This group's average rating, 3.4 was the only one well above the mean. As other groups often tended to do, they perceived the adolescent in terms of their own occupational ideology:

They make their own rules ... but they are made to think about morality; not so much sexuality but all the other pressures: to smoke, to drink, to be dishonest. (R.8)

5. Eppel and Eppel, op.cit., pp. 34 - 40.

They don't care for the old-fashioned morality, but underneath it, there is a tension, a searching. (R.14)

The dichotomization of lower class and middle class adolescents was fairly clear on this item. Lower class behaviour was seen as "more instinctive" or "less reflective":

The child from the home where the only reading is the sports' pages or horror comics doesn't worry about morals. He knows not to touch a girl under 16 because the law will get him and to avoid landing himself with a bastard. (L.11 - a Barrister).

Many of the headmasters applied this dichotomy to their experience in different schools. The Headmaster of a Maintained Church Grammar School (H.16) for example, spoke at length about the moral problems his boys often saw in "reconciling the precepts they have been taught at home with what is going on in the outside world." The Chaplain helped the boys to "sort out" these problems: but "in schools like X and Y" (mentioning two nearby secondary schools) this sort of problem would not arise.

(f) Sorting Out Feelings About Sex: This problem was responded to in much the same way as the previous item about morality in general, and shared with that and the economic problem, the lowest mean score. The problem was rated as being of little or no importance by 61 respondents (45.9%) who again judged adolescent sexual behaviour as being automatic and reflexive:-

They just experiment; that's all there is to it. (H.8)

They don't see it as wrong to sleep with a girl. The apprentices here all sleep around. They regard it just the same as eating; if you're hungry, you eat, if you want sex, you get it. (M.3, Director of an Engineering Company).

Again, these respondents were sceptical about scientific and popular attempts to make this area of behaviour a problem for adolescents. A few replied in terms reminiscent to the initial reaction to Freud at the beginning of the century:

This has been exaggerated. It's a newspaper stunt, that's what it is. Not one of our own youngsters have mentioned this. They're too balanced to worry about it. (H.17, Headmaster of a Secondary Technical School, a Headmaster for 18 years).

There's more said about this than necessary. The people who talk about it are sick themselves. (Y.4)

For those that did rate this item highly (only 6 thought it was of very great importance) the problem was conceived in terms of the confusion and lack of advice that adolescents encounter in this field and the deficiencies of sexual education in the schools. Again, the religious leaders gave this the highest weighting (3.2).

(g) Getting Recognition and Status from Society: This item is of particular theoretical significance. The mainstream of sociological writings on adolescence and a core part of delinquency theory place major emphasis on the adolescents' need for status. This is true for non-class theories of gang delinquency (e.g. Bloch and Niederhoffer) as well as specifically class-connected theories, such as Cohen's and Downes'. To what extent is this area seen as a problem by controllers, who are, after all, the crucial status-deprivers and the ones against whom adolescent deviance is supposed to be a reaction? These responses are perhaps the most interesting and revealing of all the items.

Status was clearly not rated as a very significant adolescent problem: the mean was 2.8 and the number giving it little or no importance was the largest for any single item (70, i.e. 53.5%). The comments of these respondents indicate that a large proportion, at least, of these controllers, have no conception of status and recognition as potential adolescent problem; one Headmaster said: "I can't recall a boy having raised this point" (H.6). These respondents stressed that adolescents were "inward looking" (B.12) and unconcerned about getting status from society: "They don't care a damn about what the broader society thinks about them." (L.6). Even some Youth Workers - the group which gave this item by far the highest weighting (3.4) - replied in these terms:

I don't think they care less about status. They want to be left in their own world till they are mature enough to take their place in society (Y.15 - a Professional Youth Leader).

This last quotation could be a paraphrase of the attitudes Musgrave and Friedenberg⁶ have suggested characterize the adult approach to adolescence status: deny them status on adult terms and consign them to a powerless world of their own, where they can be kept docile by playing games.

Paralleling the "too much money" attitude revealed in responses to the first item, many controllers perceived adolescents as having too much status and resented this:

Surely they are recognized enough already? (D.9, a School Medical Officer).

It works the other way as well. If you recognize a group you give them the power to defy you. (C.3)

The onus was placed on the adolescent for not trying hard enough to obtain status:

It's like professional groups seeking status ... if young people haven't got status it's their own fault. (S.1, Northview Guild of Social Service Worker).

Or the whole issue was seen as a pseudo-problem: "This is something we made up for them to think about." (S.2, a Child Care Officer).

The social class dichotomy was clearly perceived, and in the direction predictable from the theory that these middle-class controllers are "status withholders" in regard to working class adolescents. These replies implied that working class adolescents (i.e. those who already have low status) don't really need or want status and that, in fact, only middle-class youth wanted and deserved status and recognition:

It's the A-level thinking people who need status more. They want to feel that their job means something. (B.5)

Those of the lowest mentality just run with the herd. It's only those of the higher mentality who want recognition and get it by achievement. (B.7)

6. Musgrave, op.cit., and Edgar Z. Friedenberg, "Adolescence as a Social Problem," in Becker (Ed.) Social Problems, op.cit.

Only a few respondents, all of whom saw status as a general problem, reversed these priorities and talked in terms of status being deprived to certain sections of adolescents. As one Headmaster of a Secondary School (H.9) remarked about the lowest streams in the school: "They don't want to be thought of as washouts."

Among the 48 (36.1%) who rated status as an important problem, there was an acute awareness of the issue that status frustration theories draw attention to:

This is the biggest thing of all; it's half the reason for delinquency, they want to attract attention, to be somebody.
(Y.4)

This is the most important thing in the youngster's whole life ... as parents and adults we are rebuffed by them because they feel we don't give them status ... They feel an abandoned generation. (Y.6)

This is a problem ... they think that all adults regard them as morons and delinquents: 'why should we give anything to them if they think we're rubbish'; so they build up resentment.
(B.2)

It was expected that upwardly mobile respondents, who might themselves have encountered status difficulties, might perceive this as more of a problem. No significant differences along these lines, however, were found. It would be interesting, in a more representative sample, to test for social class differences in the perception of status problems among adolescents.

(h) Overcoming Boredom: This is seen as by far the most important problem, with a scale value of 3.7 and 90 respondents (68.4%) rating it as of much importance or very great importance. The comments, moreover, indicated a number of very different orientations to the problem.

The first position - taken up by very few respondents - was that boredom was a real social problem, in the sense of a shortage of leisure opportunities, and that adolescents were aware of this. The second position is that adolescents are bored, but don't know that they are bored. The objective diagnostic indicator of their boredom is that they "drift

around" doing "aimless" things like sitting in coffee bars:

This is most important. I can't understand their activities, they've got no wish to do anything ... this standing around and shaking in coffee clubs ... they need direction. (M.5)

The third position was the obverse of the second: adolescents think they are bored, but really they are not, and because of the great leisure opportunities they have today, they certainly have no right to be:

There's no need to be bored ... there's so many clubs and so on ... they're such a lazy-minded loutish lot that they don't worry what to do. (L.2)

Both these positions led by different routes to the popular connection between delinquency and lack of constructive leisure: "That's the biggest cause of delinquency: they just don't know what to do with their time." (D.5). Often though, this connection was seen as spurious or just an excuse: "They say, when they get into trouble 'it's because I was bored', but when you look closer, that's damn silly." (C.1). Or at a more sophisticated level:

The older generation find the younger generation's behaviour inexplicable, so they manufacture this "boredom, looking-for-kicks" explanation. The teenagers themselves are mainly inarticulate so they readily accept this explanation. But it's only half true. Most of them have got plenty to do, there's always things going on. (Y.7, 22-years-old coffee bar Manager).

The problem was seen in terms of a clear social class dichotomy, thus providing common sense support for a crude version of Downes' blocked leisure opportunities theory. The stereotypes were of the middle class, grammar school boy with academic, community and other constructive interests, and the working class Secondary Modern type, interested in nothing:

The middle class don't experience this ... the lower orders work on boring jobs ... boredom is always a problem with the lower orders. They don't like their work, they don't know what to do with leisure, they just want excitement, so they fight or watch wrestling. (D.6)

The magistrates were the only group that rated this problem well above the sample mean (4.1). No other significant intra-sample differences were found.

A general comment that may be made about this question is that, in addition to judging some problems as more important than others, respondents differed in their degree of problem orientation. That is, some respondents tended to see most or all of the problems as being fairly important, while others wrote off most of the areas as being pseudo-problems or excuses. This last position tended to correlate with an unsympathetic attitude to young people in general throughout the interview. A comment made by the Headmistress of a Junior School (H.23) is stereotypical in this respect:

I know that they say that their generation inherited the world as it is. But we inherited a world as well. We all have to face problems and deal with them.

Not all respondents, however, who gave low scores to the problems, were as clearly rejecting. Their attitude was rather one of uncertainty, summed up well by the comments of a Secondary School Headmaster (H.13) on the status item:

I suppose they do yearn for more understanding from adults, but even this may be prompted by Daily Mirror headlines about young people "Being Misunderstood". It was easy to know before whether these problems were real; now it's difficult.

The type of controller who takes up the no-problem orientation is usually the old-style moralist, with a bluff, no-nonsense approach to young people, heavily influenced by a Boy Scout ideology. He is usually in his early forties, comes from a lower middle class background, and is on the fringe of social work and youth work (e.g. a voluntary church youth club leader, an N.S.P.C.C. worker) although some are Headmasters (usually of junior schools) or magistrates. For them, young people have never had it so good: they've got too much money, too much choice, too much status and they couldn't care less about morality. The extreme version of this position was taken by two respondents (S.8 and Y.17) who rated every problem a "1" except "overcoming shyness" and "becoming independent of parents". The latter's comment on the parents item was: "they treat their parents like dirt."

There are a number of ways in which attitudes to adolescents might be relevant to our understanding of the delinquency control system. The controller's emotional orientation towards adolescents, his intellectual understanding of them, and his conception of what range of adolescent misbehaviour is tolerable, permissible or "normal", might crucially determine his control decisions. His evaluation of a deviant act is in terms of his perception of the properties of that class of actors. His attitudes might also be important before the control system starts operating; he might, for instance, as a "status withholder", be instrumental in generating initial pressures towards deviance.

Various aspects of the relationship between attitudes to delinquency and attitudes to adolescence will be discussed later in the thesis. The purpose of these comments - which are inferences from the interviews rather than summaries of statistical data - is to clarify the replies in Section A in the light of some current theories about intergenerational relations.

The clearest single inference is that adults' attitudes to adolescents are considerably more complicated than most theories predict. The dominant view held by popular writers on adolescence is that there is an "age war": a feud between the generations, with each side drawn up in sharp and irreconcilable conflict with the other. As pointed out in regard to communication, this picture is a vulgarized version of an orthodox sociological view: intergenerational conflict is heightened at times of accelerated social change, there is a discontinuity between the generations (no smooth status-transition), the rebellious teenage subculture functions to ease the strain, and this subculture is hostile and oppositional to the adult world which, in turn, hates and rejects young people.⁷ A vicious circle is set up because the young people are aware of this rejection:

7. This position is spelt out in the writings on adolescence of Parsons, Davis and Eisenstadt.

the majority of the Eppels' sample of young workers, for example, felt that adults are unduly critical of them, do not understand them and are ready to condemn them unfairly.⁸

I cannot comment on adolescent attitudes, although there is much to suggest that this side of the picture too is oversimplified. On the adult side, there are at least three qualifications to be made:- firstly, not all adults are rejecting; secondly, rejection and hatred are concepts too crude to describe adult attitudes to young people and, thirdly, adults' attitudes are selective, i.e. differentiating between types of adolescents. I shall examine each of these qualifications in turn.

In regard to their general orientation to young people, about half the Northview sample expressed clearly negative and unfavourable views. This proportion is more than the number of adults "clearly disapproving" in the Eppels' sample (29%)⁹ and less than the 66.6% in Musgrave's sample who were "wholly or mainly critical".¹⁰ The Eppels' percentage is low because 56% of the sample withheld judgment and were not prepared to generalize; on a specific issue, however, such as discipline, 66.7% were disapproving. Although the samples and questions are only approximately comparable, it would be fair to say from these three studies that between 50% - 70% of adults are "rejecting". A higher proportion might be found in a general population while our proportion of a half would be representative of groups such as controllers. A similar proportion appear to be cut off from communication with adolescents. It is true that the survey might have underestimated the extent of adult hostility, which is unlikely to be expressed directly in the course of a few questions in one interview. Many respondents were clearly holding back their "real" views. At the very least, however, we can conclude that a number of the controllers are not overtly hostile and rejecting.

8. Eppel and Eppel, op.cit., pp. 60 - 65.

9. Eppel and Eppel, op.cit., pp. 40 - 47.

10. Musgrave, op.cit., p. 102.

We cannot conclusively say why some controllers are more rejecting than others. There is a tendency for a sympathetic evaluation of changes in adolescents, an attempt to communicate meaningfully and a greater problem-orientation, to hang together, but why this should do so in one person rather than another is not clear. Within the sample, one factor that suggested itself was the sheer lack of contact with and information about adolescents. Despite mass communication, many adults are estranged from young people, not only in the philosophical or sociological senses, but also physically. This greater distance allows for the development of stereotypes. A microcosm of this tendency was shown in the fact that primary school headmasters were, on the whole, likely to be more rejecting and prejudiced than secondary school headmasters. But one cannot generalize these tendencies outside the sample; there is no evidence to suggest, for example, that working class adults who might be more in touch with the mass of young people, are any less rejecting.

The difficulties of generalizing about these attitudes lead on to our second qualification, that terms such as "hatred" are inappropriate to describe the dominant adult attitude. Looking at even the most unfavourable of the Northview interviews, this is not the feeling one detects. If replies support any existing theory at all, they do lend weight to Friedenberg's argument that the adult attitude is not so much a clear-cut rejection as a resentment and a lack of comprehension. Although he is talking about American society, where the traditional control system has been more substantially eroded by the Freudian ethic than in Britain, his characterization of "informed" adults' attitudes seems more applicable to our sample than the sociological orthodoxies outlined earlier:

Authority today - especially if it is middle class - is likely to express itself benignly and to respond to youthful recalcitrance with more disappointment or bewilderment than overt irritation or reprisal.¹¹

11. Friedenberg, op.cit., p. 56. It is probable, though, that both Friedenberg's comments and my impressions from the Northview sample are dated in the light of recent developments in England and America which have hardened adults' attitudes.

This is not to say that there is no hostility; as we saw in regard to vandalism, and as will be seen again in regard to the Mods and Rockers, the adult reaction is often very much more than "overt irritation". But public pronouncements and reactions to the more spectacular manifestations of adolescent misbehaviour, might be just as misleading an index of adult attitudes as the more subdued reactions in the Northview interviews. The point is, that stereotypes of a well-defined adult-youth conflict can be misleading. Adults more often show a lack of comprehension, combined with resentment, particularly about adolescent "affluence". These attitudes lie behind the apparently bland well-meaningness of many of the Northview controllers and may result in stratagems which - as Musgrave suggests - are ostensibly in the best interests of the young, but are really designed at segregating them and excluding them from full adult status.

Our third qualification relates to the selectivity of adults' attitudes, particularly in regard to social class. Although sociologists are professionally predisposed to being sensitive about class differences, they are peculiarly blind to this factor when writing about inter-generational attitudes. None of the theories we have mentioned, and least of all the functionalist theories of Davis, Eisenstadt and others, makes very great discriminations along social class lines. In the questions on adolescence in the Northview survey, though, a social class distinction was usually made. It is very clear that for most respondents "young people" meant "young working class people". If there already is an inter-generational gap, it is widened for middle class controllers by class differences. For many of these respondents, the lower class adolescent was indeed in another world. Most respondents had a very clear conception of the differences between, as one Secondary School Headmaster (H.9) put it, "the academic stream and the peasantry".

This headmaster's attitudes perfectly illustrated the trends we have

been discussing.¹² He was not rejecting and hostile, and explicitly said he did not "go along with the comments made by magistrates about modern youth." He does not see any communication gulf and conceives of his own role in terms of "pastoral care". He is optimistic about all the boys, and believes that "if the school society is fair and just, the boy will respond." But if there is trouble, "it comes, putting it bluntly, from the peasantry."

If no other respondent put it as bluntly as that, their distinctions were clear enough. The "better" type of youth was getting better still, the rest were degenerating: they were more difficult to communicate with, they had too much money, they didn't care about moral standards, they wasted all their leisure time. Adolescence, in other words, is not defined in strictly age related terms. But the discrimination was even more subtle: resentment and lack of comprehension is not just directed to lower class adolescents, but to those lower class adolescents who are the conspicuous consumers of the teenage culture.

The "image of the hot-blooded minority"¹³ is reserved for these adolescents. When Friedenberg talks about "... the functional equivalence in the minds of adults between adolescence, delinquency and aggressive sexuality,"¹⁴ it is the new working class teenager the respondents were applying the equation to: the "affluent yobbo". This is, again, part of a stereotype which mirrors the current of sociological thought which equates the teenage culture with delinquent values.¹⁵ This current ignores the differential impact of the teenage culture on social classes. Many

12. All the respondents living in the area of this school expressed a warm admiration for the headmaster's views and methods.

13. E.Z. Friedenberg, "The Image of the Adolescent Minority," Dissent, 10 (Spring 1963), pp. 149 - 158.

14. Ibid., p. 151.

15. See particularly, Mays, op.cit., and Bryan Wilson, "The Social Context of the Youth Problem," 13th Charles Russell Memorial Lecture, October, 1965.

respondents, though, made the connection Downes' points to: the working class teenager is much more dependant on it than his middle class counterpart.

The public glorifies the teenager today - teenagers get put on a pedestal and they get swollen heads. Unless he's got high mental power, he can't see the danger of all this. All this pop culture; it's all right if it's just a passing phase, but for those of low mentality it doesn't stop; it becomes their whole way of life. (B.7)

At the same time, adults do not want these adolescents to lose teenage status. They must be weaned from undesirable influences and directed into more constructive activities. For the middle class youth, or the decent lower class "college boy", this is not a problem. They see the danger of the pop culture, and they will anyway integrate smoothly into adult society. As one Vicar (R.11) strikingly described his lack of communication problems with this group:

They integrate quickly and you don't get the hostile adult reaction. In fact, they integrate so quickly that the adults don't realize it.

Adult attitudes thus tend to mirror and legitimize the power relationships within the social structure as a whole. In terms of transactional theory, this can have an important self-fulfilling effect in that the definer or controller acts upon the dichotomy he has constructed: he will define as "bad" the acts of the bad group, because this is only to be expected, he will not be able to communicate with them, because he sees them beyond communication.

Erikson seems to have appropriately summarized our respondents' attitudes when he writes about:

A certain alienation from such sectors of modern youth (called alienated by us) who, far from wishing to play the role which we would recognize as youth, pass us by as unhelpful and, worse, irrelevant ... Conversely some types of youth chosen by us for special and warm attention appear to be those that are somehow like us, those who are responsive to us or for whom we feel responsible.¹⁶

16. Erik H. Erikson, (Ed.) Youth: Change and Challenge, (New York: Basic Books, 1963). Editor's preface, pp. viii - ix.

CHAPTER 9ATTITUDES ABOUT DELINQUENCY

In this, the core chapter of the section, various dimensions of the controllers' information, opinions and attitudes to delinquency are dealt with. The first group of questions cover general orientations to delinquency; we then turn to ideas about causation and images of the delinquent and finally to reactions to specific types of delinquency and the factors affecting control decisions.

Orientation to Delinquency (Section B, Questions 4 and 5)

These questions cover the most difficult and nebulous area of enquiry: the sample's general orientation to delinquency as a form of deviance and social problem and its conceptions of social control.

Question 4: In the first part of this question, the respondent was simply asked to give his opinion on the extent of the delinquency problem: did he perceive a real and growing increase? Was the problem seen in threatening terms? Such responses are not only of intrinsic interest, but relate to the ways in which controllers act. The way deviance is handled is affected by one's perception of its extent. We saw in regard to vandalism - and will see again with the Mods and Rockers - how doctrines such as "clear and present danger" serve to justify escalation in the control culture. This effect has been well documented in respect to public policy towards drug taking and homosexuality and can be demonstrated on a micro level with other types of deviance. A recent study of shoplifting, for example, shows how the way in which supermarket personnel defined shoplifting and its extent produced differential rates of the behaviour.¹ Those who defined it as threatening to the organization considered more marginal incidents as constituting shoplifting.

1. Paula M. Newberg: "A Study in Deviance: Shoplifting," Corrective Psychiatry and Journal of Social Therapy, 2 (1966), pp. 43 - 53.

In regard to delinquency, one would prima facie expect that very few people - least of all a group containing some whose social role depends on the existence of delinquency - would not think that delinquency was increasing or was a real problem. (Surprisingly, though, in Di Renzo's sample from the general population, not everyone said "yes" to the question: "Do you believe that the amount of delinquency since World War II has increased in Indiana?" 65% said "yes", 10% "no" and 26% "don't know".²) It is not as simple, however, as a straight "yes" or "no"; the responses to this question could be grouped into three categories. In the first category, the increase in the rate of delinquency was perceived as large and real; the problem was seen in threatening terms. In the second, a statistical increase was not denied, but it was put into perspective especially in terms of changes in law enforcement. The problem was not seen as threatening. In the third category, an increase was denied and the problem was seen as spurious. Table 26 shows the frequencies of these categories.

TABLE 26

Perception of the Extent of the Delinquency Problem

<u>Category</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Threat	64	48.1
Perspective	46	34.6
Denial	14	10.5
Don't Know	<u>9</u>	<u>6.8</u>
	133	100.0

Nearly half the sample, then, perceive delinquency in terms threatening to themselves and society at large. These respondents saw the statistical increase as part of a general pattern of lawlessness. People do not respect the law any more, the law has no binding force, there is no more guilt or shame:

2. Di Renzo, G.J., Juvenile Delinquency and Public Opinion, (University of Notre Dame, Department of Sociology, 1962. Mimeo.), p. 29.

There is a general and rapid decline in moral standards, they don't think it immoral to transgress. They know what the law is, but there doesn't seem to be any disgrace in transgression. (L.12, a Barrister)

The problem is not only that delinquency exists, but that it doesn't seem to matter to people. The only crime today is getting caught. (Y.5)

The statistical increase was not only "real" but was only the tip of the iceberg, juveniles are "getting away" with more: "... a great deal of things I think are really evil don't get into the statistics." (L.6)

A third of the respondents were more cautious in interpreting the statistics. For them, more rather than fewer actions are being recorded as delinquent. They put the problem in perspective by noting the increased publicity given to delinquency and some even mention that, given changed social conditions, one might have expected an even greater problem. They do not attempt, however, to deny the existence of the problem or the apparent increase as reflected in the statistics.

The small group of respondents (14) who denied that there was an increase based their position on a perception of changes in law enforcement. There was the same amount of delinquency, say, before the war, but it is being dealt with differently:

It's the same as accident statistics: slipping on a banana skin now gets into the statistics. So, if Johnny gives a lift on the back of a motor-scooter to a girl and hasn't got a licence he now gets prosecuted. (M.C. 1)

These respondents also stressed (and condemned) the greater publicity given to the delinquency problem.

Although the small number of "Don't knows" is predictable from such a sample, what was interesting was the fairly large proportion of respondents in the "Threat" category - including official control agents - who appeared to be quite unfamiliar with published statistics on delinquency. Some, for example, "knew" that there was an increase of

delinquency in Northview, but could only guess whether this was typical nationally. Others based their perceptions on impressionistic evidence: a Barrister (L.10), for example, thought that delinquency was increasing because the court lists were getting longer. S.18, a Probation Officer, said that she would "imagine" that delinquency had increased and noted that "... there are now 15 or 16 Officers where before we used to have five."

Differences between occupational groups were not very marked. Between 40% - 50% of each group fell into the "Threat" category, with the exception of the lawyers (10 out of 13, i.e. 76.9%). The groups most likely to use the Perspective or Denial categories were the Headmasters and the Youth Leaders. There was a slight tendency for older respondents to use the "Threat" category more often, which fits in with Di Renzo's finding that age was directly correlated with a tendency to perceive an increase in delinquency.³

In a supplementary part of Question 4, respondents were asked what types of delinquency they thought had increased most. This question was included to discover how well the controllers were informed about trends in different types of delinquency and whether they had absorbed the pre-occupations and stereotypes of the mass media, for example, about "our age of violence". Table 27 shows the frequency with which various types of delinquency were mentioned.

TABLE 27

Types of Delinquency That Have Increased Most

<u>Type</u>	<u>Frequency Mentioned</u>
Property Offences	36
Vandalism	34
Violence against person	19
Rowdyism, Hooliganism	8
Sexual Offences, Promiscuity	6
Drug-taking	5
Other	2
Don't Know	23
	<u>133</u>

3. Ibid., p. 19.

Question 5: This question tackles more directly than any other the theoretical issues raised in the opening chapter: when do people think the whistle should be blown to signal an infringement? What sort of whistle should be blown? And who should blow it?

These issues are too complex and subtle to be framed in terms of a direct question and quantification of the responses was extremely difficult. Nevertheless, a number of important dimensions of social control could be discerned. In the first part of the question, respondents were asked whether they were concerned about any behaviour by young people which was "not usually thought of as delinquent and would not end up in the courts". Did they perceive non-delinquent juvenile misconduct in socially problematic terms and, moreover, did they think that the scope of social control should be extended to cover this behaviour? Probe questions were directed to discovering exactly which types of behaviour respondents thought social control should be extended to, or "something should be done about".

88 respondents (i.e. 66.2%) replied that there were types of misbehaviour outside the scope of the law which worried them and about which they would like to see something done, while 37 (i.e. 27.8%) replied that they couldn't think of any such behaviour and that they were against any extension of the scope of formal social control. (There were 8 "Don't Know" responses). The only marked difference between the occupational groups was that the Social Workers (17 out of 22, i.e. 77.3%) were far more likely than any of the other groups to define more behaviour as problematic and in need of control.

The types of behaviour which were identified as demanding social control almost defied classification by their heterogeneity. They ranged from acts which are, in fact, already legally delinquent, like types of vandalism, to "Things like pressing the button at pedestrian crossings and then running away" (H.6). Table 28 classifies the behaviour into eight categories.

Although some of these 88 respondents are merely expressing concern about conventionally defined social problems such as teenage sexual promiscuity and drug taking, others - particularly those in the "lack of discipline" and "rowdyism" categories - are closer to the rule-creating species of the moral entrepreneur. They are looking out for new forms of behaviour which annoy, irritate or offend them; they define these in problematic terms, and the "something" they would like to see done about them usually involves an extension of formal social control. Often they are defining not merely the behaviour, but also attitudes, as problematic. Roughly 1/3 of the whole sample show such overt moral enterprise. Some express their indignation emotionally in regard to their particular obsessions, without making specific control proposals:-

What irritates me most of all is their studied untidiness ... they walk about like tramps, unkempt and dirty. It just can't be good for them, this filth. They're all like that, it really gets me. (D.3)

It's their desire to hang around the streets and do nothing ... this inactivity ... looking for mischief ... they won't accept the simplest code of discipline and values. (Y.5)

... their complete inability to show any deference to adults ... just no respect. They'll swing across a zebra crossing and just look at us: It's this sort of thing. They don't acknowledge their elders and superiors. They don't care what we think. (H.8)

TABLE 28

Types of Juvenile Misbehaviour About Which "Something
Should be done"

<u>Behaviour</u>	<u>Frequency Mentioned</u>
Sexual Immorality, Unmarried Mothers	29
General lack of discipline, Anti-authority attitudes, lack of respect for adults	17
Lack of respect for property, petty vandalism	12
Rowdyism, hooliganism, annoying or inconveniencing people	12
Drug taking	5
Drunkenness	3
Personal habits, personal appearance (e.g. long hair)	3
Miscellaneous	<u>7</u>
	88

Two further replies, both from solicitors, make the dimension of moral enterprise more explicit:-

It's the sort of things that stem from lack of care, many manifestations of this sort of thing just won't get to court, for example, knocking people off the pavement ... or things like playing transistors loud on the beach ... There is a need not just to look at the legal picture - one must improve people generally (although I suppose there will always be a certain percentage of the louts). (L.2)

Things like their noisy motor bikes. Something should be done to make motor bikes quiet. If any boy tampers with his exhaust, the police should be able to examine and confiscate the bike ... It's most distressful that we should pander to their exhibitionism. (L.7)

The second part of Question 5 also deals with the scope of social control. Here, however, respondents were asked not about behaviour outside the scope of formal control, but whether "... there are any types of delinquency which are dealt with by the courts, but should be handled some other way?" This question struck a responsive chord and few respondents had to be prompted about what alternative forms of social control they had in mind. The distribution of responses is shown in Table 29 and although there are many separate categories, the single most striking characteristic of the table is the unanimity of response: only 5 respondents were against changing the nature of social control. If one adds to these the 9 "Don't Knows", this leaves about 90% of the sample in favour of change (80% if one excludes those in Category 6 who are in favour of change, but see too many practical objections).

The vast majority of the sample, then, agree that too much delinquency is being dealt with by the courts and should rather be handled some other way. They all had in mind similar types of delinquency (petty pilfering, petty vandalism, "scrumping", etc.) and their position was based on similar grounds: a straightforward condemnation of the juvenile court system (for pragmatic or ideological reasons)⁴ and a preference for informal

4. Attitudes to the juvenile court are considered in detail in a separate question (Question 15).

social control. The notion of informal social control subsumes a process whereby delinquency is dealt with "on the spot" with "do it yourself" measures either by the policeman or by the person who sees the delinquency. Before examining the exact nature of these measures, the ideological position revealed in this question should be commented on.

TABLE 29

Ways in Which Delinquency Should be Handled

	<u>Number</u>
1. By the policeman on the spot	21
2. "At the level at which it happens" (school, organization, youth club)	17
3. Policeman plus "level at which it happens"	49
4. By Social Work intervention	15
5. By the family	4
6. Theoretically in favour of on-the-spot measures, but too many practical objections	13
7. Against any change in present system	5
8. Don't Know	<u>9</u>
	133

A high value was placed on informal neighbourhood control in the context of an idealized gemeinschaft setting.⁵ A romantic vision existed of a community in which parents, teachers and employers had a binding moral hold over children and in which the kindly village Bobby would take little Johnny into the garden shed and given him a talking-to or a clip on the ear. This type of social control was seen as more effective and ideologically more satisfying than the formalized machinery of juvenile justice. Almost

5. The ways in which thinking about social problems and social pathologies are conditioned by rural values, were described graphically by Mills, (op.cit.), in his analysis of American textbooks on social disorganization: Although these textbooks were all written between 1902 and 1940, one cannot but notice the similarity of their content with the responses of the Northview sample a quarter of a century later. There is the same stress of primary groups and communities and "... the yearning for values associated with rural simplicity and neighbourliness". (Mills, p. 175.)

all the sample regretted the passing of this Golden Age and almost none questioned its historical validity. Very few (the 13 in category 6) stated that it was too late to turn the clock back (public attitudes had changed, teachers and policemen were not of the same calibre and status, parents would not tolerate an extension of police powers).

I will now examine more closely the various categories in Table 29. Taking Categories 1 and 3 together, it appears that 70 respondents - over half the sample - are explicitly in favour of the extension of powers to the police. Attitudes to the police were extremely consistent. There was firstly the widespread view that the authority of the police - along with all authority - was being steadily undermined. The law was not respected any more because the policeman's authority had been stripped away: he can't lay a finger on a young person any more without being sued for assault, the law is on the wrong side, "the policeman's hands are tied behind his back" (a phrase used 15 times). Some change was necessary, the policeman should be given more discretion to deal with things on the spot, by force if necessary: "... there's no deterrent like a slap on the ear or a boot up the backside" (D.2). It was widely held that if justice was delayed - by "dragging things through the court" (another frequently used phrase) - the effect of punishment was blunted. What was needed, as one solicitor (L.8) put it, was "an extension of the principle of corrective assault". In addition, "... every citizen should be a policeman in his own right - they should be handing out more clips on the ears themselves." (B.8)

These conceptions cannot be simply dismissed as being "authoritarian". They were invariably combined with the romantic image of the kindly village Bobby: "the fatherly copper with the farthing at the end of his glove to give a clip around the ear which really stang." (Y.2) This image of "benevolent authoritarianism" was summed up by one magistrate (M.C.2).

The policeman should be a father and judge on the spot ... there is no substitute for this type of control by fear: the kindly benevolent threat.

Others emphasized the benevolent aspect only: "Ideally one would want a sort of Dixon of Dock Green" (L.10).

A few respondents questioned the stereotype of the village Bobby: "Most of it is fiction. If the stereotype did exist it was in the days when there was no juvenile court and the laternative would have been the adult court." (S.2)⁶ A few others (mainly the 5 respondents who were against any change at all) mentioned the possible abuses that could arise from extending police powers: "The problem of saying 'let the Bobby handle it' is 'depends which Bobby' " (S.6). But these doubts were, on the whole, resolved: M.11, summed up the position:

I would rather run the risk of the odd policeman or teacher abusing his power than let his hand be tied around his back, which is the case now. I'm not saying I'm in favour of flogging, but people whose duty it is to take the place of parents, should have more licence to deal with what they see on the spot.

It would, of course, have been extremely relevant to have obtained policemen's views on these issues; in the absence of any policemen in the sample, it might be of interest to quote the views of one who was coincidentally included. He had been in the force for 18 years and runs a weekly youth club (Y.18). It cannot be claimed that his views are representative. He felt that there already is "unlimited scope" for the police to deal with things on the spot, but that public attitudes are unfortunately restricting them (and teachers) from giving the justified "clout on the ear";

... if not for people getting on their high horse and being upset, the police could do much more ... they criticize the police, but look at the sort of person Challenor had to deal with.

He is angry at the Police Chiefs ("that is, the civil servants in the Home Office") for bowing to public opinion and at the Courts for frustrating the "sorting out" process that already happens:

6. The myth, however, was repeated by many respondents in their twenties and thirties who could have had no personal experience of the village Bobby. It is possible that fictional portrayals like "Dixon of Dock Green" (compared with, say, "Z-Cars" or "Softly, Softly") give contemporary credibility to the image of the village Bobby operating in an urban setting.

Only the most serious crimes get to the Court and what do they do there? They fall over backwards to find some excuse to let them off. If these serious things are dealt with so trivially, what about the really trivial things?

The majority of the sample included teachers in the general recommendation that those in authority should be given more power. The stereotype paralleled that which was applied to the police: authority had been undermined by public opinion and permissive government:

Teachers are terribly hampered. If they so much as say a word out of place, the parents are down on their neck suing them (S.15 - a Health Visitor).

The powers teachers had been deprived of, were generally the powers to administer corporal punishment. Although no respondent was prompted to raise this issue, about 70% of the sample spontaneously said they were in favour of corporal punishment in schools and deplored the fact that teachers who "lay a hand" on their pupils are "immediately summoned for assault". The supposed decline in the use of corporal punishment was clearly related to delinquency:

The increase in delinquency all started from the time when the cane was removed from the hands of the school master. (S.8)

If you hurt them before they are nine, then they'll be all right afterwards ... you have to give them a feeling of authority from an early age so that they will have a sense of discipline later. (B.7)

There's a school near here where the cane has been abolished, now the boys just cheek the teachers when they like, there's nothing one can do ... and the authority of responsible parents in the parish has gone because their neighbours report them for the use of corporal punishment. Because there's no more corporal punishment, there's no more respect for authority. The trouble is that people become emotionally involved in the corporal punishment argument." (R.12)

Whichever side is getting "emotionally involved", it is clear that there is a firmly based ideology behind these opinions. The response to deviance is often ritualistic; as one solicitor (L.5) admitted in regard to his belief in imprisonment of homosexuals, corporal punishment and capital punishment: "I accept these things in principle, even though it is shown that they don't work in practice." Very few respondents were

against the principle of giving more authority to teachers, although some were against it in practice because of the poor quality of teachers. An objection in principle was made by a Child Care Officer, (S.2) who thought that schools rely too much on informal methods:

The Headmaster doesn't want the police in, so he just whacks the boy for a series of petty offences where there is always an inadequate, disturbed family background.

The advocacy of corporal punishment, though, is only a relatively small part of what respondents meant when they talked about handling delinquency "at the level at which it happened" (a phrase used by a Health Visitor, S.16). What they meant was that delinquency should be dealt with in the setting in which it took place or was observed: by the teacher in the school, by the employer in the factory, shop or office, by the youth leader in the club, and by the parent in the home. Only under certain specified circumstances should an outside authority be called in. Rephrasing this in terms of the flow chart model, this means that respondents are asserting their own and others' right to exercise informal control functions: defining, labelling, funelling and mediating.

Because of the central relevance of this orientation towards understanding the control system, respondents in the position to exercise these functions - i.e. to make informal control decisions - were probed as to how they actually handled (or preferred to handle) juvenile deviance in their own settings.

The most important group in this respect is, perhaps, the Headmasters. They were asked about their handling of acts of deviance that were not merely infractions of the school codes (e.g. in regard to discipline, dress) but also legally delinquent; for example, stealing and property damage. All but three of the 22 Headmasters preferred to deal with things themselves and would like more scope for this. The fact that so many take this position is not widely known, even among Headmasters themselves: H.15, for example, in expressing this view, thought that none of his colleagues would support him. All these Headmasters believed that things were better dealt

with at the level at which they happened: as one (H.13) said, defending his own use of "justice on the spot": "I'm sure that the instinctive reaction of the policeman, or the teacher, or the foreman on the building site that's damaged, is right: deal with the child on the spot."

More often than not, dealing with things on the spot entailed using corporal punishment: 13 of the 22 Headmasters justified, without being asked, this method of punishment. The total proportion who use and believe in corporal punishment was probably higher. The use of the cane in particular, and instant justice in general, was justified on ideological or ritualistic grounds and a belief that other forms of control were ineffective:

The father should be able to give the child a belting just like he would give a bad dog. One is not allowed to keep a dog that is out of control, the same should apply to children. (H.8)

As long as I'm Headmaster, I'll never give up the cane ... we have this adopted boy, a damn nuisance who's always got a chip on his shoulder and is always cheeky ... caning him is a waste of time, but I have to do it. It won't change him, but it might stop others. (H.5)

I would put the boy over my knee rather than let them go through the soft soap treatment in the juvenile court. (H.6)

Other Headmasters spoke about trying to help their pupils avoid the stigma of the law. Such justifications draw attention to the crucial channeling functions that the Headmaster has. The type of punishment technique he uses is of less importance than the fact that whatever control procedure he uses, has clear consequences for the potential delinquent's subsequent career. Outside certain limits - which are clear neither to the Headmaster nor to the sociologist observing him - decisions are continually being made as to whether certain acts will result in the actor being propelled into the formal control apparatus. The Headmaster himself is, of course, aware of some bases for these decisions; some contingencies mentioned include:- whether the act occurred inside or outside school hours, inside or outside school premises, the offender's previous history, amount of property damaged or stolen. Each contingency may determine whether the police are notified, or things are dealt with on the spot. A common test case is the boy caught pilfering from the local shop or supermarket. Most

Headmasters fitted in with the policy of the shops in the area, which with some well-known exceptions was not to prosecute. The shopkeeper would usually telephone the Headmaster and the appropriate control measures were negotiated. Sometimes - Headmasters could not specify exactly when - both sides would be in favour of prosecution, or rather, the Headmaster would intimate that he would not try to dissuade the shopkeeper from this course. More often though, the matter would be left entirely to the Headmaster: in one case, his procedure was simply to "... deal with the boy by giving him six of the best and then putting him back into circulation." (H.1)

A more complex procedure was to go with the boy to the shop and arrange some restitution with the owner (H.10). Similarly, in regard to vandalism outside the school, one Headmaster's (H.14) procedure was to "... call the parents in, arrange reparation and then belt the boy."

Whatever procedure was used, the Headmasters were very much aware of their channeling functions: they knew that whether the rule-breaker was "put back into circulation or not" was often very much up to them. With only perhaps a slight exaggeration of his own power, one Headmaster spoke of the importance of the reports he writes for the court:

We generally manage to get them dealt with the way we want.
If we think they're bad we'll get them put away. (H.9)

When specific control decisions are articulated, the point made in regard to Question 4 becomes clearer: the decision is affected by the controller's conception of the size and nature of the problem. It is instructive to compare the attitudes of H.20 and H.22, both grammar school Headmasters, aged 56 and 45 respectively, whose pupils are drawn from similar areas. For the first, the general standard of adolescent morality was getting lower, the enormous increase in pilfering within the school was one of the biggest changes in the last twenty years: "the boys can't leave things around any more." Consequently, stealing within the school had to be dealt with promptly and severely. For the other Headmaster, though, there was no lowering of standards, if anything, attitudes to property were better

("in the old days you couldn't leave things about like you can now").

Consequently, when parents complain about the odd case of pilfering, he tells them that they are being unreasonable, "We can't turn the place into a prison with teachers as wardens and prefects as deputy wardens."

This last Headmaster had a clear conception, shared by most of the others but not articulated in this exact form, of the school as a family: delinquency should be dealt with as it would be in the home. This and similar conceptions reflected the type of yearning for *gemeinschaft* social control referred to earlier. As many as 7 (about a third) of the Headmasters spontaneously mentioned the fact that they had themselves been brought up in rural or village communities.⁷ It was often apparent that some had not adjusted their conceptions of deviance and control to an urban setting. In any event, the nostalgia for more informal social control was very strong. One Headmaster (H.14) who himself recollected having been given a sound beating by "the village cop", expressed sentiments about the old days that would have been echoed by most of the sample:

... behaviour was predictable, you knew how people were going to react to certain situations. Now you don't know this. You don't know anything about them.

A similar orientation to social control was taken by most youth workers. They stressed the need to maintain a family-like loyalty among the members, a sense of honour which would somehow be tarnished if outsiders were called in. Most youth leaders resented the fact that formal control agents - particularly probation officers and magistrates - did not pay enough attention to their recommendations about what to do with members who had got into trouble. Youth workers have more scope in interpreting their function than have Headmasters and consequently there is less unanimity among them about handling delinquency within the club.

7. One Headmaster (H.9) remarked that prior to his present appointment (in a Secondary School in a deteriorating area of Northview) he had "had no contact with the great unwashed." Mills (*op.cit.*) noted that nearly all the authors of social pathology textbooks he analysed were born in small towns or farms near small towns.

One might compare the attitudes of the three professional youth workers. Y.13 sees the club role as preventive, but does not hesitate to call in the police. If a wallet is reported missing, he closes all the doors and tells the boys that he is phoning the police. The wallet is usually back before the police come, but he has them in anyway, so that the boys can see he wasn't bluffing.

Y.14, on the other hand, is extremely reluctant to call in the police. He was one of the few in the sample against any extension of police power and believes that the police are only interested in obtaining convictions. He supports this opinion by recounting an incident in which he phoned the police to ask for advice after he had caught four boys stealing some lemonade. A few minutes later, a squad car arrived, the boys were bundled inside (including one who had nothing to do with the incident), and were taken to the Police Station and charged. He adopts a permissive policy which he is aware has attracted hostility among adults in authority. In deciding what to do with vandalism and stealing in the club, his attitude is affected not so much by the amount stolen or damaged, but his knowledge of the prevailing norms in the area, one of high delinquency.

His position can again be contrasted with Y.15, who, although he also prefers to deal with things himself, does frequently call the police in for a "bad case". But this is only on an unofficial basis: the police are asked to advise and not to apprehend. Unlike Y.14, who is obviously not on good terms with the police, he is able to follow this procedure because the club happens to be connected with the police and he himself is an ex-policeman. Thus do fortuitous organizational factors affect the flow of deviants into the official system.

A final group whose control procedures are worth scrutinizing are employers and others in authority relations at work: in the sample, these include the businessmen, but also some magistrates and councillors in their full-time roles. As victims of delinquency - usually shoplifting or

pilfering by their own employees - they are often in crucial positions to put the formal control apparatus into motion, that is, by calling in the police or pressing for charges to be laid.

As studies of shoplifting would lead one to expect, this group showed wide variation in policy. Three-quarters of the group instinctively preferred to deal with delinquency themselves; as the Managing Director of a large department store (B.5) put it: "We know that it's not our job to act as judge and prosecutor, but in practice we reserve the right to deal with things ourselves." In regard specifically to shoplifting, this orientation was often at odds with the firm's official policy. Five of the group whose firms were part of national organizations said that, although they were instructed to prosecute in all cases, they were extremely reluctant to do so and bent over backwards to try to deal with things themselves. The manager of a large public service organization (B.4), on the other hand, personally preferred to prosecute, but his national organization was against this because of the adverse publicity that would result.

Among those that preferred to deal themselves with offences by their own juvenile employees, there was a strong feeling - akin to that of the headmaster and youth worker - that the organization was like a family in which deviance should be contained and insulated from the outside world. B.2, for example, the personnel officer of a large factory, said that although it was a factory rule that anyone caught stealing would be sacked and prosecuted, he would always try to use informal methods. He would talk with the manager and shop steward and then try "to bring the boy in line myself." He would tell the boy that he was letting him down. Another member of the group in charge of personnel in public organization (B.6) explicitly stated that he spoke to his young employees as if he were one of their parents; he would use methods of control such as "withdrawal of privileges". Another personnel manager (B12) compared himself with a school principal: the offence would reflect on him if he couldn't deal with it himself.

Some of the group had evolved complicated procedures of social control and went through an elaborately formalized ritual for dealing with the deviant. Although each case was judged "on its merits", these rituals functioned to routinize a difficult decision-making process. The rule-breaker would be put through a series of test situations, his responses to which would affect his career as a potential deviant. The following procedure, for example, was described by B. 1 for dealing with boys in his shop who were caught stealing:

I first leave him alone in my office to thaw out for about ten minutes. He begins to feel sorry for himself and you tell him that he's lost his job and his whole future career has been prejudiced. You tell him that you've got to inform his parents and then you try to find out if he minds about this; if he does mind, then it's likely that he won't do it again. If he doesn't mind, then you have to put the fear of God into him. If he doesn't have the right attitude then I'll tell him that I've decided to call in the police. By then you've had him sweating for an hour and you can let him go. This sanction often works, although some just don't keep straight.

A variation of this procedure was used by B.5. The boy would be asked to come up with his parents, but then left in a room outside. The manager would then "study" the parents' reaction to the situation and they would be asked whether they would like to handle things themselves or whether they would like him to deal with the boy. In nine-tenths of the cases they would let him take over and his method would be to tell the boy not to worry about him - because the store can afford the loss - but to think about letting down his parents: "I don't feel I have any success until the child is in tears."

It should not be thought that such attempts to combine the parental role and organize a successful status degradation ceremony, are relished by the group. On the whole, they regarded these tasks as necessary but not very pleasant. B.5, for example, thought this was the most unpleasant part of his work and found it painful to see people in distress: "When the store detective rings through to say there's someone in his office, I feel a thump in my heart."

For all of the group, there comes a point when outsiders (the police) must be called in. For some - about a quarter - this point comes very soon and is determined by policies which they may or may not agree with, but have no choice in implementing. For the rest, who have more discretion, the decision is affected by factors such as the seriousness of the offence, the type of offence (B.6 would deal with vandalism himself but "would not touch petty theft"), previous record and the attitudes adopted by the boy and/or his parents. As with the headmasters and the youth workers, these factors are not clear bases for decision-making: they serve only as limits or guidelines, and the controller is usually well aware of how hazy and unreliable they are.

Causation of Delinquency and Image of the Delinquent
(Section C, Questions 6, 7 and 8)

In dealing with the conceptions of vandalism and in examining in Chapter 7 some formulations about deviancy control systems, we noted the crucial importance of controllers' ideas about the causes of deviance and images of the typical deviant. Cohen and Short, Matza and Scheff all suggest that a crucial contingency affecting the deviant's career is the way in which his behaviour is explained. Scheff notes how current psychiatric doctrines about the nature of mental illness effects the screening of people alleged to be mentally ill. These doctrines are invoked partly because they are believed to be true, but partly because they conveniently justify present policy.⁸ Matza focuses less on the content of the controller's explanation of delinquency, than on the nature of these explanations as positivist theories especially in their espousal of the doctrine of determinism and their consequent denial of individual responsibility. In these three questions, the focus is on the content of explanations: whether controllers actually do use deterministic explanations will be considered in parts of Questions 13 and 14.

8. Scheff, op.cit., pp. 151 - 153.

Question 6: The question here is quite straightforward: "What do you think are the most important causes of delinquency in general?" The procedure in asking this question was to record the respondent's immediate reply and then to confirm that this was the "one thing" he felt to be the most important cause of delinquency. He was then probed in detail, whether or not he mentioned these factors, about his specific opinions on the relevance of three areas: Home (Family), School and Economic Conditions.

The replies to the first part of the question are shown in Table 30. The overwhelming concentration (70.7%) on the family, to the exclusion of macro-social factors and other institutions, such as the school, will be commented on later. Although probing revealed that respondents did not all mean the same when they said, "It all starts from the family (parents, home)", these replies were remarkable in their unanimity of tone and form. Although the general public's opinion on the causes of delinquency might well cover a more diverse range⁹, there is little doubt among this sample of controllers where the causes of delinquency are located.

The one major category of response not probed in detail in the second part of the question - "Social Malaise" - is worth commenting on, because although it was only mentioned explicitly 17 times, it was a factor that ran through many other responses: for example, the "breakdown of the family" and "weakening of parental discipline" were often seen as symptoms of a deeper sickness. Respondents using this category referred to the absence of a sense of purpose in society, a general lowering of morals and standards, "the lack of meaningfulness in life today" (R.3) and the irresponsible attitudes of adults in authority. About half these replies carried overtly religious overtones; four came from Religious Leaders, but

9. Scott, from his analysis of 500 British press cuttings in which opinions were expressed on delinquency, notes that an outstanding finding was the "astonishing variety" of opinions. The sources of most of these opinions, however, were journalists and writers to correspondence columns, and can thus hardly be thought to constitute public opinion. See P.D. Scott, "Public Opinion and Juvenile Delinquency," British Journal of Delinquency, 1 (July 1950), pp. 56 - 59.

TABLE 30One Most Important Perceived Cause of Juvenile Delinquency

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency Mentioned</u>
1. Home, Family, Parents	94
2. Social Malaise	17
3. Affluence	5
4. Heredity	3
5. Original Sin	3
6. External Pressures (commercial exploitation, teenage culture, etc.)	2
7. Effect of War	2
8. Miscellaneous and Don't Know	<u>7</u>
	133

the others were spread evenly throughout the occupational groups. One of the "Social Malaise" responses is worth quoting at length, not just because it is a particularly vivid example, but because it comes from a professional social worker (S.18, a woman who has been a probation officer for 22 years). In other words, this is not the caricatured moral entrepreneur speaking - for example, the magistrate from the bench - but one whose occupational role has stereotypically been associated with the forces of permissiveness and with the type of ideology Matza attributes to social workers and allied professions:-

It goes back two or three generations: a gradual easing and slackening off. I myself was the worst offender. In the twenties we were full of the new education, free expression and all that: leave people alone and they will be naturally noble. There was a swing after the earlier rigidity, but I think we went a little mad. Freud was the new idea and we were all for Freud. And although I think his theories are right ... we went too far in excusing everything, because after all "these were their impulses." But really a child need control. You can see how things have gone wrong - with education, discipline, socialism - with this current attention on 'Swinging London'. Certainly all the top models, playwrights, photographers are there - a new generation, everyone marvellous but what they don't say is that these people are rude, vulgar, selfish, horrible. This is what our generation did to the whole nation.

This "swing of the pendulum" theme ran through many responses: the

reaction against Victorian severity had been carried too far, the rot had now set in, authority and morality had been corroded away, but people were seeing the results and the pendulum would soon swing back the other way.

I shall now consider the specific responses to probes about the family, school and economic factors as causes of delinquency.

(1) Family: No respondent thought that family background was unimportant in causing delinquency. The exact ways in which family background was thought to be causative could be divided into five categories, as shown in Table 31.

TABLE 31

Ways in Which Family Background is Thought to Cause Delinquency

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency Mentioned</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. No discipline, authority, control	43	32.3
2. Lack of parental guidance and interest; working mothers	39	29.3
3. "Psychological" factors: insecurity, parental discord, broken home	27	20.3
4. Low moral standards	13	9.8
5. Family unit breaking up	<u>11</u>	<u>8.3</u>
	133	100.0

Although most of the respondents would probably have said that each of these categories was of some importance, in response to an open-ended probe, they clearly have different orientations to the family as a socializing agent. In the first and largest category, there was a straightforward authoritarian conception of the parental role. These replies reflected the "swing of the pendulum" argument: "Parents are just letting go of the reins" (H.8). The picture - which respondents tended to generalize to families other than those which produced delinquents - was one of parents allowing their children total freedom. Slightly over a third of this group referred explicitly to the absence of corporal punishment:

Lack of authority usually goes with not using corporal punishment. When my little girl who's four defies authority, she gets a smack, that's all. If you can't control a small child, the situation must get worse. (R.12)

While some 30% of each occupational group were in this category, there were three of the Youth Workers (16.7%) and ten of the Lawyers (76.9%).

The second and fifth categories are to some extent alike. The fifth is most akin to the type of nostalgia for some idealized pre-industrial society which emerged in so many responses to the question about social control. There is little value judgment except sadness. These respondents mourned the passing of "... the traditional British home life ... where the family was a self-contained unit" (M.11). Their picture of the "good" family, sitting united in front of the fireside, was to some extent shared by respondents in the second category, although these responses were more realistic and focused on factors such as the absence of parental concern and sympathy with their children. The picture was of parents who were totally disinterested in their children, did not co-operate with the school, and were not concerned about their children's welfare. As one Headmaster put it, "'interest' is too weak a word when you get cases of boys saying that their father didn't wish them a happy birthday" (H.19). Other typical responses in this category were:-

Home for these children is just a sort of hotel where they can leave their cases and pick up some money. (R.6)

You get families where the parents turn away from their T.V. sets to find they've got a 15-year-old boy on their hands. (Y.11)

These boys ask for clubs to be open on a Sunday because they dread the Sunday afternoon session watching T.V. with their parents reliving their youth by watching old films. (Y.14)

The parents work all day and then come home to go off to the pub again or open a tin of beans; they don't give the children a meal. (Y.17)

Replies in this category tend to mirror the picture drawn by some criminologists of the delinquency-producing family. The controllers' picture may be viewed in the same way as the criminologist's: one might question, for example, the notion of pathology inherent in the description

and the extent of social class bias and value judgment. Some of the responses clearly reveal the contempt in which such families are held: "If family planning is the answer, then it'll have to be: these are the type that breed delinquents ... they always come from that sort of home, or the thing they call home." (H.4, a Junior School Headmaster on a Council Housing Estate). Controllers also differ along a dimension which mirrors a controversy within criminology: the relative importance of the mother or father. There was a slight tendency for respondents closer to the problem (like probation officers, professional youth leaders, some headmasters) to stress the importance of the father, while the more remote respondents (e.g. lawyers, doctors) used the "working mother" stereotype.

The third category, used, as might be expected, twice as much by the social workers as any other group, referred to various types of emotional pathology within the family. The emphasis was on the insecurity caused by physically or psychologically damaged homes. Perhaps even more than in either of the previous categories, these respondents held their view with considerable certainty and clarity:

There is not a single case in my five-and-a-half years at this school where trouble of any kind, in and out of school, has not been due to some maladjustment at home. (H.13)

The usual picture is this: the father marrying the mother when she is six months' pregnant; they are never happy, he objects to the child and hates him when he is seven or eight ... the father sleeps around with other women ... you see the separation in one court and the children in the juvenile court. (M.7 - a female Juvenile Court Magistrate)

In addition to unstable marriages, the absence of a father figure is often mentioned as a source of pathology; as a Salvation Army Officer remarked, "You never say to a boy in your group 'how's your dad', because you don't know whether his dad is around." (R.13)

The fourth category - low moral standards - although to some extent overlapping with the first two, carries the clear connotation of the absence of a moral code which the parents should exemplify. At its extreme, the picture here was of the archetypical criminal family, actually passing down

criminal values and techniques to the children.

(2) School: In view of the considerable emphasis which sociological theories of delinquency place on the school - as the starting-off point for "status frustration" or "dissociation" from the middle-class value system - it was thought important to include specific probes on the role of the school in causing delinquency. As Table 30 indicated, no one mentioned these factors as being of major importance; the most striking fact about Table 32 is that even when specifically probed about this area, 36.8% of the sample still could not see any connection between the educational system and delinquency and, even in the other categories, the effects mentioned were seen as marginal. In only two categories (3 and 5, making up 13.5%) were the responses at all allied to the mainstream of criminological theory about the school.

TABLE 32

Ways in Which School/Educational Factors are Thought Relevant
in Causing Delinquency

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency Mentioned</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. Not enough discipline in schools today; less use of corporal punishment	32	24.1
2. Low moral standards set by teachers	18	13.5
3. Absence of "child centredness" in school - no meaningful relationship with teachers, etc.	14	10.5
4. Bad influences, gangs forming in school	13	9.8
5. Pressures from external educational system - effects of "11+", segregation, competition, etc.	4	3.0
6. Physical defects in school - no sporting facilities, etc.	3	2.3
7. School, educational system has no influence at all on delinquency, no relevance to the problem	<u>49</u> 133	<u>36.8</u> 100.0

Respondents in Category 1, made a straightforward causal link between the "breakdown" of discipline in the school and delinquency. In about two-thirds of the cases, this breakdown was equated with the decline in the

use of corporal punishment: authority was being eroded, the pupils were being pandered to:

The teaching profession lacks moral courage ... they have opted out of the whole business of discipline. (M.C.1)

About 37% of the Magistrates and 53% of the Lawyers held this view compared with 24% for the whole sample.

In Category 2 the emphasis was on the low moral tone of the school and particularly the low standard set by teachers:

There is a lack of respect for the masters. Some boys have told me that the masters behave like school children ... for example, about their wage claims, they have brought themselves down to the level of dockers or coal miners. They don't set high moral standards or any sort of example: look at those who march around with their pupils wearing nuclear disarmament badges. (B.1)

I am amazed to see some of my staff reading the Sketch or the Mirror: standards are falling everywhere. (H.23)

Others in this category stressed the absence of a sense of "moral community", (R.9) which could give the pupil a set of values to look up to and emulate. The relationship of the school to the rest of the community was also mentioned, and there was a yearning for the old village school-house which had "stood for something" in the community.

Respondents in Category 3 were the most psychologically aware and those in Category 5 the most sociologically aware: the stress was on factors such as large classes, the stigmatizing effects of streaming and segregation, the consequences of the "11+", etc.

Category 4 referred to the conventional "bad friends" theory and, in some cases, this effect was used to justify opposition to comprehensive education. B.7, for example, recounted the story of a boy who had gone to a private school and was "quite a nice lad", but then changed to a state school:

... and now he's just a lout; he just followed the herd. It's easy for a youngster to get in with the wrong crowd unless he's strong and independant. This is what's going to happen with

comprehensives: you throw them all together in the same melting pot - there must be some levelling down; this can definitely be a cause of delinquency.

In the largest single category of responses, the school and educational system were seen as being entirely irrelevant to the problem of delinquency. The response was either one of blank incomprehension, simplistic perceptions such as "... the problem would obviously be worse without schools" (Y.17), or righteous indignation: "the school is the only real bastion against delinquency" (Y.18). The blame always lay elsewhere, the schools were doing their best:

You can't think of the school as cause. It acts as a brake on delinquency and there would be more if the school was not there. The school has the role of counteracting other influences and it's doing it - although it's fighting a losing battle. (H.11)

I can't see how the school can really contribute. I suppose the atmosphere might be wrong but I can't imagine any school in Northview today being like this. They all try to inculcate some moral and ethical standards. Very few schools have an overbearing discipline which would make the child go the other way. The area is always more important; with comprehensive area schools the problem will get worse. (H.16)

The schools are doing a terrific job ... they're already doing more than they're expected to and we can't demand that they do more. The parents are failing and the school already has to carry the parents on its shoulders especially in Secondary Schools. (M.2)

About a third of each of the occupational groups responded in these terms, with the exception of the Businessmen (50%) and Youth Workers (55%).

3. Economic Factors: Economic factors are of even greater significance than educational in sociological theories of delinquency. How relevant does the sample think they are?

TABLE 33

Ways in Which Economic Factors are thought Relevant in Causing Delinquency

<u>Category</u>	<u>Frequency Mentioned</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. Greater teenage affluence	57	42.8
2. Deprivation - absolute and relative	28	21.1
3. Pressures created by commercial exploitation	9	6.8
4. No relevance at all	39	29.3
	<u>133</u>	<u>100.0</u>

As Table 33 indicates, the largest category of respondents see the supposedly greater teenage affluence as being the economic factor of most relevance in causing delinquency. As was clear from Questions 1 and 3(b), the dominant stereotype is that money is readily available to young people and they have little sense of deprivation. In fact, if we combine this category with Category 4 it appears that 72.1% of the sample see no connection between economic deprivation and delinquency:

Poverty never had anything to do with it and it has nothing to do with it now. (S.12)

No-one is delinquent any more because he is forced by outside economic conditions. One isn't delinquent because there is no other way open. (C.1)

Those in Category 1 go on to suggest that delinquency is caused by too much money: there is easy money around for the young person and this makes him greedy for more:

The more people get the more they desire. (L.2)

The basic cause is too much money ... Thirty years ago I was liberal and progressive and believed the social reformers who said that money was at the root of all social problems like delinquency ... Now we've got progress, there's no more poverty: but there's more of a problem than ever. (H.20)

All along things are coming to people without effort; jobs, money ... Juvenile delinquency is just an expression of the desire to get things without making any effort. (H.11)

Delinquency is trying to get at too many things too easily ... people have become more aware of the good things in life ... we've thrown back the curtain for them too soon. (M.3)

The remaining 28% of respondents pointed more or less explicitly to the type of factors sociological theories of delinquency have emphasized: strains created by commercial exploitation of the adolescent, the relative economic deprivation of the working class adolescent, large families and overcrowding, etc.. A few of these respondents used these factors to articulate explanations close to various subcultural theories:

They resent society: they are more class conscious. I feel the same way, although I'm doing it in an acceptable legitimate way through politics: they resent it all as much as I do, and that's how it comes out: in delinquency. (M.C.6)

In regard more to this than any other causal factor, the responses were affected by the controller's own economic position and origin. Using the index of father's occupation, 59.6% of those from professional origins thought that affluence was a cause of delinquency, compared to 42.8% for the whole sample, 34.8% of those from other middle class and white collar origins, and 28% of those from working class origins. Those from professional parents were similarly less likely to think of economic deprivation as being important (12.8% compared to 21.1% for the whole sample). One might interpret these figures as indicating a tendency for those who have not experienced economic difficulties themselves to see this area as unimportant. Using the index of social mobility, on the other hand, there were no significant differences between the upwardly mobile respondent and the rest except in terms of Category 3 (commercial pressures) which 14.5% of the upwardly mobile group thought important compared to 1.5% of the rest of the sample.

Question 7: Because the issue of causation is of such importance, a further question was constructed in which respondents were asked to weight, in order of importance on a five-point scale, each of sixteen factors which might be relevant in causing delinquency. After weighting each factor separately, the respondents were asked to read through the list again, ranking in order the three factors thought to be most important.¹⁰ The scores are shown in Table 34, the three columns representing respectively the average weighting attached to each factor, the rank order of these weightings, and the order of the factors when ranked by the sample in terms of comparative importance. These columns show some significant differences: for example, the factor of emotional disturbance which is given the highest weighting is only fifth when ranked in terms of

10. See Appendix F for list of factors, scale values and full instructions. The factors were read out at random to correct for possible response bias arising from the ordinal position of each factor on the list.

TABLE 34

IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS FACTORS AS CAUSES OF DELINQUENCY

Factor	Average Weighting on Five-Point Scale	Ordinal Position of Weighting	Ordinal Position when factors ranked as 1st, 2nd, 3rd importance
Little parental love and attention Gang membership Economically poor home Using drugs Emotional disturbance Below average intelligence Delinquent area Parents mentally ill Lack of status and recognition from society No religious training in home School unsatisfactory and boring Lack of discipline in home Lack of recreational facilities in neighbourhood Overprotected and spoilt by parents Anti-social behaviour inherited Influence of T.V. and films	4.14 3.19 2.08 2.91 4.43 3.17 3.56 3.62 2.72 2.76 3.03 4.06 2.64 3.13 3.00 2.67	2 6 16 11 1 7 5 4 13 12 9 3 15 8 10 14	1 7 15 9 5 11 3 3 10 12 13 2 15 8 6 14
371.			
	No importance at all Very little importance Some importance Much importance Very much importance	1 2 3 4 5	

comparative importance. This is to be interpreted as meaning that when there is emotional disturbance, it is thought as likely to lead to delinquency, but that emotional disturbance is not thought a factor of great importance as a cause of delinquency as a whole.

Some Comments on Questions 6 and 7: The most general point to be made about these responses is that the level of explanation was usually psychological and the locus of delinquency-producing factors was invariably the home. There was little or no awareness that factors outside the family or the immediate network of primary groups are relevant causes. This pattern can be seen in the initial response to Question 6 (Table 30) and the weightings given to the items in Question 7 (Table 34). The items assigned the four lowest average weightings were all macro-social or community factors: influence of mass media, economic deprivation, status frustration and blocked leisure opportunities. Similarly, the item dealing with school experience was given a ranking of 13 out of 16 and, as I indicated earlier, educational factors are thought peripheral to delinquency. On the other hand, the four highest weightings are given to unambiguously intra-familial or individual factors; little parental love and attention, lack of discipline, emotional disturbance and parental mental illness. An exception to this pattern is the delinquent area factor which is given a fairly high priority.

How does this pattern of responses relate to other findings? As previously pointed out, there are few comparable studies of similar populations. In one study of controllers which used some comparable questions on causality, the pattern was similar to the extent that economic factors ("slum conditions") were devalued while 95% of the sample agreed with the statement that "Lack of parental control is the reason a child commits a delinquent act."¹¹ Closer comparisons can be made with samples

11. Dearing and Capozzola, op.cit.

from the general population. Di Renzo, for example, used a four-point rating scale with a list of 24 causal factors, including most of those in Question 7.¹² The factor rated most often (by 65.8% of the sample) as being of a "very great deal of importance" was "lack of discipline within the family".¹³ In a comparable British sample from the general population, the cause rated "very important" most often (71%) was "lack of discipline in the home".¹⁴ Other factors rated of greatest importance by the American sample include broken homes, absence of religious influence (not considered very important by the Northview sample) and drinking. Of the comparable factors which were rated high by the Northview sample, but intermediate or low by the American sample, the most significant were emotional disturbance and parental mental illness.

The factors unimportant in Northview were, on the whole also unimportant in the American and British general samples. Mass media influence was rated the lowest of all Di Renzo's 24 items; economic, educational and status factors were similarly given a low priority. Minority group status (a factor not included in the Northview questionnaire because of its less obvious relevance in Britain) was, for example, rated a "very great deal" of importance by only 5.8% of the sample, while 22.3% rated it as being of no importance. Educational and status factors were similarly thought unimportant by the British general sample: the factors "people go straight from school to dead-end jobs" and "the poor are envious of the rich" were rated as "very important" by only 27% and 11% of the sample respectively.

One might conclude from these comparisons, that the Northview sample is not very different from the general population in their ideas about

12. Di Renzo, op.cit., pp. 36 - 90 and Appendices.

13. Ibid., p. 42.

14. "Ourselves and Crime - Who's Guilty?" New Society, 29th September, 1966, p. 479.

delinquency.¹⁵ There is a slight tendency for the controllers - particularly professional social workers - to concentrate even further on psychological causes. This tendency is to be expected because of the individualistic, situational bias built into the professional training of such groups.¹⁶ Martin and Fitzpatrick suggest that this tendency is characteristic of most external caretakers: they never see or experience the world from which their clients come and, because of this, take up a position of cultural absolutism.¹⁷ They believe that the explanation of deviance is to be found in the family life and personality structures of their cases rather than in subcultural or structural patterns. Social workers, psychiatrists and the like, represent merely an extreme version of this tendency: their theories play down sociological or anthropological perspectives, they view individuals through a "pathological lens";¹⁸ deviance is explained as an end product of the psychological or moral defects of the persons involved.

Question 8: There is a sense in which a person's notion of the "typical" delinquent is subsumed in his idea about what causes delinquency. Thus, if he sees delinquency as caused by low intelligence, overcrowding, slum housing, working mothers, he has an image of the typical delinquent and his background. It was thought important, however, to deal with the question of imagery in a separate question, in order to establish more exactly the respondent's picture of the typical delinquent in terms of his background and visible characteristics.

In the event, this did not prove a particularly fruitful question.

-
- 15. One would expect, though, that more adequate surveys than those quoted would reveal social class, education and other differences in opinions.
 - 16. On the tendency to treat social problems as individual problems, see Mills, op.cit., and Bend and Vogelfanger, op.cit.
 - 17. Martin and Fitzpatrick, op.cit., p. 97.
 - 18. Ibid., p. 56.

Many of the sample pointed out that their contacts with delinquents were too limited to generalize about their characteristics. The responses reveal the form rather than the content of the stereotype: in what terms does the respondent picture the delinquent and what - if any - types of delinquents does he distinguish? To obtain the precise content of the stereotype, this question should be put, not in an open-ended form, but by using a check-list of various parts of the picture: social class, type of school, psychological traits, etc.. From this list, a composite picture of the typical delinquent could be constructed. This picture might help to understand the operational image of the typical offender with which control agents operate. This generalized image effects the way they handle specific cases: the judgment that X is "just another one of those ..." or, conversely, that he is "nothing like the usual ..." carries certain implications as to the method of control that follows. We would like to know why some deviants are thought to be "unusual" or abnormal members of that class of deviants and what implications this has for their career.¹⁹

The responses to the question "what do you think the typical or average delinquent is like? Could you describe him?", could be divided into three categories. The first (37.6% of the sample) drew a more or less clear composite in sociological terms. Delinquents came from large working class families, living predominantly on council housing estates. The parents had little interest in their children and did not bother to discipline them; the mother invariably was working. The boy was of low I.Q., he went to a Secondary Modern School and then to a menial job; he had, however, plenty of money. His social characteristics were either crudely delineated: he was "one of the peasantry" (H.9), "the van boy type" (B12), or distinguished in sharper terms:

19. In discussing the process of "typification in diagnosis", Scheff (op.cit., pp. 178 - 187) speculates on the functions of diagnostic stereotypes in control agencies. His discussion of stereotyping, however, is very limited and neither he nor other sociologists have dealt adequately with this issue.

They come from working class, stubbornly socially conscious fathers ... and you always have a struggling mother - emotionally or financially struggling. (S.10)

Their families have made money and have come up to Northview from London but haven't grown with their money. (S.2)

There were sometimes elements in the composite which logically contradicted each other or the causal theories previously advanced by the respondent, e.g., class factors were unimportant as causes, yet delinquents were seen as coming from a particular social class. But these logically dissonant perceptions were easily resolved attitudinally: H.9, for example, although painting a picture of the typical working class family from which delinquents come, explained that he gave a low weighting to the factor "little parental love and attention" in Question 7 because "... the lower mentality parent shows a fierce sort of animal love, a sort of protectiveness especially when their offspring is in trouble."

A smaller group of respondents (23.3%) typified the delinquent in individualistic, psychological terms. They saw delinquents as being alike not in sharing a similar social background but in possessing the same psychological traits. These traits distinguished them from others with similar social characteristics: as one headmaster put it; "you can spot them out ... most Secondary Schools have a pool of these children." (H.4) The traits or attitudes most commonly mentioned included, "low I.Q.", "greed", "irresponsibility", "ingratitude", "laziness", "anti-authority attitudes", "surliness", and "cowardice". Individual composites varied in clarity and specificity:-

... bored easily, no incentive to work, content to just get by, no ambition or interest, can't tackle anything definite, just waiting to get their own way and leave home. (S.18, a Probation Officer)

They're all the same: unstable characters, often schizoid or potentially schizoid. (D.2)

The final category of 25.6% of the sample (the remaining 13.5% said they did not have enough contact with delinquents to generalize), drew distinctions between various types of delinquents. These distinctions were

made on the grounds of types of offence, psychological characteristics or social class. This latter distinction revealed an interesting set of stereotypes about the differences between middle class and lower class deviants. In the first place, middle class offenders would commit a different type of offence; they were usually credited, for example, with more sexual offences. One headmaster distinguished between the ordinary violent offender and "... those with evil sexual tendencies: these sexual perverts come from a higher social class than the crudely violent type." (H.6) Or else the middle class would commit more "skillful" crimes: "... although one wouldn't find delinquents at X (a well-known public school in Northview), this is not to say that they won't be swindlers later." (M.3) Secondly, middle class delinquency was seen as not only less frequent but also less serious; it wasn't "real" delinquency; it wasn't intrinsic in the person as "ordinary" delinquency was:

... you do get the wrong ones at Eton, minor delinquencies which are hushed up, but I must admit that I have only once seen a youngster in court from a good school and a good home and this was for being stupid, that's all. And medicine and law came to the aid. But for the others, even cash for the lawyers and legal aid couldn't help. (M.C.3)

There was, finally, the perception that middle class delinquency was also different in causation, the middle class offender, for example, had inherited a "bad strain";

... there's the percentage that are born wrong, for example, the boy from the public school; his parents have done everything for him, yet he ends up in prison, it must be something in him. (M.C.1)

Another causal pattern frequently attributed to the middle-class offender is that of emotional disturbance. This might be called the "Leopold-Loeb syndrome": the assumption that whereas ordinary delinquency might be explained in simple terms (for example, lack of discipline in the family), the middle class delinquent is driven by emotional disturbances or "impulses":

Grammar school boys will often commit serious offences. They are more clever and, at times, more vicious than the others; viciousness is not related to the lower orders. But in grammar

school the cause would be emotional upsets rather than social pressures. (H.9)

There were no significant differences between the groups along these dimensions except that professionally trained social workers tended to use psychological imagery more frequently.

The Mods and Rockers (Section D, Questions 9 - 12)

At the same time as the Northview interviews were being planned, the study of reactions to the Mods and Rockers was under way. Although the focus of the Northview section is on delinquency in general and of the Mods and Rockers section on mass media and local community reactions, I did not want to miss the opportunity of finding out the sample's views about a type of juvenile misconduct which at the time was so highly publicized and seemed so important. I will summarize here very briefly the responses to these questions, and use the findings more fully in the Mods and Rockers chapters.

Asked (Question 9) simply how they felt "about this sort of thing", nearly half the controllers (48.9%) saw the Mods and Rockers phenomenon in threatening and serious terms. The behaviour was seen as symptomatic of a more general breakdown in law and order and its long term implications were found to be highly disturbing. Another 20% felt less threatened by what happened: the problem was confined to the resorts, the behaviour was just a manifestation of the pop culture or the "group mentality", and although it was condemned, it was only of marginal significance. Some 15% thought that the behaviour had been exaggerated by the mass media and another 10% denied that the problem was of any importance.

Questions 9 and 10 are related to specific parts of the imagery about the Mods and Rockers; briefly, they indicate that:- (i) while 33% of the sample thought that the behaviour was something quite new, 40% that these were merely old actors (the Spivs, the Teddy Boys) on a new

stage; (ii) the sample was evenly divided about whether the events would be repeated or die away; (iii) over 80% of the sample were highly critical of the mass media handling of the phenomenon, accusing them of exaggeration and (iv) the sample was evenly divided about whether the Mods and Rockers were the "delinquent type" or represented a broader cross-section of adolescents.

In regard to the punishment thought most appropriate (Question 11) the sample treated the matter more seriously than might have been predicted from some of their initial responses. The most favoured forms of punishments were ones which involved reparation: either through financial repayment of the costs of any damage, or some enforced work scheme. Short, sharp solutions were thought more appropriate than either "soft" sentences, such as probation, or long ones, such as Borstal. Although using a period in the army as a form of punishment was not altogether favoured, nearly 60% of the sample felt that if there was still National Service, the Mods and Rockers phenomenon would not have occurred. The exact responses to Question 11 may be found in Table 47.

Reactions to Types of Delinquency and Information Affecting
Decision-making. (Section E, Questions 13 and 14)

Question 13: In this question, respondents were presented with a list of fifteen different types of activities which are usually labelled as delinquent.²⁰ They were asked to imagine each act being committed by a hypothetical 15-years-old boy, with no previous record of delinquency. This would be the first time he was involved in that particular activity and - unless otherwise stated - he would be alone. Respondents were then asked, by using a set of four-point rating scales, to judge each of these acts along four dimensions:-

20. See Appendix E for list and full instructions. In the last 60 interviews, Questions 13 and 14, which are extremely time-consuming to administer during the interview, were redrafted so that the respondents could complete them in writing. Respondents were left with stamped addressed envelopes to return the completed questions, but despite a letter of reminder, 19 forms were not returned and 9 of the remaining 114 had to be excluded because answers were incomplete. This left 105 forms on which basis Questions 13 and 14 are analysed.

- (a) seriousness for the community
- (b) likelihood of the boy being emotionally disturbed
- (c) likelihood of the causes lying in pressures from society
- (d) whether the boy should be sent away from home (to a place like a detention centre)

This procedure is a relatively crude way of trying to discover the ways in which different types of delinquency are judged, in terms of seriousness and psychological and sociological determinism, and how these judgments effect a specific control decision. The procedure does not exactly simulate a real-life situation, the judgments and decisions are not ones which all the sample routinely make, and the amount of information given about the case is very inadequate. Given these limitations, though, this question raises a number of interesting issues.

The results, shown in Table 35, can be analysed in three ways:- firstly, how do the fifteen acts compare with each other in terms of each of the four dimensions of judgment? Secondly, what is the overall degree to which the label of emotional disturbance is used (Column b) and to which sociological determinism is applied (Column c)? And, finally, how are the judgments on each dimension related to each other; for example, is it likely that if the actor is seen as emotionally disturbed, he will be "excused" from a punitive sentence?

In regard to seriousness of the act, the rankings are more or less as might be expected: violent personal crime, serious vandalism and drug taking are ranked high, while civil disobedience, petty vandalism and petty theft are not thought serious. What is, perhaps, worth noting is the comparative seriousness with which homosexual activity is viewed. In the absence of any objective criterion such as "damage to society", it is, of course, virtually impossible to evaluate these judgments in anything other than subjective terms. One can only state that these judgments are "wrong" or "distorted" by comparing them with other sets of judgments, say, by the general public or by criminologists. In the absence of reliable

TABLE 35
REACTIONS TO FIFTEEN TYPES OF DELINQUENCY

	[a] Seriousness to Community		[b] Emotional Disturbance		[c] Social Forces		[d] Detention Away From Home	
	Ave.Score	Rank	Ave.Score	Rank	Ave.Score	Rank	Ave.Score	Rank
1. Destroying School Property	2.63	6	2.54	3	2.21	6	3.26	7
2. Armed Robbery	3.90	1	2.28	4	2.48	4	1.74	1
3. Sexual Relations with 15 year old girl	2.48	8	1.62	9	2.06	9	3.52	10
4. Taking car for joy ride	2.53	7	1.36	14	1.95	11	3.20	6
5. Placing stones on railway track	3.75	2	2.23	5	2.18	7	2.18	2
6. Taking cheap article from chain store	1.84	13	1.56	10	1.96	10	3.54	11
7. Drunk on street with friends	2.00	10	1.38	13	2.10	8	3.67	15
8. Gang fight using weapons	3.45	3	2.17	6	2.26	2	2.18	2
9. Motor scooter without licence	1.90	11	1.15	15	1.50	15	3.68	14
10. Mods and Rockers	2.15	9	1.64	8	2.59	3	2.89	5
11. Homosexual Relations	2.66	5	3.10	1	1.80	12	3.38	8
12. Civil Disobedience	1.46	15	1.46	12	2.28	5	3.54	11
13. Starts using drugs	3.38	4	2.89	2	2.86	1	2.86	4
14. Steals books from Public Library	1.87	12	1.47	11	1.66	13	3.64	13
15. Defaces wall of public building	1.80	14	1.92	7	1.72	14	3.46	9
	Not at all serious	1		Not at all likely	1		very much in favour	1
	Somewhat serious	2		Somewhat likely	2		In favour	2
	Quite serious	3		Quite likely	3		Against	3
	Extremely serious	4		Extremely likely	4		Very much against	4

research on these populations we can only point out, in the most general terms, inconsistencies or anomalies between the sample's judgment and others known or hypothesized. The high seriousness assigned to drug taking, for example, might be one such anomaly. It is unlikely that expert opinion would agree that a boy of 15 taking purple hearts for the first time is virtually as serious a concern for the community as a boy taking part in a gang fight with weapons.

In a sense, one "objective" standard can be obtained by comparing the judgments with either or both the sentences specified in the law for that particular offence and those actually handed out by the courts. Previous research has suggested that there is a discrepancy between specified sentences, actual sentences and popular opinion as to what the punishment should be.²¹ These comparisons can be made explicitly in Column (d) where respondents have to indicate the degree to which they are in favour of custodial treatment. In practice, we can only make suppositions about the actual sentences the boy would have received. Of the five acts which the sample were in favour of dealing with by detention - armed robbery, fighting with weapons, Mods and Rockers, drug taking and placing stones on a railway track - it is unlikely that the last three would have been dealt with this way (bearing in mind that these are first offences). In terms of available legal penalties there are also some slight anomalies in the ranking - for example, defacing the wall of a building is ranked higher than shoplifting and stealing a book from a library.

A specific point that may be made about these weightings is that the scores showed a great deal of consistency. Standard deviations and other indexes of scatter were calculated for each score, and with the exception

21. A.M. Rose and A.E. Prell: "Does the Punishment Fit the Crime? A Study in Social Valuation," American Journal of Sociology, 61 (November 1955), pp. 247 - 259.

of the judgment about the seriousness of homosexuality and the type of punishment appropriate to drug taking, the scores of the whole sample tended to cluster round the mean. It is probable that this sample shows a greater degree of consensus than a general population: Silvey, for example, quotes a B.B.C. audience research project where people were asked to rate a list of crimes in order of seriousness.²² The results showed a general lack of consensus: not more than a quarter of the respondents agreed over any one offence and there was a wide distribution of opinion.

In regard to the assessment of psychological disturbance and sociological determinism, the responses show almost equal weightings being given to these factors. In fact, the average sociological weighting (2.05) is slightly higher than the average psychological weighting (1.90) - an unexpected finding in view of the low priority assigned to social factors as causes of delinquency. It is likely that a question in this form makes respondents think along lines they would not consider in abstract. More important, though, is the fact that in absolute terms both weightings are rather low, and this, together with comments made on the question, shows that the sample does not readily accept this sort of labelling or determinism. In regard to emotional disturbance, the only act receiving a score above 3 was homosexuality, suggesting a ready acceptance of the stereotype of the homosexual as sick. The fact that one is referring to a first "offence" indicates all the more sharply the acceptance of the sick label in this connection. Of interest in the other rankings is the relatively high position of the three vandalism offences (3rd, 5th, 7th).

Another type of analysis that may be made from Table 35 refers to the relationship between each dimension. In order to examine all of these relationships, a four by four correlation matrix was calculated.²³ The

22. J. Silvey: "The Criminal Law and Public Opinion," Criminal Law Review (1961), pp. 349 - 358.

23. Use was made of a linear regression programme revised for the London School of Economics, Psychology Department. I am indebted to the L.S.E. Computing Service for their assistance.

following are the sets of correlations obtained (the letters a, b, c, d, referring to the columns in Table 35):

$$1. \quad a:b = -0.011; \quad a:c = -0.087$$

$$2. \quad a:d = -0.480$$

$$3. \quad b:c = +0.413$$

$$4. \quad b:d = +0.213; \quad c:d = +0.240$$

1. These low correlations suggest that there is no tendency for the evaluation of the act as serious to be associated with either the imputation of emotional disturbance or sociological determinism.
2. As low scores in "d" denote acceptance of detention as a punishment, this figure indicates a positive correlation of 0.480 between the evaluation of the act as serious and the judgment that the actor should receive a severe punishment. The correlation is by no means perfect - one might note, for example, that Item 15 is ranked 14th in column "a" and 9th in column "b" - but nevertheless there is a clear indication that the "principle of offence" remains crucial.
3. The fairly high positive correlation between "b" and "c" suggests that something like a general deterministic orientation operates: one either accepts both psychological and sociological explanations or else rejects them both and uses a free-will model of some other type of explanation. Again, if one compares the rankings and the scores of individual items there are exceptions to this tendency. Homosexuality, for example, is thought to be associated with emotional disturbance, but not with social forces.
4. These two low correlations - almost identical as one might expect from our interpretation of the high correlation between "b" and "c" - are extremely interesting in that they reveal no tendency for determinism to affect the type of punishment favoured. Not only does determinism not excuse the offender from custodial detention, but if anything, the opposite is true: the correlation quotient suggests that the act is slightly more

likely to be punished if it is highly determined. What is more likely, however, is simply that these dimensions are independent of each other and that the relationship between seriousness and punishment - the "principle of offence" - is primary. In regard to offences which are serious and also likely to be associated with emotional disturbance (for example, homosexuality, drug taking, railway vandalism) the sample seem to be saying: "if it is serious, it is serious enough to be punished properly".

Question 14: The problem of determining the bases on which control decisions are made, is explored further in this question. Respondents were asked to judge, using a five-point scale, how important each of 10 listed factors would be to them in deciding what to do with a boy. Table 36 lists these factors in the order of the average weighting given to each.

It must be repeated that these scores give only a crude indication of the relative importance of various factors in effecting decision-making. Faced with actual cases, respondents might be far more influenced by, say, educational and social class factors than they would care to admit in answer to a hypothetical and abstract question. Respondents found the question difficult to answer as it involved bringing to the surface certain common-sense assumptions and various organizational norms which are usually left implicit and unquestioned. The scores to this extent are artificial and often reveal a conscious attempt to produce the "right" answer. The reaction of a Youth Employment Officer (Y.11) was instructive in this regard. He rated all the factors except social class as being of very great importance, but then looked worried and asked if he could check his ratings again. He left them unchanged and remarked:

I feel I'm just like the others when I give importance to these things. I don't suppose all of them really should influence me and I'm worried that I sound like those magistrates talking about "long-haired louts". But, when faced with a decision on individual cases, these things are important.

TABLE 36Importance of Various Factors in Affecting Decision-Making

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Average Weighting</u>
1. Past involvement in delinquency	4.38
2. Whether act is premediated	4.14
3. Likelihood of emotional disturbance	4.07
4. Whether boy thinks act justified and doesn't regret it	3.97
5. Whether act done alone or in gang	3.58
6. Whether boy shows respect to policeman or magistrate	3.31
7. Whether act is disapproved of by public	2.82
8. Boy's type of school or type of job	2.59
9. Boy's general appearance and way of dress	2.44
10. Boy's Social Class	2.28

Scale:	No Importance at all	1
	Very Little Importance	2
	Some Importance	3
	Much Importance	4
	Very Great Importance	5

It is likely that many respondents were not as honest, and gave low scores to factors which they felt should not influence them, using some abstract ideal of justice or fair play. Alternatively, as was suggested in discussing the previous question, judgments along dimensions such as emotional disturbance, might not, in practice, influence control significantly.

Taking them at their face value, the scores in Table 36 do confirm a tendency already distinguished: the low weighting given to macro-social factors. Each one of the factors rated as being of very little importance - if one includes appearance and dress as a way of indicating social identity - are of this type. Although there was a relatively high scatter of scores among the sample as a whole, there was a fairly clear consensus between the occupational groups about the weightings. The single exception was the doctors who consistently gave higher weightings to each factor, including the four lowest factors. Magistrates scored the lowest of all the groups on the "emotional disturbance" item (3.68), the second lowest on the "alone

or gang" item (3.31) but the highest on the "premeditation" item (4.93).

Some Comments on Questions 13 and 14: The issues raised by these questions - how various types of delinquency are judged and the bases for control decisions - are central to the thesis, and as such are discussed elsewhere. A few specific comments on the responses, however, are appropriate at this stage:-

(1) There is little indication that the doctrine of determinism and its apparent corollary, the denial of individual responsibility, have made much impression on the sample. Under certain circumstances, admittedly, there are signs that some aspects of some versions of positivist doctrines are becoming acceptable: for example, the ready use of the label of emotional disturbance for some types of delinquency and the verbal assertion at least, that this label effects control decisions. Nevertheless, the implications of positivism do not appear to be fully absorbed or their contradictions with the classical viewpoint understood, let alone resolved. Respondents can, at the same time, use the emotional illness model of positivism and the "punishment must fit the crime model" of the classical school. In terms of sophistication, the Northview sample can be compared in this respect with a general sample from an American city who show the same apparently paradoxical combination of beliefs: 86% of this sample agreed that "The punishment given to a delinquent should be based on how bad the offence was" while at the same time, between 50% and 60% agreed with statements attributing emotional disturbance to delinquents or calling for psychiatric treatment of various types of delinquency (e.g. 57% agreed that "The troubles of most members of delinquent gangs are so deep-rooted that psychological or psychiatric treatment is needed").²⁴ While this sample was much more inclined to use psychiatric labelling than the Northview sample (over half agreed that most boys who engage in petty theft are emotionally disturbed), there were the same attitudinal paradoxes in regard to the question of punishment and

24. William P. Lentz, "Social Status and Attitudes Towards Delinquency Control," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 3 (July 1966), pp. 147 - 154.

responsibility. Part of the paradox disappears if we accept the view that psychiatric "treatment" is another form of punishment or control, and is realized to be so. The comment of one youth leader, who gave a high "sickness" score to drug taking and homosexuality and was also in favour of detention for both acts, encapsulates this view: "He (the homosexual) should be punished in a hospital." (Y.3)

(2) The responses to these questions raise a more general point concerning the relationship between information about the offence or offender and the control decision that follows. This relationship is more complex than might at first appear. The last two low correlations in Question 13 and the high scatter in Question 14, suggests that there is little agreement about what information does or should matter. This point is supported by what Wilkins and Chandler call "... perhaps the most surprising result" in their research on probation officers: "... the lack of any consensus among trained officers as to the value of information in decision making."²⁵ These findings question the commonly held assumption that "better" information about an offence or offender necessarily leads, for example, to a more enlightened attitude towards punishment. A pilot investigation to establish whether knowledge of a criminal's life history leads to a decrease in the severity of the punishment recommended, produced extremely ambiguous findings.²⁶ While severity of punishment decreased with biographical information in the overall sense, the decrease was only statistically significant in three out of ten crimes presented. In fact, in some cases (certain property offences) the crime was punished more

25. L.T. Wilkins and A. Chandler, "Confidence and Competence in Decision-making," British Journal of Criminology, 5 (January 1965), p. 28. This research indicates something of the complexity of studying the relationship between information and decision-making; actual case histories were used and the background information classified in terms of 49 variables.

26. D.W. Knight, "Punishment Selection as a Function of Biographical Information," J. Crim. Law, Criminol. and Pol. Sci., 56 (September 1965), pp. 325 - 327.

severely by the group which had the biographical information. Another study which suggests that information does not necessarily produce attitude change, showed that the effect of a criminology course and a "liberal criminological ideology" did not necessarily result in a more sympathetic identification with delinquents and criminals.²⁷ Certain studies, on the other hand, have shown a more positive effect of information in conditioning attitudes to offenders: for example, criminology students have been shown to take a more lenient "mental hygiene" attitude towards sexual offences than the general population.²⁸ Criminology students, however, are a selected group and it is quite plausible that a less punitive attitude might have existed prior to their receiving criminological information.

Wheeler's study has shown some important and unexpected findings.²⁹ It indicates that the relationship between a punitive ideology and the severity of response to delinquency (as evidenced by willingness to take boys through the official court process) is not as positive as one might predict. In fact, the more punitive the control agent is, the less willing he might be to take boys to court. The relationship between judicial ideology and sentencing outcome is also ambiguous and was often precisely the reverse to that which could be expected: judges who took more severe action were those who read more about delinquency, read professional journals, were less formal, were more permissive in ideology and were younger. Thus, the more severe actions came surprisingly from those exposed to more professional and therapeutic ideologies. The awareness of psychological factors and a more sophisticated view of causation, seemed to lead to a greater sensitivity to deviant possibilities and a greater

27. T.E. Dow, "The Role of Identification in Conditioning Public Attitudes Towards the Offender," J. Crim. Law, Criminol. and Pol. Sci., 58 (March 1967), pp. 75 - 79.

28. G.M. Gilbert, "Crime and Punishment: An Exploratory Comparison of Public, Criminal and Penological Attitudes," Mental Hygiene, 42 (October 1958), pp. 550 - 557.

29. Wheeler et al, op.cit., pp. 45 - 58.

willingness to commit to court and take other severe actions. Although the correlations were small and Wheeler admits that his interpretations of them are tentative, these and similar studies must at least show how complicated it is to unravel the workings of the control system. Existing studies have left us with fragmentary and often contradictory findings about what effects control decisions. Future research will have to interrelate more systematically the sort of factors suggested in Chapter 7.

CHAPTER 10CONTROL AND PREVENTION

This chapter covers the control and prevention of delinquency, dealing specifically with the controllers' opinions about the juvenile court, the type of approach to prevention favoured and opinions about the prediction of delinquency.

The Juvenile Court

The juvenile court is the key institution in the specialized apparatus for controlling delinquency, and its philosophy and methods have always been controversial issues in the administration of justice. In its simplest form, the argument has been between, on the one hand, "tightening up" of the juvenile court and its administration according to the principles governing the rest of the legal system, and, on the other, setting up a special system governed less by the rigorous procedures of justice and more by a principle of individualization, with procedures and philosophy deriving less from law than from psychiatry and social work. It is Matza's argument that the last ideology has won out: the juvenile courts have departed from a strict adherence to due process, give less emphasis to the question of intent and recognize the mental element in crime thus limiting the notion of criminal liability.¹ Part of the aim of this question is to assess to what degree this ideology is accepted here and to find out just in what terms the sample conceives of the function of the juvenile court. This relates to the flow chart model in the sense that one's conception of the constituent parts of the system effect one's decision as to the direction in which the deviant should be referred. Thus, as we saw in regard to Question 5, the use of on-the-spot social control was partly justified because of an opposition to the juvenile court. As many of the respondents have an active role in manning the court, this issue has an obvious policy

1. Matza, op.cit., particularly Chap. 3.

relevance, which was given a certain sharpness by the publication at the time of the survey of a Government White Paper² which suggested the re-constitution of the juvenile court, if not entirely on the American model, at least in the direction of a looser social work-oriented system. If few of the respondents had read this document, most had seen the wide publicity it received.

The sample's opinions about "the way the juvenile court should be run" (Question 15) could be divided into four categories, as shown in Table 37.

TABLE 37

Opinions about the Juvenile Court

	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. No criticism of present system	38	28.6
2. Tighten up, atmosphere should be more like "real" court	50	37.6
3. More social work-oriented, "Family Court" conception	25	18.8
4. Combination of "2" and "3": tighten up for some, welfare for others	<u>20</u>	<u>15.0</u>
	133	100.0

In the group which was satisfied with the present system, magistrates - as might be expected - were over-represented (42.1% compared to 28.6% of the whole sample). Members of this group often took up the same position for different reasons and with very different images of what actually goes on inside a juvenile court. One was satisfied with the system because it was "tough" enough, another because it was "soft" enough. Some of this group had not thought much about the issue and merely accepted the present system in good faith:

I've never been to one, but from what I've heard, the children are handled pretty well and there's a friendly atmosphere. None of my colleagues have adversely criticized the court. (H.21)³

-
2. "The Child, The Family and the Young Offender" (H.M.S.O., London, 1965). Although this document has been overtaken by subsequent legal proposals, the broad lines of debate on the juvenile court are still the same.
 3. In fact, some two-thirds of his colleagues were critical of the juvenile court. This type of non-communication within and between the various groups in the sample was fairly common.

On the whole, though, the present system was defended from a more informed position which saw any changes as necessarily leading to an erosion of traditional legal values. One barrister (L.13) graphically described his opposition:

On the whole, the present system is good: one would be doing a disservice by eliminating from the field conduct which we know is criminal. Larceny is a crime and the boy of 14 or 15 knows this. If we establish that it is a crime, then there must be punishment with the concept of criminal responsibility ... This does not mean you must not take into account psychological and sociological factors as causes or suggested treatment ... but one can't say that all crime is a product of ill-health. By all means use social welfare methods of prevention, like probation. But one can't say that certain things which are criminal are suddenly not criminal ... You are trying to make crimes into non-crimes and non-crimes into para-crimes.

Most of the group of lawyers, however, (about 70%) went further than L.13 in re-asserting the values of the classical view. They were part of the 37.6% of the sample in Category 2 who were extremely hostile to the juvenile court system on the grounds that it had already sold out to positivism. This was part of a more general sell-out: the courts were too soft, the magistrates too lenient and the authority of the law had been discredited. This group believed that the informality, the easy-going atmosphere and leniency which they believed characterized the juvenile court, had led to a disrepute for the law; delinquents don't care any more what the court will do:

It's informal, like a family welfare place already. If an act is serious enough to warrant police prosecution, then the court must be solemn enough to impress the child that his action is not just something little or frivolous. As with the adult court, you must impress on them a sense of awe: all this patting them on the head, police not wearing uniform is silly ... it's all too soft. (L.6)

The present set-up is quite useless ... at the most they say, "he's a naughty boy" and fine the parent ... this doesn't effect him. On the whole, I believe one should punish first and ask questions afterwards ... there must be justice, the boy must know that he's done wrong. (H.5)

Now it's just soft soap ... a waste of time. The police should be there in full uniform; at present it's all calculated not to frighten them, but it should be the other way. The full panoply of the law should be brought in - the Clerk with his wig and so on. Now they're just playing everything down. (H.6)

The magistrate is afraid of losing public sympathy and support because of the class thing: in order to show that he has no class

prejudice, he is too lenient ... The child is now made to feel cock of the walk for half-an-hour, important people are giving up time to listen to him. This all started after the war when people were in the queue for rations, they got soft about children, giving them the bananas and so on. I saw it coming then: children expecting adults to pay so much attention to them. (H.23)

The third group of respondents wanted to see changes more or less in the opposite direction. Although few of them went all the way towards a complete treatment-oriented system, they advocated changes in the direction of greater informality, less stress on legal procedures and the elevation of social work ideology and procedures. In common with "The Child, the Family and the Young Offender", the emphasis was on family factors, both in causation and treatment, although few respondents agreed with the actual measures proposed in the White Paper. Often, the move to informality was supported for the "wrong" reasons:

The formal adult atmosphere makes them feel too important. The court should be more informal so that one can humiliate them, bring them down a bit. The formality, with policemen standing around doesn't effect the hardened ones. (Y.17)

The final group of respondents took up a position somewhere between the third and fourth categories. They criticized the present system for not differentiating between what was seen as two types of juvenile delinquent: the vicious thugs and the naughty little boys. For the first, the present system was too lenient and, for the second, it was too tough: "ideally one wants one court for one set of children and one for another." (S.2) Those acquainted with the White Paper were against the proposal to set up Family Councils on the grounds that this was impractical, and that this system would not be able to exert enough control: "The court must have a few teeth of its own like the present juvenile court has, not refer things back to the teeth of another court." (S.2) Although they were unclear about how it would operate, they were proposing some screening device to separate out the tough cases from those who could be dealt with more informally.

Taking the last three categories together, we see that over 70% of the

sample are critical of the present juvenile court system, the nearly 40% in Category 2 in particular showing what amounts to a complete lack of confidence in the system. In order to examine this issue further, respondents were asked what they thought about the type of person who was selected to sit on the juvenile bench. As Table 38 indicates, respondents were virtually as critical of the magistrates themselves as of the system. Only 28.6% were entirely satisfied with the present composition of the bench. Although the proportions are identical, these are not altogether the same respondents who had no criticism of the system as a whole. Three magistrates themselves, for example, while in favour of retaining the court in its present form, wanted to see different types selected for the bench. On the other hand, there were those who were hostile to the system but did not blame the magistrates for its deficiencies: "It's not their fault; they're just carrying out all the soft-coddling directives from the Home Office." (L.4)

TABLE 38

Opinions about Types of Persons Selected as Juvenile Court Magistrates

	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. No criticism of present system of selection	38	28.6
2. No criticism of present system of selection but magistrates should be better trained	21	15.8
3. Magistrates should be drawn from wider cross-section, more relevant experience, etc.	43	32.3
4. Magistrates should be full-time professionals (legally trained)	10	7.5
5. Magistrates should be trained social workers or psychologists	13	9.8
6. Don't Know	<u>8</u>	<u>6.0</u>
	133	100.0

The criticisms of those in Category 2 were relatively mild and were directed not to the social and personal characteristics of magistrates but to the inadequacy of the training they receive. They also did not go as far as the 10 respondents in Category 4 who advocated the appointment

of full-time professional lawyers, i.e. an extension of the stipendiary system.

The largest group of respondents, though, in Category 3 were extremely critical, to the point of being abusive, about the personal and social characteristics of juvenile court magistrates. On the most general level, magistrates were accused of being unrepresentative of the community, out of touch with young people, without any relevant experience or simply incompetent. The most frequently used negative stereotype - as one might expect from the large numbers wishing to tighten up the court - is that of the benevolent old lady, the middle class female do-gooder: "A high proportion of them are the nice old-lady type. I'd rather have an ex-Colonel." (H.6)

Respondents often had anecdotes to tell about this type of magistrate:

This might be sounding blimpish, but I really have heard an interested, nice, charming woman magistrate say to a boy who'd really done a nasty piece of violence, "Now Freddy, you've been a very naughty boy." This is just not on. (L.11)

From a slightly different value perspective, magistrates were seen, not so much as being not tough enough, but as having no knowledge of young people. They did not talk the same language as the children they saw: a probation officer (S.19) quoted a magistrate who had said to a 12-year-old boy, "Conduct yourself with rectitude." It was frequently suggested that magistrates should be younger, perhaps should have children themselves or be drawn from the ranks of school teachers and youth workers. The selection system - seen as being entirely political - was frequently blamed for the unrepresentativeness of the bench, and a small minority of respondents accused magistrates of various types of prejudice and discrimination:

In Northview, the average magistrate is right out of touch ... you just get the best Rotarian or the richest greengrocer and they're all anti-teenager. (Y.7)

I'm entirely against political appointments; most magistrates appointed are unsuitable, prejudiced and intolerant about certain things. The type who say, "You disgusting little lout

going round seducing young girls.": they're no use at all. (H.2)

The present recruitment system results in having people who want to "get on" - you must have people who care, who want to do service, who don't use the bench for business or social reasons, or as a reward for sitting on the Council. If they don't want him an Alderman, they say, "Let's make him a J.P." (M.7)

In the present set-up, it's only the people who can spare the time who sit on the bench, you then get retired old Tory ladies (like Lady X and Lady Y) who come in to "do a morning" ... Many of my fellow magistrates are extremely prejudiced, for example, one was so prejudiced against coloureds, that the rest of the bench had to talk to him. Others have social class prejudice, their attitude is, "What can you expect from a bunch of illiterates with such big families?" (M.C.6)

Each of these four respondents was identified with left-wing political views. The issue of the social class representativeness of magistrates appeared to be one of the few overtly connected with political identification.

The small group of 13 respondents - five of them social workers themselves - who wanted to see professional social workers on the bench, criticized magistrates on much the same grounds as the other groups: incompetence, lack of relevant experience and unrepresentativeness. They did not think, however, that the problem could be solved merely by broadening the social class and age composition of the bench. As a marriage guidance counsellor (S.7) put it:

... the trouble with getting a wide cross-section is that you get a lot of idiots - people with authoritarian attitudes and prejudices who should have nothing to do with deciding about children's lives. The trained social worker's point of view is best.

This type of opinion which involves an endorsement of the social work ideology was, however, exceptional. The general response to this question gives no indication that the ideology of the juvenile court described by Matza and others has made much headway in this country. In most cases, this ideology was explicitly resisted.

Prevention

Attitudes towards the prevention of a social problem usually reveal one's perception of the nature of the problem. In discussing their ideas about preventing delinquency, respondents not only summarized their

conception of the problem, but brought out a number of dimensions which were implicit or had lain dormant in answering other questions.

In the first part of Question 16 respondents were asked to say what would be the one thing they would like to see done to "prevent delinquency or at least keep it in check." As might be expected from such an open-ended question and the heterogeneity of the sample, the replies covered a wide range. They were difficult to divide into fewer than the following ten categories:-

- (1) Restore the importance of the family unit, educate people to be better parents, strengthen family ties. (N = 23)
- (2) Tighten up parental discipline, make parents more aware of their responsibilities in punishing their children and exerting authority. (N = 17)
- (3) Change society's attitudes: there must be more "discipline", "authority", "higher moral standards"; church, educationalists, politicians must create an atmosphere of greater responsibility. (N = 17)
- (4) Make greater use of youth clubs and other types of youth work directed at young people's leisure time. (N = 21)
- (5) Improve social work services: more social workers, better staffed children's homes, early detection of delinquency and intervention by social workers. (N = 13)
- (6) Changes in the legal and penal system: tighten up the juvenile courts, increase severity of sentences, use corporal punishment, more emphasis on deterrence and retribution. (N = 11)
- (7) Make police more efficient and respected by improving their techniques of detection, extending their powers and giving them greater protection. (N = 8)
- (8) Bring back National Service, conscription or introduce some form of enforced "youth corps". (N = 4)
- (9) Changes in schools: more teachers, smaller classes. (N = 4)

(10) One cannot prevent delinquency at all: "society is too rotten", "it goes back too far", "it's human nature". (N = 7)

There were a further 8 miscellaneous proposals. These included restriction on publicity given to delinquency, measures designed to foster a sense of community and vague prescriptions about making adults more interested in young people.

The way this question was answered, suggests that most respondents combine a fairly certain conviction about where "something should be done" with a considerable lack of specificity about what that "something" should be. The 30% who thought that the target for prevention should be the family, and the 13% who would direct their attention to society as a whole, very rarely had any concrete schemes for "restoring the family unit", "tightening up parental discipline" or "restoring a sense of authority". When pressed, some proposed schemes such as giving school children lectures on "family life" or campaigns to "educate parents". Those in caretaking positions, were usually more explicit about their own preventive role; S.15, a health visitor, for example, spoke about how she would like to increase parental responsibility:

I think people like us must encourage parents more. I think there is a frightful harm in this free-for-all business, no discipline ... I mean I believe in psychology and all the rest of it, but all this "you musn't smack, that might make him do so and so ..." I have noticed a change in parents lately. Parents have lost the courage of their convictions and they are frightened to do anything if a child suffers. I do think they are getting more definite now ... and people like me have to encourage parents ... to have a certain discipline and to have the courage of their own convictions and to do what they think is right ... they have read so many books and find it so hard and try too hard go wrong.

Many of these respondents, however, did not have access to families or simply did not see their role in terms of such personal "encouragement" of parents. They either had no specific proposals in mind, or else, came close to those in Category 10 in believing that the problem was so intractable, the pathology of family or society so deep-rooted, that really nothing could be done:

The way attitudes are in this country, the way the country is being run as it is - not just by the Socialist government - I don't think there's much chance of improving the situation at all or even keeping things in check. Things must deteriorate: we have the wrong set of values ... delinquency is a form of canker, the bad apple in the barrel and nothing can be done about it. (L.6)

The other categories of response speak for themselves. The youth work and school categories will be dealt with separately as all respondents were probed in detail about these two areas. Responses recommending improvement in the social work services (a category in which, as might be expected, the social workers were the most frequently represented: 50% as compared to about 10% of the whole sample) were the most specific. These respondents were, on the whole, concerned with gaps or overlaps in the social services while those in Category 6 who recommended changes in the legal and penal system, seemed to have in mind more radical changes in policy and guiding philosophy. As in Category 7, the changes involved a general "tightening up" of the control system: stiffer sentences, more emphasis on deterrence, more powers to the police and courts.

In the second part of the question, respondents were asked to give their opinions on three specific methods of approaching delinquency prevention: through youth clubs (and other forms of youth work); schools and psychiatry. (1) Youth Clubs: As Table 39 indicates, respondents were divided about the value of youth clubs in preventing delinquency.

TABLE 39

Role of Youth Clubs in Preventing Delinquency

<u>Category</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. Unqualified acceptance of youth club approach as best method of delinquency prevention.	43	32.3
2. Qualified acceptance of youth clubs: value limited by type of club and other factors.	55	41.4
3. Very doubtful about role of youth clubs.	23	17.3
4. Unqualified rejection of youth club approach.	<u>12</u>	<u>9.0</u>
	133	100.0

The first group of respondents took what may be described as the

"jolly-good-idea" attitude. They tended to be equally enthusiastic about all types of youth work: clubs, Scouts, Boys' Brigade, etc., and did not mention any limitation to the potential of this approach in preventing delinquency. They tended to use a muscular Christian ideology: get the boys into the open-air, and organize sporting activities and hobbies to help them get rid of their excess energy. Names such as Rev. David Shepherd and Sir John Hunt were mentioned as the type of people to run these activities. All occupational groups were more or less equally represented in this category except for Doctors (50%) and Magistrates (42%): groups such as these tended to have the outsider's romantic and somewhat superficial view of what youth clubs can do:

Obviously more boys' clubs is the answer: I'm told that even those from criminal homes if put on to a football field can be helped. (L.11)

There were insiders, however, particularly the voluntary youth workers, who were equally enthusiastic:

The one thing is to build the biggest youth centre in the world: somewhere where they can do everything. (Y.3, a Scout Master)

The second and largest group of respondents, although still retaining faith in the youth club approach, were somewhat more critical. Their qualifications were expressed along two dimensions: firstly, while clubs undeniably prevented some delinquency, there were those who need the clubs who couldn't be reached. Secondly, they had their doubts about some types of youth work; a lot depended on the leader, the type of activities offered and the degree of organization. They were, on the whole, against what they saw as the main features of local authority clubs and "experimental" youth work: permissive organization and leadership and the "laying on" of facilities such as dancing:

I agree with clubs, provided it's not just benevolently doling out jive to their heart's content. (B.2)

"You need control and not just a gramophone." (H.6) They would favour clubs with "energetic leadership" and more discipline (H.6 cited, with

approval, a club he had visited "where you just have to slam the door when you walk in and there is instant silence") and, consequently, approved of uniformed organizations and schemes such as the Duke of Edinburgh Award, Outward Bound, etc.. This approval was sometimes taken to its extreme conclusions:

This might sound facetious, but I really think that Hitler had the right idea. His youth corps was just the thing: there was little delinquency there, even if they became almost mentally ill afterwards. You must have mental and physical outlets ... one must replace the twenty-year cycle of war with some physical activity. (B.7)

The third group of respondents, although pointing to similar limitation of youth work as the second, were perceptibly more sceptical about the whole approach. They thought that only a small proportion of youth work was any use and that a large proportion was really bad. They grudgingly conceded that some clubs "keep them off the streets". Organizations like Scouts, Guides and Boys' Brigade were "harmless" and perhaps did some good, but the rest were of dubious value:-

I really haven't much faith in them. Too much money is being spent on youth work. Even the church youth clubs are playing to the gallery ... they are offering the wrong sort of things. (H.8)

I have mixed feelings about them: in some cases, the bad influences are picked up in equal proportion to the good. They vary from the structured, controlled church type, which tend to absorb those who are not in need and are called "sissy" by the rest, to those that are near brothels. I'm exaggerating, but you know what I mean: they're just placed to pick up a girl as easily as possible. (M.3)

The final group of respondents (12) went all the way in rejecting youth work: youth organizations could have no impact at all in preventing delinquency, and some can make it worse:

The herd them into clubs' brigade? I don't think much of them. Clubs are useless. I would think twice before letting my own children go ... that's where they get led by the unruly elements; the rough ones always get on top. (L.2)

I'm dead against youth clubs: the whole argument about finding things for their leisure is nonsense - at the best, things like playing fields can do no harm, but the typical club with its juke box and its smokey atmosphere ... is more likely to foster delinquency. They're just breeding grounds for illegitimacy. Even places like the Boys' Brigade: they're notorious for having more delinquents than anyone else. (H.1)

The whole argument about feeding them recreational facilities is just clutching at straws. (H.7)

It was interesting to note that many of the last two groups were insiders: people who had had both experience and faith in youth work, but were now disillusioned. One of the last group was, in fact, a councillor who had been Chairman of the Youth Sub-Committee and had opened a number of youth clubs, but had "no real faith in them". (M.C.1) Another was a Roman Catholic priest (R.2) who, at the beginning of his eighteen years in the area, thought that youth work was of some use but was now convinced of its "futility":

... useless, just a waste of time. The club is a place for young people to hang about and twist, and it can even do harm: decent parents can think that the club is all right because it is run by the church, so they send their kids along. The result is that they're carried away by the rest ... The so-called Youth Service causes the most trouble: they give to youth only what they want - and all the youth do is take: break and smash things up and keep asking 'you do things for us' ... The biggest mistake of the youth service is to take youth away from home. This just spreads the general rot: all the good is diluted and the evil gets concentrated in one place.

(2) School: We have already seen that educational factors are regarded as peripheral in causing delinquency. As Table 40 indicates, when questioned directly as to what the school can do to prevent delinquency, the sample is somewhat more willing to see some connections. The categories of response exactly parallel those used in assessing the causative role of the school. (Table 32).

TABLE 40

Role of Schools in Preventing Delinquency

<u>Category</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. Improve moral tone	33	24.8
2. Tighten up discipline - especially use more corporal punishment	24	18.0
3. "Progressive" changes in teaching methods - smaller classes, less formal teaching, etc.	21	15.8
4. Improve sporting and other physical facilities	18	13.5
5. Integrate school with community: closer contact with Y.E.O., etc.	16	21.0
6. More streaming and segregation	4	3.0
7. No role: school is already doing enough	17	12.8
	<u>133</u>	<u>99.9</u>

In the largest category - among which were nearly half the headmasters themselves - the preventive role of the school is seen in terms of exerting some moral force. The conception of morality varied in its degree of sophistication. For some, it was simply a question of teachers "setting standards". The view, which we have already encountered, that the quality of teachers is dropping, was frequently expressed:

... I heard from a friend that at training colleges these days you can't leave things lying around, because they might be stolen. How can you expect standards of honesty among the children then? Teachers are also very lax in regard to punctuality: you can't expect the children then to be punctual. There is a need for a general pulling up of standards in the teaching profession. (D.9, School Medical Officer)

For others, the view of moral standards was more complex and entailed the setting up of a total moral community. The school should "demonstrate what a fair and just society can be" (H.9), inculcate standards of right and wrong, take over the functions of the home but counteract, if necessary, the standards of morality acquired in the home and the outside community.

The respondents stressing discipline had a more straightforward conception of the role of the school. Discipline had broken down in schools, teachers have their hands tied behind their backs, they are sued for assault if they lay a finger on a child, things must be tightened up if the problem is not to get entirely out of control:

All of us are basically animals: we have to control things by using the carrot and the stick. Most of them have had the carrot the whole time and it doesn't tempt them any more. Therefore, it's time to use the stick. (L.7)

The other categories of responses were more related to the conception of the school as a community than as an agency of social control. The changes in teaching methods that were advocated were in the direction of improving personal relationships by using tutorial systems, discussion groups, etc.. These respondents also mentioned the need for increased psychological awareness among teachers and the need to include sex education in the curriculum. Those in Category 5 had a similar orientation but stressed the relationship of the school to the rest of the community. Besides better

careers' advice, they would like to see more Parents/Teachers' Associations and similar bodies. Those in Category 4 who wanted to improve sporting facilities had a less ambitious view of what the school can do, but again stressed values of community life, derived often from the traditional public school ethos:

I would like to see more funds available to those who can't afford things like cricket flannels: this would give them more pride in their game. (M.2)

Improve out-of-hours facilities. Encourage, through sport, a spirit of competition and esprit de corps for the school. They should think of winning the cup for the school, not for themselves. (M.10)

The responses in Category 6, although few, are worth mentioning because they might represent a more widely held attitude. The conception is that children with low intelligence, academic ability and delinquent potential (the three are often equated) should be streamed away from the rest of the school and segregated so that they should not "contaminate" the others:

One can recognize the type at school ... one must get him into something else instead of holding on to him. One should divert them, for example, with discussion groups. Or they should be moved into a camp. (R.11)

Seventeen respondents could not conceive of the school playing any preventive role. Although this is smaller than the number (49) who denied that the school had any causative connection, there was fairly general consensus, even among those who did offer preventive schemes, that schools should not be criticized too much: they are already shouldering burdens that the home and other institutions should bear.

(3) Psychiatry: The permeation of psychiatric ideologies and methods into the administration of juvenile justice has been shown - or, at times, taken for granted - by Matza, Hartung and Szasz. To what extent has this happened in Britain? What role is assigned to psychiatric agencies, such as child guidance clinics, in the prevention of delinquency? What is the general image of psychiatry?

TABLE 41Role of Psychiatry in Preventing Delinquency

<u>Category</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1. Full awareness and acceptance of role in various contexts	16	12.0
2. Qualified acceptance: need to be selective, use for treatment and not prevention (or vice versa)	48	36.1
3. Very doubtful: opposed to psychiatric approach to delinquency, but no prejudice against psychiatry as such	34	25.6
4. Totally opposed to psychiatry	35	26.3
	<u>133</u>	<u>100.0</u>

As Table 41 indicates, the acceptance of psychiatry in the field of delinquency prevention, is by no means wholehearted. Only the 12% in Category 1 - half of which was made up by social workers and ministers of religion - can be said to have been "converted" in any sense to the psychiatric ideology. Most of this group talked about the broader applications of psychology; for example, in educational psychology - others, like most of the second category, pinned their faith in psychiatry because it was a "new Science" and hence must "come up with something". The consensus among those in Category 2 was that although psychiatry had its limitations, and should not really "be taken too far", one should try everything. The following conversation that took place during a pause in the interview when two child care officers were discussing a case, indicates an attitude which is perhaps more prevalent among control agents in this country, than a total acceptance of the psychiatric ideology:

Child Care Officer 1: Perhaps we should refer him to the Child Guidance.

Child Care Officer 2: That won't help much

Child Care Officer 1: I know, but perhaps we should refer him anyway - it's something.

The limitations to psychiatry, which this group mentioned, were mainly related to issues of selectivity: only a small proportion of cases could be reached by clinics or were suitable anyway for psychiatric treatment.

There was strong opposition to a wholesale extension of psychiatric methods:

The psychiatrist often gets in when it's too late. I suppose though, clinics have some value in referring the child before the offence is committed. But we don't want a platoon of welfare workers combing the estates to see who to refer to the clinic: this would be an abomination. (M.5)

Others in this group were, as one respondent put it, "confident in psychiatry as a discipline, but not in psychiatrists themselves". (R.9) Like this Roman Catholic priest on a Council Estate, they felt that psychiatrists had no "social understanding", they had no contact with ordinary working class families: "They live in W (a middle class suburb of Northview) and they have their rooms in Harley Street." The headmaster of a primary school on the same estate commented about psychiatry:

It's bound to help, as long as psychiatrists talk to the people they're dealing with in their own language ... I've had a lot of these trick cyclists coming into the school, they all seem pretty mad themselves ... peculiar looking, long-haired youths doing all sorts of tests; but their reports are always good ... (H.4)

The third group, while expressing similar criticisms of psychiatry to the second, were perceptibly more sceptical about the whole field. They recognized some valid uses of psychiatry, but did not see its relevance to the field of delinquency prevention. With various degrees of subtlety, these respondents were particularly critical of what to Matza and Hartung is a key tenet of the psychiatric ideology: the denial of responsibility:

I try to avoid psychiatrists with youths - unless I'm sure they can do something. If you introduce young people to psychiatrists, they treat themselves as problems because they see a psychiatrist: they think this gives them a licence to be different. (S.17, a Probation Officer)

My impression is that psychiatrists can always talk their way into finding all sorts of things - and then believe that they are correct. I think it's all much simpler: it's just a lack of moral fibre and discipline. (L.10)

... it's much better to be truthful about a boy, and say, "he's a thief" rather than give excuses like, "his grandmother was frightened by an elephant." (Y.5)

The final group of respondents - among whom were some 45% of the headmasters - expressed the most rigid opposition to psychiatry in any form.

As was the case with those opposed to youth clubs, most of this group were "insiders" - people who had had some contact with psychiatric agencies, such as child guidance clinics. Some claimed to have believed in psychiatry at one stage, but were now disillusioned. Six headmasters said that they had virtually stopped referring any of their pupils to child guidance clinics: "It just makes them worse." (H.16) Contact did not necessarily result in any understanding of psychiatric methods and child guidance clinics were frequently attacked for being remote and incomprehensible. Untrained social workers, particularly, and some magistrates, reacted in stereotypically hostile terms to what was perceived as nonsensical:

I don't know what goes on there. You get them down there and they just let them play around: the children come out laughing and there's no reason given. They've just had a good old play and that's all. (S.9)

... the children I refer to the clinics, all they ask them about is their parents' morals: they shouldn't do this sort of thing. (S.8)

I've got no faith in them at all. I first came across them while on R.A.F. Parole Boards ... I saw psychiatrists get off the bad boys and girls on the most ridiculous grounds ... Doctors whom I know tell me that psychiatry is the easiest way to earn a living. That's why they go in for it. The patient never dies and there's no right or wrong way. - No two psychiatrists think alike; they always reach different conclusions. People trade on this and fool them - especially the boys. (L.7)

Psychiatric treatment was thought to make the problem worse in three ways. Firstly, "they" (psychiatrists) put ideas into people's heads that weren't there before." (Y.8) Another youth worker (Y.5) recounted, for example, how a group of boys had started to become anxious about homosexuality after a psychiatrist had mentioned the subject in a talk to them. Secondly, treatment segregated a child and made him feel different:

... they come to think that they are somebody, it gives them an exaggerated sense of their own self-importance, it makes them feel that they have become unusual and this makes them worse. (H.17)

Thirdly - the fundamental criticism levelled against psychiatry - it provides the delinquent with an excuse for continuing his career and it erodes the whole basis of individual responsibility and culpability:

... it results in a namby-pamby attitude: giving them excuses, which are not really the right reasons, because a child knows the difference between right and wrong. (M.10)

He (the child) gets the idea that the Child Guidance Clinic is something he can use as an excuse, so it merely serves as a loosening of any other deterrence. I always think twice before I send a child to the Clinic: in my experience this has the definite result of reducing the pressures to keep them straight. (D.7)

I started my career seeped in the atmosphere of Freudian psychology. I'm now convinced that however valuable it may be in the clinic, it's not much use in real life ... and, more important, at its door must be laid a large slice of delinquent behaviour ... Freudianism seeks to exculpate crime and delinquency, it tries to find a way out, an excuse and this results in sapping personal responsibility ... look at America: there Freudianism is accepted all over and, therefore, they have more delinquency. (H.1)

Prediction

The development of prediction methods has been hailed by a vocal section of criminologists as one of the most promising directions in delinquency prevention. There are obvious policy implications in asking a sample of controllers their opinions on such methods, as many of them would be personally involved in their implementation. The issue of prediction, however, also raises a more fundamental theoretical question in assessing attitudes to delinquency: to what extent is delinquency conceived of as a potential, a proneness or a pre-disposition that can be distinguished in advance of its overt appearance?

It was clear from the pilot interviews that the theoretical and policy dimensions needed to be separated and so in Question 17 the sample was first asked to say whether they thought it was theoretically possible "to spot out at a very early age - say at 6 to 8 - which children are likely to become delinquent later". They were then asked, "if an accurate prediction method had been devised", whether they would be in favour of using it. Table 42 breaks down the replies to these two questions in yes/no terms.

TABLE 42Attitudes to the Use of Prediction Methods in Delinquency Prevention

	<u>Prediction theoretically possible</u>		<u>In favour of using Prediction methods</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Yes	67	50.4	51	38.3
No	34	25.6	53	39.9
Don't Know	32	24.0	29	21.8
	<u>133</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>133</u>	<u>100.0</u>

These crude percentages obscure the reasons behind the various replies, although it is interesting to note the relatively large number of genuine "don't knows" on both issues. This reveals a simple lack of information - most respondents had not heard about nor thought of the possibility of predicting delinquency - as well as some deep intellectual and emotional misgivings about the whole issue. These "don't knows" were unable to resolve the doubts and misgivings, felt by most of the sample, by coming down in favour of one position or the other.

For those who thought prediction theoretically possible, there were two bases for their position. The first - used by slightly less than half this group (30) - was that prediction "must" be possible for no other reason than that the idea seemed plausible and that Science will eventually be able to do anything:

There's nothing inherently strange and surprising in the idea. It's like the Jesuist's idea of taking a boy before six, or even Baden Powell's approach. (L.11)

It can't be done now, but with sufficient advance, it will be done ... I'm thinking of my experience in the army where they managed to brainwash us ... I suppose they can do anything. (L.8)

The remaining 37 took the position that prediction must be possible because they could do it themselves. It is significant that two-thirds of the Headmasters (including all the Primary School Headmasters) and half the Social Workers (compared with just over 20% of the whole sample) took

up this position. They simply "knew" that they could predict delinquency and assumed that anyone with similar experience could do so:

Oh, I can spot them out all right: any social worker who knows the family, how they eat, sleep, breathe, can tell you this. It's a feeling you have. (S.6)

You can pick them out quite easily: the shifty-eyed youths, you catch them at cheating or petty pilfering. (H.6)

... the child doesn't suddenly become delinquent; the red light comes on long before anything happens. (H.18)

The bases for this do-it-yourself prediction were extremely varied, but usually contained an element of intuitive "feeling" plus the interpretation of signs ranging from the look in boys' eyes to the state of his family's garden:

Without boasting, I can say that just by looking at a group of seven-year-olds, I can suggest which child is likely to be most in danger. I know it straight away by looking at him. You can practice with 11+ kids coming in, you have a good look at them on the first day without marking up their records. You can tell right away, by little attributes, type of shoes, hair-cut (not just how long) and by looking at their eyes. (H.13)

You can predict the thug families in advance; when I was in suburbia, I used to think that the person worrying about his garden had no time for anything else. Now I just have to see an untidy, messy garden to know straight away what sort of family lives inside. (R.2)

You must, as all of us do, say of someone: 'He's sure to turn out a criminal.' There's truth in Wordsworth's 'shadow of a prison house' ... for example, you can see the psychopathic type by failure of growth of the capillary lobes under the finger nails, there's a definite physical stigma. (D.6)

Looking now at the group who thought prediction impossible, there were again two types of reasons for this position: about half the group (16) rejected the possibility of prediction on pragmatic, common-sense grounds: there were too many factors to be taken into consideration, later influences might change the picture and so on. The rest of the group (17) based their case on more fundamental and ideological grounds: prediction is impossible in principle, one can never predict human nature and, moreover, it would be dangerous to try. Prediction simply "can't be done". These replies were equally distributed among all the groups with the exception of the lawyers who were slightly over-represented. The principled denial of the

possibility of prediction which the following responses reveal, was expressed more strongly and by a larger proportion of the sample in regard to the suggestion of actually using prediction methods:

It's like saying somebody will be a criminal because he's got forked ears or a certain shape of head. (B.6)

This would be dangerous. It's more than just the type of youngster, but the whole home background and the character might develop later. It's like trying to pre-sex a chicken before it's hatched. (R.11)

It would be like Lombroso saying that there was such a thing as a definite criminal type. (M.C.2)

For many, the possibility of prediction was extremely threatening and ran counter to deep-rooted beliefs:

It really is impossible to do this. It's just pure theory. I'd hate to think it was ever possible. (H.7)

Research tells us that it can be done, but personally I doubt it ... there's an element of predestination about it. I would be upset to believe it's true. (L.13)

In regard to the second part of the question - whether prediction devices should actually be used - there were more doubts and objections. Those who were in favour of using prediction (38.3%) thought simply that it sounded a good idea, and that it was common-sense to try to prevent delinquency before it "happened". About a quarter of this group, however, expressed doubts about how the techniques would actually be used: wouldn't the parents object? Should one tell the boy? Should the teachers know the results? It is interesting to note that about a quarter of the group favouring prediction methods was made up of those who, in the first part of the question, had denied or doubted the theoretical possibility of prediction. These were mainly lawyers and businessmen who believed that one should "try anything" and who had a blind faith in science: if scientists said that it could be done, then it satisfied them.

For the just over 60% who opposed or doubted the use of prediction devices, reasons could again be divided into pragmatic and ideological. For some it was a sheer administrative problem: the test would be too

complicated to use. Others were sceptical about what actually could be done when the future delinquents had been predicted:

... It's one thing to be forewarned, but how are you forearmed?
(L.12)

... what can you do? The brother's in Borstal, the father's whoring, the mother's drinking - what the hell can the teacher or educational psychologist do? (M.7)

This group did not see what practical use prediction devices might have, and thought that if one was going to predict at all, personal judgment was better. The fact that the test would be too impersonal, too rigid and "too mechanical" (R.7) was mentioned by 17 respondents. It was also seen as an intrusion by psychologists into somebody else's field:

I'd rather have better trained teachers than somebody coming from the outside snooping around. (M.12)

I hope this wouldn't happen: it sounds terribly Child Guidance, doesn't it? (M.C.4)

Other problems mentioned were how to obtain the co-operation of the parents, how to ensure that the results were kept confidential and, following from this, how to protect the boy from unfair labelling and stigmatization:

I don't like the idea of testing, punch-carding everyone ...
I myself don't like knowing the background of the lads, when I worked as a housefather I wouldn't look at the records.
(Y.13)

This sort of thing could ruin someone. I'm against things like case histories: however secretive one attempts to keep them, they get into untrained hands and this could be disastrous. (M.C.1)

This last response raises the more ideological objections to prediction referred to earlier:

It would be very dangerous to use such a thing. It would strike at the whole accepted body of Christian teaching ... The basis of Christianity is free will: the doctrine of Christ is used to combat evil and this wouldn't be applicable if someone is already condemned. (H.7)

... God forbid that anything like this should ever be used.
(H.20)

To say that somebody will never be good, to write him off: this sounds like Hitler. We've had enough of that. This type of approach is not part of our requirements as human beings. (X.3, a Juvenile Court Magistrate)

... diagnosing somebody as pre-delinquent? It sounds a bit like "Brave New World". (L.9)

It should be noted that there were a number of respondents, particularly Headmasters and Social Workers, who thought that prediction was possible - because they themselves could intuitively predict - but were opposed to using any formal prediction methods for the reasons listed above, but particularly because a test would be irrelevant or usurp their own functions:

It wouldn't add more than we know already; how will it help? Psychologists won't accept this, but it's not really a question of testing, we're better than them, we can sum up a boy just by looking at him. (H.13)

These responses reveal that the prediction of delinquency is not an entirely acceptable proposition on either the theoretical or practical levels. On the theoretical level, prediction is a logical extension of the deterministic tenets of positivism, yet its possibility is not seen by half the sample. About two-thirds - including large sections of groups such as Headmasters and Social Workers who would be involved in using prediction devices - are against any implementation of this principle. Besides the fact that many of the sample's reservations about prediction - particularly the problem of labelling and what exactly would be done with the results of prediction - have been expressed by criminologists themselves, it is by no means clear that the rejection of prediction is merely the result of an "uninformed" or "unenlightened" attitude. In fact - although the sample is not large enough to validate this impression statistically - it appeared to be the more authoritarian respondent who tended to accept prediction. It looked an easy way out of the problem and it confirmed his belief that delinquency was something "in" the person. Virtually all the respondents who used genetic and biological notions in talking about delinquency, also accepted the idea of prediction.

In the next chapter, I will take up some of the themes from these questions on the juvenile court, prevention and prediction and relate them

to some more general ideas on the sample's conception of delinquency and social control.

Community Involvement

In the final group of questions (Questions 19 a - e), I tried to obtain a rough indication of the sample's involvement in various community agencies and, particularly in the case of control agents, their perception of each other's role in dealing with delinquency. These questions were included to see how exposure to certain kinds of information and contact between various agencies might influence delinquency control. In addition, it is important to gauge the receptivity of such a group to preventive measures which demand some degree of community participation.

Not one of the sample was a member of any national body (such as the Howard League) concerned with crime and delinquency. The only national bodies that were represented were professional associations such as the Magistrates Association and the National Association of Probation Officers. Membership of local organizations was somewhat restricted, the general picture being of a few members of the sample highly involved in a number of Northview activities, while the majority were active in one or two organizations or none at all.

Leaving aside membership of their own organizational groups by virtue of which they were included in the sample (for example, church, voluntary social welfare agency, local Law Society) some 28% of the respondents were not involved in any other group in Northview. There was an overall low involvement in the more professional type of welfare organization: 5 were associated with the Guild of Social Service, 4 with the Marriage Guidance Council and 5 with the Association for Moral Welfare. On the other hand, volunteer organizations, particularly in the field of youth work, were fairly highly represented: leaving out the group of youth workers themselves, 17 of the rest were actively involved in various Boys Clubs and another 18 in Scouts or Guides. A further 7 helped with Cadet Corps or A.T.C. About 40% were active participants in church activities, this figure being higher

(60%) for the Headmasters. The Businessmen, Councillors and Magistrates were heavily involved as members of the Board of Governors of various schools: one magistrate was on five Boards, two on four, and three businessmen, two councillors and two magistrates were each on three Boards. These three groups between them had 43 membership of Boards of Governors.

The sample had mixed feelings about a more community-centred approach to delinquency prevention and control, and their own involvement in this direction. Just over a half were, in principle, in favour of "approaches by the whole community to deal with this sort of problem", although in further discussion they were unclear about what sort of co-ordination would be required or what gaps existed in the present community services. The rest of the sample were dubious about co-ordinating various community services because "committees get into the hands of the wrong sort of people" or because "the individual trial and error method is the best". Most members of key groups, such as Headmasters, Social Workers and Magistrates said that they were too busy to become involved in much extra work.

In terms of communication between the agencies, the more peripheral groups in the delinquency prevention field - Businessmen, Councillors, Lawyers, Doctors and Ministers of Religion - said that they were not aware of any gaps in communication between the agencies in Northview, and they themselves were satisfied with their contacts. The Headmasters singled out their good relationships with the Probation Service, but were particularly critical about Child Guidance Clinics. The staff of the Clinics were seen to be remote and out of touch and were criticized for not keeping teachers informed of the progress of children whom they referred. The Headmasters tended also to be dissatisfied with the courts and claimed that magistrates did not pay enough attention to reports they had spent a long time in compiling. A few Headmasters were also critical of the Child Care Department, who were compared unfavourably with the Probation Department.

The Magistrates also had a better image of Probation Officers than any

other group with whom they had to deal. Many of them mentioned, however, what they saw as a lack of communication and co-ordination between Headmasters and Probation Officers. On the whole, the Magistrates were satisfied with the contact they had with others. The Youth Leaders, on the other hand, were dissatisfied with the contact they had with most other groups. They were the most insulated of the groups, and the one most likely to perceive that their contribution to delinquency prevention was being denigrated. They had various conflicts with Headmasters and Teachers (for example, over the use of school premises and equipment), they believed that Magistrates did not pay any attention to their opinions and were critical of Probation Officers for not consulting them about writing reports on boys they knew.

In the light of findings such as Miller's⁴ and that part of Wheeler's⁵ research concerned with relationships between control agents, it would seem important for future research on the delinquency control system in this country, to investigate the type of questions I have only briefly touched on. The attitudes of key channeling groups, such as Headmasters, to control and treatment agencies, such as the court and the child guidance clinic, may be crucial contingencies effecting the flow through the control system. One would need to establish these attitudes more exactly, locate their reference points (for example, in training, professional identification or chance factors such as friendship) and relate them to various methods of handling deviance.

4. Miller, (1958) and (1968), op.cit.

5. Wheeler et al, op.cit., pp. 37 - 45

CHAPTER 11SOME GENERAL THEMES

In this brief concluding chapter on the Northview survey, I would like to identify a number of themes that emerged from the interviews. This is not a summary of all the findings, but some inferences that could be drawn from comparisons of the same individual's responses to different questions and my general impressions from the nearly 150 interviews I carried out in Northview.

Morality and Responsibility

There are a number of strands of opinion which appear to converge together: the stress on informal, but strict social control, the lack of support for deterministic interpretations of delinquency, the virtually total opposition to the welfare-oriented juvenile court, the scepticism about psychiatry and the suspicion of the idea of predicting delinquency. Taken together with other strands running through the responses, these themes indicate a conception of control and prevention based on a rigid and traditionalist notion of collective morality and individual responsibility. The collective is seen to possess, in Durkheim's term, a "moral authority" and the individual is seen to be wholly responsible for his actions. This sample of controllers at least, even looking at the official control agents only, do not reflect the ideology attributed to the delinquency control system by sociologists such as Matza and Hartung:

Statements reinforcing the delinquent's conception of irresponsibility are an integral part of an ideology of child welfare shared by social work, psychoanalysis and criminology.¹

It (the denial of responsibility) is ... firmly a part of the professional ideology of many people in authoritative positions who handle delinquents: social workers, juvenile court judges, psychiatrists and other employees of the court, probation officers and the like.²

1. Matza, op.cit., p. 94.

2. Hartung, op.cit., p. 65.

There were some who did come closer to the child-welfare ideology and there were others who were aware that, in defending the traditionalist view, they were fighting a rearguard battle. Partly out of deference to a university sociology student who was perceived as one of "them", they made remarks such as "this must look pretty reactionary to you" or "this probably sounds authoritarian, but ...". The way in which policies such as corporal punishment was supported, is another indication of this defensiveness. But most of the sample were either unaware of the enemy, or else very confident of their own position.

The inroads of the psychiatric and child-welfare ideology, then, and the wider implications of positivism, are strongly resisted, as is the increasing bureaucratization of social control. A more personalized system of controlling delinquency is preferred, one, nevertheless, that retains a certain severity and dignity. Social control should not only be more strict and personal, but is too serious a matter to be left to the whims of social workers, psychiatrists and other such groups whose very existence is undermining the bases of collective morality and individual responsibility. The hearkening back to informal village controls and the admiration of "discipline" in all contexts, relates to the struggle to maintain a closed system of morality. This theme was summed up by C.1 - a member of the Northview Council for 30 years - in a self-parodying description of his vision: "real control within a rigid, paternalistic society."

One apparently paradoxical exception to this theme is the reluctance by the sample to recognize the positive potential of the school in preventing delinquency. One might have expected that the image of a school integrating its moral authority into a tightly knit neighbourhood would have fitted into the type of social control envisaged. The school's role was resisted, not so much because this was an undesirable image, but because of a resentment at the thought of connecting the school with delinquency at all. The school had enough responsibility already as the last bastion of authority against the rising tides of permissiveness, to

allocate to it a more specialized role in delinquency prevention. Such a role in any event, was resisted to the extent that it was identified with the tenets of progressive education. There was, besides, a recognition that the old-style school had disappeared: the standard of teachers was supposedly falling, they were becoming more career oriented, the tightly knit neighbourhoods in Northview were breaking down to be replaced by decaying slums, the teachers who were part of the community were dying out and the new teachers had no identification with the area. All that was left was for the school to set itself up as a surrogate parental authority, defending a closed system of morality that was being eroded from all sides.

Information, Attitudes and Policy

The relationship between information, attitudes and policy in the field of delinquency control is a complex one. We have already seen in discussing Questions 13 and 14 that there is no easy way of predicting control action from knowledge of the control agent's information and attitudes. Conversely, the erroneous assumption is often made that changes in practice and policy accurately indicate or reflect attitudinal changes. The Northview interviews give a clear indication of the gap between paying lip service to a policy and actual attitudes. So, social workers might refer cases to child guidance clinics which they don't believe in, magistrates might read social workers' reports which they have little faith in, councillors might make public speeches in opening youth clubs and privately think that the money is being wasted.

Related to the apparent datedness of the sample's ideas, is their sheer insulation from relevant information about delinquency. Although, as Wheeler's and other research has warned us, there is no one-to-one relationship between information and action, the gap in the Northview sample between theoretical knowledge and social policy is an extreme one. This is the type of gap which Wilkins has pointed to, and the way in which some of the sample supported their policies and at the same time admitted their lack of information, lends some support to his "diabolical hypothesis",

that "... degrees of certainty with which opinions are expressed tend to be inversely proportional to the amount of information". This hypothesis, Wilkins adds, "... can be sustained more readily in the field of crime and human behaviour than any other field."³

The sample not so much resisted new ideas which could not readily be assimilated into existing frames of reference but selectively shut out the relevant information. Only a handful consciously related their replies to known research or theory, or even seemed aware that relevant debates were going on in, say, journals such as New Society. One juvenile court magistrate who was also a key member of the Children's Committee, said, for example, that it had occurred to him that it would be a good idea for someone to do research on the connection between broken homes and delinquency, and asked whether this had ever been done.

A related tendency - one which Mills and Martin and Fitzpatrick drew attention to - is the resistance to seeing beyond individual cases: "Every person is different", "one cannot generalize", "I had a boy in here only the other day who ...". Anecdotes are used to illustrate positions and they become so much a part of the local folklore that they eventually are seen as evidence to justify a particular position. A number of the sample - including the headmaster of the school one of the boys had attended some fifteen years previously - mentioned the case of two boys who had been involved in a murder in the area. One of the boys had apparently been "let off lightly" by the juvenile court a short time before the murder took place, and this fact was taken to support an attack on the court's lack of judgment.

These attitudes are, perhaps, not unexpected. Those involved in policy programmes in regard to the penal system, or in the education of control agents, however, need to be more aware of the complexities of the relationship between information, attitude and policy in this field.

3. Wilkins, (1964), op.cit., p. 30.

Soft or Hard?

It is too simple to dismiss some of the attitudes expressed in the interviews as "punitive" or "authoritarian" and to attempt to place them in some dimension of "soft" versus "hard" or "tough-minded" versus "tender-minded". Criminologists and penal reformers who have categorized attitudes to crime and delinquency in this way, are guilty not only of psychological reductionism, but of expressing a multiple set of dimensions along one continuum. In fact, attitudes to delinquency are more complicated and inconsistent than categories such as authoritarianism could predict. Even a subdimension of authoritarianism, such as punitiveness - measured, for example, by support of policies such as hanging or flogging for certain types of crime - does not do justice to the multiplexity of the attitude.

What emerges from a comparison of the responses within each interview is a high degree of variation and apparent inconsistency. From the limited range of statistical techniques that were employed, it would appear that responses do not "hang together" in theoretically predictable ways. A negative evaluation of young people does not always correlate with a punitive approach to all types of adolescent deviance. The reverse, indeed, was sometimes true. Many respondents, such as headmasters and youth leaders, took a bluff tolerant attitude towards adolescents in general ("a better generation"), but were extremely intolerant and punitive towards delinquency such in general and phenomena/as the Mods and Rockers in particular. Yet other respondents were somewhat "hard" and unsympathetic about adolescent problems but were not particularly punitive about delinquency.

Also - to the extent that this could be judged in one interview - many respondents were sympathetic and soft on an interpersonal level (for example, as headmasters, youth workers or social workers), but advocated hard policies towards delinquency as a social problem. One respondent who suggested an "eye for an eye" approach to justice and was a firm believer in hereditary delinquency (a belief often taken in itself as an indication of authoritarianism), at the same time advocated getting rid of the whole

atmosphere of formality from the juvenile court and introducing a welfare approach. One youth worker, who was among the few in the sample to put forward "progressive" social policies such as integrating community agencies, extending casework services to home and school, at the same time defended a very rigid morality, used phrases such as "looseliving women" and believed that there was an organized Communist plot to disrupt youth clubs in Northview. Some respondents took a kindly, sentimental "boys will be boys" attitude on many questions, yet were puritan, hostile to the Welfare State and in favour of corporal and capital punishment. Some respondents who accepted certain psychiatric explanations, were just as hard in general as those who were hostile to psychiatry.

Many more such apparent inconsistencies could be listed. Some might be mere artefacts of the research design, and in a larger sample they might cancel each other out and leave behind more predictable clusters of attitudes. Other inconsistencies are only apparent, and can be explained plausibly: for example, psychiatric control and techniques such as prediction may be easy ways out for the more authoritarian respondents.⁴ The inconsistencies should also not be exaggerated: in most interviews, it was not too difficult to predict responses to one question from responses to another. It is, nevertheless, apparent that a soft-hard dimension is not altogether satisfactory for understanding attitudes to delinquency. Only at the extremes - particularly at the hard end - did attitudes cluster together in an entirely predictable way.

Unanimity or Disagreement?

Related to the comparison of one set of attitudes to another, is the issue of comparing one respondent with another. In presenting the findings, some differences in terms of age, social class and occupational

4. As one otherwise predictably consistent respondent said in advocating the extension of psychiatry into the penal system: "It would be much easier if they (criminals) had some sort of mental kink ... you could then just get a psychiatrist to straighten this kink out" (motioning with hands).

groups were indicated. In certain cases, these differences were quite notable. Looking at the interviews as a whole, however, one is struck not so much by any differences, as by the degree of unanimity in the sample on most issues.

The sample was, of course, selected on the basis of all the groups having something in common: the possession of one or other control functions. The interviews tended to confirm that along some dimensions of this function, at least, the respondents' self-definitions coincided with the definition the sociologist attributes to them. The respondents were aware of their channeling functions, their influence in the community or their role as spokesmen on moral and social issues. A solicitor, for example - one of the most marginal control groups - asked me who else I was seeing. I started to reply, "barristers, ministers of religion, headmasters ..." and he interrupted to say, "I see - all those really concerned with maintaining law and order." Two others in the sample said that their first reaction to the letter asking for their co-operation, was to throw it in the wastepaper basket, but then they changed their minds "out of public duty". A headmaster asked (in regard to Question 13), whether I wanted his view or the community's view, and then said, before I could reply: "I suppose, though, my views would coincide with those of the community."

Even given such confirmations of the respondents' identification with each other on some dimensions, they were objectively different in enough ways to justify expecting some differences in their responses. Some are professionally concerned with delinquency and trained in relevant disciplines, others are not, there are wide age differences in the sample and some political and social class differences. Yet these differences never manifested themselves as much as could be expected. Age, for example, except on the question of intergenerational communication, did not seem to be of great importance. Attitudes and opinions seem more influenced by the controller's position as a controller (and what this implied in

terms of occupation and social class) than his age. In the small group of seven respondents aged 20 - 29, only one - a coffee bar manager - was strikingly different from the older groups. A 23-years-old social worker in the Mental Welfare Department, for example, answered wholly in terms of the type of social work morality identified by Halmos and Wootton, and although chronologically close to adolescents, was socially just as distant as the older respondents. She condemned the "loosening up in morality", thought that adolescents "don't think about sex: they just go ahead and take the consequences", that economic factors had little relationship to delinquency, that National Service would have prevented the Mods and Rockers and that "society is getting soft".

Although no question was asked on political affiliations, these could be identified for the councillors and the magistrates/councillors. As far as could be judged within these small groups, political affiliation made little difference to attitudes. This was contrary to the expectations of the respondents themselves, who assured me that I would find wide differences between Labour and Conservative members of, say, the Children's Committee.

Returning to the occupational groups, unanimity was particularly evident on the very general issues such as attitudes to young people and ideas about the causation and prevention of delinquency. This is contrary to Dienstein's findings that probation officers, juvenile police officers and teachers showed vast differences of opinion on attitudes to delinquency and appeared to share no common frame of reference.⁵ It is probable that if the Northview sample contained more highly professional social work groups as well as an entirely different group such as police officers, greater differences in attitudes would have been found. As it was, groups such as social workers and headmasters showed many of the same

5. Dienstein, op.cit.

trends as groups such as the businessmen who are, in many respects, far removed from them.

The social workers, for example, tended to be profoundly a-theoretical and insulated. The voluntary workers in particular, and those working for agencies such as the Guild of Social Service, supported doctrines such as delinquency being caused by original sin, "a question of people giving way to evil", were pre-Wootton in their attitudes to social work and (together with their more professional colleagues) were more suspicious and hostile about the research than most of the other groups. One of this group had trained at the London School of Economics, and had studied criminology, but distrusted completely the research approach to subjects like delinquency:

Some children have mentally ill parents and that sort of thing, yet they still turn out alright. This shows how useless science is in trying to find out causes. ... you need kindness and love to deal with people and that's the only way you can solve the problem. This whole New Society type of approach is no good, it's no use to find out about things... One must use one's native wit, wisdom and experience. All these scientific aids don't tell us much about people: care, concern and love is needed.

These attitudes were expectedly less evident among the more professional social workers, such as Child Care Officers, Probation Officers and Psychiatric Social Workers. Yet the differences were not marked, and on many items their responses were indistinguishable from the rest of the sample. One probation officer's comments about detention centres, "the present ones are more like Butlins Holiday Camps. The do-gooders have got hold of them", was almost word for word identical to a magistrate's comments.

The views on social control expressed by the headmasters have already been cited as typical of the whole sample's orientation to social control. These views were certainly not more "advanced" than those of groups with less insight into the process, nor were the headmasters' views on young people as a whole less stereotypical than

those expressed by others with less contact. A tendency evident among some headmasters was their social distance from the communities in which they worked. One headmaster of a Secondary Modern on a Council Estate, for example, was puzzled and annoyed that ballroom dancing and violin teaching had failed to catch on among his pupils.

Examples of the tendency towards unanimity have been cited only to counterpose an oversimplified image of controllers' attitudes. That differences in opinion do exist, can be seen from only a cursory examination of most of the tables. To give a more rounded picture of both the differences and the similarities - and also to illustrate some of the more general themes from the survey as a whole - I would like to summarize some of the characteristics and attitudes of two headmasters: both in charge of Junior Schools a short distance away from each other on a large Council Estate in Northview. Of the two, H.4 was the more representative of the current of unanimity running through the sample.

Similarities:

Working class origins

Family situation seen as main cause of delinquency

Belief in their own ability to predict delinquency

Few communication problems with young people

Stress informal social control, handle deviance in school

Believe in using the cane under certain circumstances

Differences:

H.2

Childhood spent in large cities.

Realistic about limitations on informal social control in urban setting.

Stress on equality in educational system.

Sympathetic to young people; sees them as more idealistic, subject to more pressures. Average problem score on Qu.2 = 4.00.

School should put forward a morality realistic in terms of the community outside.

H.4

Childhood spent in rural areas.

Arcadian myth about restoring informal village-type of social control.

In favour of 11+, streaming.

Not very sympathetic to young people; sees them as having too much money, pampered. Average problem score on Qu.2 = 2.80.

School should put forward values of justice, fair play, teachers by personal example should show how the "good life" may be led. School as a closed community, "almost monastic".

H.2

Work within lower class value system, need to be in touch with community, work with parents and local agencies.

Family factors cause delinquency, but can see pressures and problems facing families on the estate.

H.4

Contemptuous of lower class values; alienated from area, lives in C., a largely middle class town some distance from Northview; sees no need for himself or teachers to be integrated into community.

Condemns "low-grade" families on Estate who "... get new houses, with modern conveniences, yet still send their children dirty to school.

One important way in which future research of this type should be extended is to use observational techniques, (for example, in courts and classrooms), to see how, in fact, such different orientations effect behaviour. More intensive techniques should also be used to study the community as a whole, its power and communication structure and the relationships between different agencies.

PART IV

THE MODS AND ROCKERS

CHAPTER 12INTRODUCTION

Criminologists have tended to confine their attention to global categories such as "crime" and "delinquency" or to specific types of crime. These phenomena are analysed nomothetically in an attempt to derive general laws or relationships. The ideographic description and analysis of specific events or sequences of events has been left to journalists or historians and is used, if at all, for illustrative purposes. In terms of the canons of the scientific method this is a legitimate practice, but it has meant that data on specific current or historical events have not been collected in terms of any theoretically meaningful categories. In the field of juvenile delinquency, for example, there is no sociologically respectable data on such significant events as made up the Teddy Boy phenomenon of the Nineteen Fifties. A surprising amount of theorisation on gang delinquency rests on second-hand, highly impressionistic evidence. A similar situation exists in other areas of sociology; for example, the study of mass phenomena such as riots, panics and crazes.

In this part of the dissertation, the transactional approach is used to analyse some aspects of the Mods and Rockers events which took place at various seaside resorts in England between 1964 and 1966. Although this sort of analysis meets the requirement of using sociologically meaningful categories of data collection, it should be emphasized that the aim of describing the Mods and Rockers phenomenon as such is only secondary. The emphasis throughout is on the key concept of societal reaction. The behaviour itself will constitute the background material, rather than taking the reaction for granted and using it as background. If the independent variable is reaction, the dependant variable is the growth of the behaviour itself. This approach necessarily limits the scope of the study - as was indicated at the end of Chapter 1 this limitation is endemic to transactionalism - and I would like to briefly mention the two perspectives that would have to be used in a fuller study.

The first and most obvious one derives from the literature on sub-cultural delinquency. This would provide the structural setting for explaining the Mods and Rockers phenomenon as a form of adolescent deviance among working class youth in Britain. Downes' variant of subcultural theory is most relevant, and I would substantially agree with his remarks in his preface, where he notes that the Mods and Rockers events intervened between his writing and the book going to press; "No mention is made of these occurrences in what follows, largely because, - in the absence of evidence to the contrary - I take them to corroborate, rather than negate, the main sociological argument of the book."¹ At various points in these chapters, the relevance of subcultural theory will be commented on.

The other less obvious framework derives from one of the most neglected fields in sociology and social psychology, that of collective behaviour. All the characteristics of the classic crowd situation described originally by Le Bon were present in the Mods and Rockers events and the spread of the phenomenon - as will be shown in some detail - had much in common with the spread of fads, crazes and mass hysteria or delusion. The literature on collective behaviour will be drawn upon extensively to illustrate these parallels. There has not been a great deal of progress in the field since Le Bon published The Crowd in 1896. The early formulations by Tarde, Freud, McDougall and F.H. Allport made little lasting contribution and later work has often just elaborated on Le Bon's contagion hypothesis as well as suffered from a lack of data. One more promising recent attempt - for all its deficiencies from a sociological viewpoint - is Smelser's value added scheme for explaining collective behaviour in a structural framework.² The aspects of the scheme most relevant to the Mods and Rockers will be briefly summarized.

In the value added sequence each of the following determinants of

1. Downes, op.cit., p. ix.

2. N.J. Smelser, Theory of Collective Behaviour, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962).

collective behaviour must appear:- (i) structural conduciveness;
 (ii) structural strain; (iii) growth and spread of a generalized belief;
 (iv) precipitating factors; (v) mobilization of the participants for action;
 (vi) the operation of social control.³

Structural conduciveness creates conditions of permissiveness under which collective behaviour is seen as legitimate. Together with structural strain (e.g. economic deprivation, population invasion) this factor creates the opening for race riots, sects, panics and other examples of collective behaviour. In the case of the Mods and Rockers, conduciveness and strain correspond to the structural sources of strain in subcultural theory - anomie, status frustration, blocked leisure opportunities and so on. The growth and spread of a generalized belief is important because the situation of strain must be made meaningful to the potential participants. For the most part these generalized beliefs are spread through the mass media, and because this mechanism is crucial to shaping the social reaction, we shall be very much concerned with this determinant. Precipitating factors are specific events which might confirm a generalized belief, initiate strain or re-define conduciveness. Like the other factors in Smelser's schema, it is not a determinant of anything in itself - for example, a fight will not start a race riot unless it occurs in or is interpreted as an "explosive situation". While not spelling out in detail the precipitating factors in the Mods and Rockers events, I will show how the social reaction contributed to the definition and creation of these factors. Mobilization of participants for action again refers to a sequence present in the Mods and Rockers events which will only be dealt with in terms of the other determinants.

It is Smelser's sixth determinant - the operation of social control - which, together with the generalized belief factors, will concern us most. This factor, which "in certain respects ... arches over all others"⁴ refers

3. Ibid., pp. 12 - 18.

4. Ibid., p. 17.

to the counter forces set up by society to prevent and inhibit the previous determinants: "Once an episode of collective behaviour has appeared, its duration and severity are determined by the response of the agencies of social control."⁵ It is significant that from a completely different theoretical perspective - Parsonian functionalism - Smelser attaches the same crucial importance to the social control factors stressed in the transactional model. It is also significant that despite Smelser's repeated stress on the importance of social control, he pays less attention in his study to this factor than any other.

Sources of Data

The main analysis will cover the period from just before Easter 1964 (the date of the first Mods and Rockers event at Clacton) to September 1966, the end of a full three year cycle of Bank Holiday weekends. This will be referred to as the research period and although there were manifestations of the phenomenon subsequent to the end of this cycle - and they are still appearing at the time of writing - this period saw the beginning and the end of the more important features of the phenomenon. Subsequent developments will be mentioned only in so far as they relate to the main argument.

The two main sources of data may be classified under the headings of Documentary and Original:-

1. Documentary

- (a) Press references to the Mods and Rockers during the whole research period. This includes national press as well as local press from the main areas involved: Brighton, Clacton, Great Yarmouth, Southend, Hastings and Margate. (The real names of the towns, newspapers and some individuals will be used, but occasionally in order to protect the anonymity of individuals, false names such as "Seatown" and "Beachside" will be used.)
- (b) A special collection of press cuttings covering the incidents at Margate over Whitsum 1964. These cuttings were compiled for the Margate Corporation by an agency, items being selected purely on the basis of the word "Margate"

5. Ibid., p. 284.

being present. There is thus no sampling bias in the selection of items and some sort of quantification would be possible. There are 670 separate items from papers dated May 15th - June 12th. These include 223 editorials or columnist comments, 110 reports of speeches, interviews with public figures, etc., 121 letters, and 270 reports or features covering the incidents themselves. The problem of weighting makes it difficult to use precise techniques of content analysis on this collection: one obviously cannot assign equal weight in terms of shaping and reflecting public opinion to an item from the 'Daily Mirror' and another from, say, the 'Leamington Spa Courier'.

(c) Local publications of a more restricted circulation - parish newsletters, council minutes, annual reports of statutory or voluntary associations, etc.

(d) Miscellaneous national documents such as the Hansard reports of the relevant parliamentary debates in the Commons and the Lords.

(e) Letters and reports received by the National Council of Civil Liberties alleging malpractices by police or courts during the various incidents.

(f) Re-analysis of interview schedules used in a survey of 44 youths convicted in the Margate magistrates court, Whitsun 1964.⁶

2. Original

(a) Two pilot questionnaires administered to a group of 19 trainee probation officers in the preliminary stages of the study (December 1964). The first was in open-ended form and dealt with attitudes to various aspects of the Mods and Rockers - images, causes, solution and initial reactions. The second was in the form of a 90 item Likert-scale covering responses to a hypothetical incident of hooliganism of the Mods and Rockers type. This scale was also completed by nine teachers and seven W.E.A. students.

6. The results of the survey are reported in P. Barker and A. Little, "The Margate Offenders: A Survey," New Society, July 30, 1964, pp. 6 - 10. I am grateful to Mr. Barker for giving me access to the original interview schedules.

- (b) Interviews and informal discussions in Brighton, Margate and Hastings at the end of 1964, after the first wave of incidents. Formal interviews were held with editors of all the local newspapers and various publicity department officials. Informal discussions, of the type used in the first stages of a community study, were held with informants such as hotel keepers, shop assistants, bus conductors, taxi drivers and newspaper vendors.
- (c) Letters, some of them followed up by personal interviews and others by postal questionnaires, were written to the M.P's of the areas involved, local councillors and a range of other public figures who made statements about the Mods and Rockers and proposed plans to deal with them. In certain cases, individual plans crystallized into more institutionalized forms, which will be referred to as "action groups". Three such action groups were studied in detail, through prolonged contact with their main initiators - the "Beachside" Safeguard Committee, the "Seatown" Council Work Camp Scheme and the Brighton Weekenders.
- (d) In the case of the Brighton Weekenders, a social work project designed to provide sleeping accommodation and other help for young people coming down to Brighton, I participated as a volunteer worker over three Bank Holiday weekends.
- (e) Sixty five interviews, thirty of which were tape-recorded, were carried out in Brighton over the Whitsum Bank Holiday, 1965. Members of the public standing on the promenade or pier watching the Mods and Rockers were interviewed on a quota sample basis by myself and another graduate criminology student. There were five refusals out of the original seventy approached in two days. The interview schedule is reproduced in Appendix H. The distribution of the sample is shown in Table 43.
- (f) On the spot observations were made at every Bank Holiday in 1965 and 1966 in either Brighton or Great Yarmouth. The happenings themselves were observed as well as police activity and the reactions of visitors and local residents, such as shopkeepers with whom informal discussions were held. The court proceedings at Brighton were observed and recorded on three occasions. During one Bank Holiday (Brighton, Easter 1966) the method used

was closer to participant observation: I wore what could be described as Mod clothes and spent the weekend with various groups on the beach, and in the clubs.

(g) The relevant questions on the Mods and Rockers in the 133 Northview interviews as described earlier.

(h) Twenty five essays written by Third and Fourth Form pupils from a school in the East End of London. The essays entitled simply "The Mods and Rockers" were set by the English teacher as part of normal course work.

TABLE 43

Social Characteristics of Brighton Sample
Whitsum, 1965 (N = 65)

<u>Sex</u>		<u>Marital Status</u>	
Male	34	Married	31
Female	31	Single	23
		Widowed/Divorced	11
<u>Age</u>		<u>Political Affiliation</u>	
16 - 20	9	Labour	31
21 - 24	9	Conservative	28
25 - 29	1	Others/Don't Know	6
30 - 34	2		
35 - 44	6		
45 - 49	6		
50 - 64	24	<u>Social Class</u>	
65	8	Working Class	40
		Middle Class	22
		Upper Class	3
<u>Place of Residence</u>			
Local	32		
Out of Town	33		

Modes and Models of Analysis

Faced with data from such disparate sources and with the problem of analysing something as nebulous as "reactions" to a recent or contemporary phenomenon, it is difficult to decide on the best method of presenting the data. One could describe the whole phenomenon chronologically or else use categories such as those used in the Vandalism and Northview parts: "Images", "Ideas about Causation" and "Ideas about Control and Prevention". A mode of analysis, however, is chosen not simply out of convenience, but in order to meet a specific end. In this case, the primary requirement

for whatever mode is chosen is that it can be meaningfully related to the themes of transactionalism, particularly the deviancy amplification model. It would be inappropriate, however, to use merely the stages in the amplification model to describe the Mods and Rockers phenomenon. For one thing, the existence of these stages (initial deviation - punitive sanction - development of deviant identity - further deviance - further punitive reaction, etc.), is hypothetical; it would be prejudging the argument to force the data to fit the sequence. Another problem is that the stages are not precise enough to describe an actual series of incidents. Unlike, say, drug addiction or homosexuality, the Mods and Rockers phenomenon was not just a type of deviant behaviour, but was identifiable by a series of historical events. The problem is to find a framework which allows for a sequential analysis and which does justice to the data by not forcing them to fit a model derived on logico-deductive grounds.

Appropriately, it is from the field of collective behaviour in the areas known as "disaster research", that a suitable framework can be found.⁷ This area contains an impressive body of findings about the social and psychological impact of disasters, particularly physical disasters such as hurricanes, tornadoes and floods but also man-made disasters such as bombing attacks. The need to discover the problems of social organization under nuclear attack has been the stimulus for much of this research, and the findings are geared (rather optimistically) to finding methods of overcoming these problems. Impressive theoretical models, however, have also been produced, and Merton argues that the study of disasters can extend sociological theory beyond the confines of the immediate subject

7. Early journalistic accounts of disasters have given way to more sophisticated methods of data collection and theorization. The body in the U.S.A. most responsible for this development is the Disaster Research Group of the National Academy of Science, National Research Council. The most comprehensive accounts of their findings and other research are to be found in: G.W. Baker and D.W. Chapman, Man and Society in Disaster (New York: Basic Books, 1962) and A.H. Barton, Social Organisation Under Stress: A Sociological Review of Disaster Studies, (Washington D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1963).

matter. Disaster situations can be looked at as strategic "research sites" for theory-building: "Conditions of collective stress bring out in bold relief aspects of social systems that are not as readily visible in the stressful conditions of everyday life."⁸ The value of disaster studies is that by compressing social processes into a brief time span, a disaster makes usually private behaviour public and immediate and therefore more amenable to study.⁹

The relevance of disaster research to the Mods and Rockers is that it provides perhaps the only detailed model in sociology for considering the reaction of the social system to something stressful, disturbing, disastrous - or deviant. This is not to suggest that what happened at Clacton or Margate was a disaster in the same category of events as a natural disaster like an earthquake. The differences are too obvious to spell out. Nevertheless, there were resemblances, and definitions of "disaster" are so inconsistent and broad, that the Mods and Rockers events could almost fit them. Elements in such definitions include: whole or part of a community must be affected, a large segment of the community must be confronted with actual or potential danger, there must be loss to cherished values and material objects resulting in death or injury or destruction to property. In addition, many workers in the field claim that research should not be restricted to actual disasters - a potential disaster may be just as disruptive as the actual event. Studies of reactions to hoaxes and false alarms show disaster behaviour in the absence of objective danger. More important, as will be shown in detail, a large segment of the community reacted to the Mods and Rockers events as if a disaster had occurred. "It is the perception of threat and not

8. R.K. Merton, introduction to Barton, Ibid., pp. xix - xx.

9. C.F. Fritz, "Disaster" in R.K. Merton and R.A. Nisbet (Eds.), Contemporary Social Problems, (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1963), p. 654.

its actual existence that is important."¹⁰

The most relevant aspect of disaster research is the sequential model of the phases of a typical disaster. Despite terminological differences, most researchers have distinguished almost identical time phases. The following is a composite classification:¹¹

1. Warning: during which arises, mistakenly or not, some apprehensions based on conditions out of which danger may arise. The warning must be coded to be understood and impressive enough to overcome resistance to the belief that current tranquility can be upset.
2. Threat: during which people are exposed to communication from others, or to signs from the approaching disaster itself indicating specific imminent danger. This phase begins with the perception of some change, but as with the first phase, may be absent or truncated in the case of sudden disaster.
3. Impact: during which the disaster strikes and the immediate unorganized response to the death, injury or destruction takes place.
4. Inventory: during which those exposed to the disaster begin to form a preliminary picture of what has happened and of their own condition.
5. Rescue: during which the activities are geared to immediate help for the survivors. As well as people in the impact area helping each other, the suprasystem begins to send aid.
6. Remedy: during which more deliberate and formal activities are undertaken towards relieving the affected. The suprasystem takes over the functions the emergency system can't perform.
7. Recovery: during which, for an extended period, the community either recovers its former equilibrium or achieves a stable adaptation to the changes which the disaster may have brought about.

In presenting the Mods and Rockers data, the relevance will be indicated of hypotheses and empirical findings pertaining to each of these phases. The use of this model is meant only as a partial analogue

-
10. I.H. Cisin and W.B. Clark, "The Methodological Challenge of Disaster Research," in Baker and Chapman, op.cit., p. 30.
 11. From: Barton, op.cit., pp. 14 - 15: D.W. Chapman, "A Brief Introduction to Contemporary Disaster Research" in Baker and Chapman, op.cit., pp. 7 - 22: J.G. Miller, "A Theoretical Review of Individual and Group Psychological Reaction to Stress," in G.H. Grosser et al (Eds.), The Threat of Impending Disaster: Contribution to the Psychology of Stress, (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1964), pp. 24 - 32.

in the absence of any other satisfactory material. There are many concepts or even whole phases which have no apparent relevance and material from other fields, especially in collective behaviour, will have to be used. For convenience, the following condensed description of the phases will be retained:

1. Warning
2. Impact
3. Inventory
4. Reaction

If one compares this empirical analogue with deviancy models such as amplification, one notes obvious and crucial differences. In disaster research the sequence of the stages has been empirically established; in the deviancy model this is by no means the case - not only is the sequence itself hypothetical, but also the notion that the connection between the stages is consequential (i.e. causal) and not merely sequential. In disaster research, moreover, it has been shown how the form each phase takes is affected by the characteristics of the previous stage (e.g. the scale of the remedy operation is affected by the degree of identification with the victim). It is this sort of uniformity which is unproven in the deviance model. The nature of the reaction to the event is important in different ways. In the case of disaster, the social system responds in order to help the victims and to evolve methods to mitigate the effects of further disasters (e.g. by early warning systems). The disaster itself occurs independent of this reaction. In regard to deviance, however, the reaction is seen as partly causative - the on-the-spot reaction to an act determines whether it is classified as deviant at all. The way in which the act is reported and labelled also determines the form of the subsequent deviation; this is not the case with a disaster.

To express the difference in another way, while the disaster sequence is linear and constant - in each disaster the warning is followed by the impact which is followed by the reaction - the deviance model is supposed to be circular and amplifying: the impact (deviance) is followed by a

reaction which has the effect of increasing the subsequent warning and impact, setting up a feedback system. It is precisely because the Mods and Rockers phenomenon was both a generalized type of deviance and also manifested itself as a series of discrete events, that both models are relevant. While a single event can be meaningfully described in terms of the disaster analogue (warning-impact-reaction), each event can be seen as creating the potential for a reaction which, among other possible consequences, might cause further acts of deviance.

The data will be presented, then, as a typical reaction sequence. The logical start in describing this would be with the "warning" phase; and, indeed, one of the defects of the amplification model is its failure to specify the conditions which must exist before the initial deviation, to affect the reaction. In order to describe the effect of the reaction on later stages though, we need to enter the sequence at the point of the initial reaction. In operational terms this means starting with the reactions to the first manifestations of the Mods and Rockers phenomenon: the events at Clacton in Easter 1964 and Margate in Whitsum 1964. Data from comparable phases in each event will be presented side by side to prevent unnecessary repetition and to show which features were typical, which were bound by specific situational factors and how these factors changed over time.

Using the disaster analogue as a loose framework on which to "hang" the data, the aim of these chapters is to describe the societal reactions to the Mods and Rockers - particularly as these reactions were reflected in the mass media - and show how these reactions developed and reverberated as the deviance finally became absorbed into the social structure.

CHAPTER 13REACTION: THE INVENTORY PHASE

Clacton is an East Coast resort not particularly well known for the range of amusements it provides for its younger visitors. Easter 1964 was worse than usual. It was cold and wet, and in fact Easter Sunday was the coldest for eighty years. The shopkeepers and stall owners were irritated by the lack of business and the young people had their own boredom and irritation fanned by rumours of cafe owners and barmen refusing to serve some of them. A few groups started scuffling on the pavements and throwing stones at each other. The Mods and Rockers factions - a division initially based on clothing and life styles, later rigidified, but at that time only vaguely in the air - started separating out. Those on bikes and scooters roared up and down, windows were broken, some beach huts were wrecked and one boy fired a starting pistol in the air. The vast number of people crowding into the streets, the noise, everyone's general irritation and the actions of an unprepared and undermanned police force had the effect of making the two days unpleasant, oppressive and sometimes frightening. In terms of the model, this was the initial deviation or impact.

Immediately after a physical disaster, there is a period of relatively unorganized response. This is followed by the inventory phase during which those exposed to the disaster take stock of what has happened and of their own condition. In this period, rumours and ambiguous perceptions become the basis for interpreting the situation. Immediately after the Aberfan coal tip disaster, for example, there were rumours about the tip having been seen moving the night before and previous warnings having been ignored. These reports were to form the basis of later accusations of negligence against the National Coal Board, and the negligence theme then became assimilated into more deep-rooted attitudes, for example, about indifference by the central government to Welsh interests. In the next chapter, we will look in detail at these long-term themes.

We are concerned here with the way in which the situation was initially interpreted and presented by the mass media, because it is in this form that most people receive their pictures of both deviance and disasters. One does not have to be present at a disaster to have some idea of what happened or what the possible causes were. Similarly, one's view of deviance is second-hand. In the imaginary village community one might have been able to react to the village idiot in terms of first-hand impressions: in mass society images arrive already processed and on the basis of these processed or coded images of the deviant, people react, become angry, formulate plans, make speeches, write letters to the newspapers. So the media presentation or inventory of the Mods and Rockers events is crucial in determining the later stages of the reaction. The problem is, how accurate an inventory was made - how was the deviance reported? On this basis we can analyse the effect of this reporting on the putative deviation and other stages in the amplification sequence.

On the Monday morning following the initial incidents at Clacton, every national newspaper, with the exception of the Times (fifth lead on main news page) carried a leading report on the subject. The headlines are self-descriptive: "Day of Terror by Scooter Groups" (Daily Telegraph), "Youngsters Beat Up Town - 97 Leather Jacket Arrests" (Daily Express), "Wild Ones Invade Seaside - 97 Arrests" (Daily Mirror). The next lot of incidents received similar coverage on the Tuesday and editorials began to appear, together with reports that the Home Secretary was "being urged" to hold an inquiry or to take firm action. Feature articles now appeared highlighting interviews with Mods or Rockers. Straight reporting gave way to theories especially about motivation: the mob was described as "exhilarated", "drunk with notoriety", "hell-bent for destruction", etc. Reports of the incidents themselves were followed by accounts of police and court activity and local reaction. The press coverage of each series of incidents shows a similar sequence.

Overseas coverage was extensive throughout; particularly in America,

Canada, Australia, South Africa and the Continent. The New York Times and New York Herald Tribune carried large photos, after Whitsum, of two girls fighting. Belgian papers captioned their photos, "West Side Story on English Coast".

It is difficult to assess conclusively the accuracy of these early reports. Even if each incident was observed - a physical impossibility with only one research worker - one could never check the veracity of, say, an interview. In many cases, one "knows" that the interview must be, partly at least, journalistic fabrication because it is too stereotypical to be true, but this is far from objective proof. Nevertheless, on the basis of those incidents that were observed, interviews with people who were present at others (local reporters, photographers, deck chair attendants, etc.), and a careful check on internal consistency, some estimate of the main distortions can be made. Checks with the local press are particularly revealing. Not only are the reports more detailed and specific, but they avoid statements like "all the dance-halls near the seafront were smashed" when every local resident knows that there is only one dance-hall near the front. The inventory will be analysed under three headings:- (1) Exaggeration and Distortion; (2) Prediction; (3) Symbolization.

Exaggeration and Distortion

The first type of exaggeration was in reports of the numbers involved. It is notoriously difficult in any crowd situation to estimate numbers and it is probable that any overestimates in the case of the Mods and Rockers were no more than would occur for a soccer match or a political demonstration. Distortion came not only in reporting the number of young people present, but, more important, in reporting the number who actually took part in any violence or vandalism. Most of those present were spectators or fringe participants who could be drawn into mass activity such as a rush across the road to watch a fight. Only a minority was roused to the type of violence that the headlines would have one believe everyone

took part in.

Another type of exaggeration was of the severity of the damage and physical violence. Phrases such as "beat up the town" and "orgy of destruction" created the impression of a great deal of damage. The picture of violence was transmitted in such reports as the Daily Express (19/5/64):

There was Dad asleep in a deckchair and Mum making sandcastles with the children, when the 1964 boys took over the beaches at Margate and Brighton yesterday and smeared the traditional post-card scene with blood and violence.

In addition, the effect of the behaviour was greatly exaggerated. This was done through reports of "innocent holidaymakers" fleeing in fear from the Mods and Rockers, of local tradesmen forming vigilante squads to protect themselves and of the loss of trade that the resorts would suffer because visitors would be scared off.

What are the sources of these and other distortions? A perceptive journalist has pointed out one of the most obvious: "Since every one of those who raised his foot to kick a Roker had an audience of thirty reporters, as many photographers and half a dozen newspaper teams, it was easy enough to give the impression of a riot."¹ The same journalist reports a conversation with the Assistant Editor of the Daily Mirror a couple of days after Clacton in which he admitted that the affair had been "a little over reported".² The sources of "over reporting" lay in subtle and often unconscious journalistic techniques such as the use of the generic plural - if a boat was overturned, reports read "boats were overturned". There was also the technique, well known to war correspondents, of reporting the same incident twice to look like two different incidents.

Another source of distortion lay in the publication, usually in good faith, of reports which were later to receive quite a different perspective

1. P. Laurie, The Teenage Revolution, (London: Anthony Blond Ltd., 1965), p. 129.

2. Ibid., p. 130.

by fresh evidence.³ An example of this was a story later used to justify the image of the Mods and Rockers as being an affluent horde. The story was about a boy who told the Margate magistrate that he would pay his £75 fine with a cheque. This incident was in itself true enough; what few papers bothered to publish and what they all knew, was that the boy's offer was a pathetic gesture of bravado. He later admitted that not only did he not have the £75, but did not even have a bank account and had never signed a cheque in his life.

It is apparent, though, that most distortion occurred not so much in the use of these techniques, but in the style of presentation, the sensational headlines and the melodramatic vocabulary characteristic of most crime reporting. The effect of the presence of the young people, for example, was exaggerated by metaphors such as "battle", "riot", "attack", "siege" which left the overwhelming image of innocent holidaymakers fleeing in fear from a marauding mob. The Brighton, Whitsum 1964, incidents were reported in this way, even the local paper spoke about "deserted beaches" and "elderly holidaymakers" fleeing the seafront to escape the "screaming teenagers". One had to scan the rest of the paper or be present on the spot to know that on the day referred to (Monday, 18th May) the beaches were deserted because the weather was particularly bad. The "holidaymakers" that were present, were there to watch the Mods and Rockers. Although at other times (for example, August, 1964 at Hastings) there was intimidation, there was very little of this in the Brighton incident referred to. In the 1965 and 1966 incidents, there was even less intimidation, yet the incidents were ritualistically reported in the same way, using the same metaphors, headlines and vocabulary.

3. The repetition of obviously false stories, despite known confirmation of this, is a familiar finding in studies of the role of the press in mass hysteria. See, e.g.: N. Jacobs, "The Phantom Slasher of Taipei: Mass Hysteria in a Non-Western Society," Social Problems, 12 (Winter 1965), p. 322.

To observe the type of foundation laid for the putative deviation, one might construct a composite description of the deviance as presented by the mass media. The following was this, supposedly factual, initial picture:

Gangs of Mods and Rockers from the suburbs of London invaded, on motor bikes and scooters, a number of seaside resorts. These were affluent young people, from all social classes. They came down deliberately to cause trouble by behaving aggressively towards visitors, local residents and the police. They attacked innocent holidaymakers and destroyed a great deal of public property. This cost the resorts large sums of money in repairing the damage and a further loss of trade through potential visitors being scared to come down.

The evidence for the ten elements in this composite picture is summarized below:

- (i) Gangs: There was no evidence of any structured gangs. The groups were loose collectivities or crowds within which there was occasionally some more structured grouping based on territorial loyalty, e.g. "The Walthamstow Boys".
- (ii) Mods and Rockers: Initially, at least, the groups were not polarized along the Mod-Rocker dimension. This polarization took place much later (and partly as a consequence of the publicity). Throughout the period, many of the young people coming down did not identify with either group.
- (iii) Invasion from London: Although the bulk of day trippers, young and old, were from London, this was simply the traditional bank holiday pattern. Not all offenders were from London; many were either local residents or came from neighbouring towns or villages. This was particularly true of the Rockers who, in Great Yarmouth, came mainly from East Anglian villages. The origins of 54 youths, on whom information was obtainable, out of the 64 charged at Hastings (August 1964) was as follows: London or Middlesex suburbs - 20; Welwyn Garden City - 4 ; small towns in Kent - 9; Sussex - 7; Essex - 4; and Surrey - 10.
- (iv) Motor bikes and Scooters: At every event the majority of young people present came down by train or coach or hitched. The motor bike or scooter

owners were always a minority; albeit a noisy minority that easily gave the impression of ubiquity.

(v) Affluence: There is no statistically valid evidence either way in regard to this item. Conversations with the users of the Brighton Weekend Project suggest that the young people coming down were not particularly well off. In regard to those charged in the courts, there is clearly little basis for the affluence image. The average take home pay in the Barker-Little sample (Margate, Whitsum 1964) was £11 per week. The original Clacton offenders had on them an average of 15/- for the whole Bank Holiday weekend. The best off was a window-cleaner earning £15 a week, but more typical were a market assistant earning £7.10.0d. and a 17 year old office boy earning £5.14.0d.

(vi) Classless: Indices such as accent and area of residence, gathered from court reports and observation, suggest that both the crowds and the offenders were predominantly working class. In the Barker-Little sample, the typical Roker was an unskilled manual worker, the typical Mod a semi-skilled manual worker. At Clacton, out of the 24 charged, 23 had left school at 15, and 22 had been to Secondary Moderns. All were unskilled; there were no apprentices or anyone receiving any kind of training.

(vii) Deliberate intent: The bulk of young people present at the resorts came down not so much to make trouble as in the hope that there would be some trouble to watch. Their very presence, their readiness to be drawn into a situation of trouble and the sheer accretion of relatively trivial incidents were found inconvenient and offensive; but if there were great numbers deliberately intent on causing trouble, then much more trouble would have resulted. I will make this point clearer when analysing the Impact. The proportion of those whom the police would term "troublemakers" was always small. This hard core was more evident at Clacton than at any of the subsequent events: 23 out of the 24 charged (97 were originally arrested)

had previous convictions.⁴

(viii) Violence and Vandalism: Acts of violence and vandalism are the most tangible manifestations of what the press and public regard as hooliganism. These acts were therefore played up rather than the less melodramatic effect of the Mods and Rockers which was being a nuisance and inconvenience to many adults. In fact, the total amount of serious violence and vandalism was not great. Only about one-tenth of the Clacton offenders was charged with offences involving violence. At Margate, Whitsun 1964, supposedly one of the most violent events,⁵ there were two stabbings and one man was dropped onto a flower bed. At Hastings, August 1964, out of 44 found guilty, there were three cases of assaulting the police. At Brighton, Easter 1965, out of 70 arrests there were 7 for assault. Even if the definition of violence were broadened to include obstruction and the use of threatening behaviour, the targets were rarely "innocent holidaymakers", but members of a rival group, or, more often, the police. The number of recorded cases of malicious damage to property was also small; less than 10% of all cases charged in the courts. The typical offence throughout was obstructing the police or the use of threatening behaviour. In Clacton, although hardly any newspapers mentioned this, a number of the 24 were charged with non-hooligan type offences: stealing half a pint of petrol, attempting to steal drinks from a vending machine and "obtaining credit to the amount of 7d. by means of fraud other than false pretences" (an ice cream).

(ix) Cost of damage: The court figures for malicious damage admittedly underestimate the extent of vandalism because much of this goes undetected. Nevertheless an examination of the figures given for the cost of the damage

4. This group may be analogous to the hard core who in race riots and other crowd situations are thought to be more labile, predisposed to take the initiative and respond violently to what is perceived as provocation, especially police provocation.

5. See the Daily Express "blood and violence" report quoted earlier.

suggests that this was not as excessive as reported. Table 44 shows the cost of damage at the first four events (estimates from local authority figures quoted in local press):

TABLE 44

Cost of Damage to Four Resorts: Easter and Whitsun 1964.

<u>Place</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>No. of Arrests</u>	<u>Estimated Cost of Damage</u>
Clacton	Easter, 1964	97	£513
Bournemouth	Whitsun, 1964	56	£100
Brighton	Whitsun, 1964	76	£400
Margate	Whitsun, 1964	64	£250

It must be remembered also that a certain amount of damage to local authority property takes place every bank holiday. According to the Deputy Publicity Manager of Margate,⁶ for example, the number of deckchairs broken (50) was not much greater than on an ordinary bank holiday weekend; there were also more chairs out on Whit Sunday than ever before.

(x) Loss of trade: The press, particularly the local press, laid great emphasis on the financial loss the resorts had suffered and would suffer on account of the Mods and Rockers through cancelled holidays, less use of facilities, loss of trade in shops, restaurants and hotels. The evidence for any such loss is at best dubious. Under the heading "Those Wild Ones Are To Blame Again", the Brighton Evening Argus quoted figures after Whitsun 1964 to show that, compared with the previous Whitsun, the number of deckchairs hired had dropped by 8,000 and the number using the swimming pool by 1,500. But the number using the miniature railway increased by 2,000, as did the number of users of the putting green. These figures make sense when one knows that on the day referred to, the temperature had dropped by 14°F. and it had been raining the night before. This is the main reason why there was less use of deckchairs and the swimming pool. In Hastings, August 1964, despite a big scare-publicity build up, the number of

6. Interview (23/11/64).

visitors coming down by train increased by 6,000 over the previous year.⁷ Newspapers often quoted "loss of trade" estimates by landlords, hotel keepers and local authority officials, but invariably, final figures of damage fell below the first estimates. These figures, however, came too late to have any news value. Although there were cases of people being scared away by reports of the disturbances, the overall effect was the opposite. The Margate publicity department had a letter from a travel agent in Ireland saying that the events had "put Margate on the map". Leaving aside the additional young people themselves attracted by the publicity - they would not be defined as commercial assets - many adults came down to watch the fun as well. It was not uncommon to be asked, on the way down from Brighton station, "where are the Mods and Rockers today?" Parents were observed holding their children on their shoulders to get a better view of the proceedings. In an interview with a reporter during which I was present, a man said, "My wife and I came down with our son (aged 18) to see what all this fun is at the seaside on Bank Holidays" (Evening Argus 30/5/64).

Prediction

There is another element in the inventory which needs to be discussed separately because it assumes a special importance in later stages. This is the implicit assumption, present in virtually every report, that what had happened was inevitably going to happen again. Few assumed that the events were transient occurrences; the only questions were where the Mods and Rockers would strike next and what could be done about it. As will be suggested, these predictions played the role of the classical self-fulfilling prophecy, for, unlike the case of natural disasters where the absence of predictions can be disastrous, with social phenomena such as deviance, it is the presence of prediction that can be "disastrous".

The predictions in the inventory period took the form of reported

7. Estimate by Hastings Stationmaster, quoted in Hastings and St. Leonards Observer (8/8/64).

statements from local figures such as tradesmen, councillors and police spokesmen about what should be done "next time" or of immediate precautions they had taken. More important, youths were asked in T.V. interviews about their plans for the next bank holiday and interviews were printed with either a Mod or a Rocker threatening revenge "next time". The following are extracts from two such interviews: "Southend and places won't let us in any more. It will get difficult here and so next year we'll probably go to Ramsgate or Hastings." (Daily Express 30/3/64). "It could have been better - the weather spoiled it a bit. Wait until next Whitsun. Now that will be a real giggle." (Daily Mirror 31/3/64).

Where predictions were not fulfilled, a story could still be found by reporting non-events. So, for example, when attention was switched to East Anglian resorts in 1966, the East Anglian Daily Times (30/5/66) headed a report on a play attended by a group of long-haired youths "Fears When Ton-up Boys Walked in Groundless." Reporters and photographers were apparently sent on the basis of false tip-offs to events that did not materialise. In Whitsun 1965, a Daily Mirror report from Hastings, where nothing at all happened, was headed "Hastings - Without Them." In Whitsun 1966, there was a report (Daily Mirror 30/5/66) on how policemen on a "Mods and Rockers patrol" in Clacton could only use their specially provided walkie talkies to help two lost little boys. Again, headlines often created the impression that something had happened: the Evening Argus (30/5/66) used the subheading "Violence" to report that "in Brighton there was no violence in spite of the crowds of teenagers on the beach."

Symbolization

Communication, and especially the mass communication of stereotypes, depends on the symbolic power of words and images. Neutral words such as place names can be made to symbolize complex ideas and emotions, e.g. Pearl Harbour, Hiroshima, Dallas. A similar process can be observed in the Mods and Rockers inventory: these words themselves and a word such as "Clacton" acquired symbolic powers. It became meaningful to say "we don't

want another Clacton here" or "you can see he's one of those Mod types."

There appear to be three processes in such symbolization: a word (e.g. Mod) becomes symbolic of a certain status (e.g. deviant); objects (e.g. clothing) symbolize the word; the objects themselves become symbolic of the status (and the emotions attached to the status). The cumulative effect of these three processes as they appeared in the inventory, is that the terms Mods and Rockers were torn from any previously neutral contexts (e.g. the denotation of different consumer styles) and acquired wholly unfavourable meanings. The identical effect is described by Turner and Surace in their classic study of the 1943 Zoot Suit riots, as the creation of "unambiguously unfavourable symbols".⁸ They show how newspaper headlines and interpersonal communication following the initial incidents in Los Angeles, reiterated the phobia and hatred towards Mexican American youth. References to this group were made in such a way as to strip key symbols (differences in fashion, job style and entertainment) from their favourable or neutral connotations until they came to evoke unambiguously unfavourable feelings. Content analysis showed a switch in the references to Mexicans to the "Zooter theme", which identified this particular clothing style as the "badge of delinquency" and coupled such references with mention of zoot suiter attacks and orgies. Invariably the zooter was identified with the generalized Mexican group. In the same way, the Mods and Rockers status traits were, in later stages of the reaction, to wash off on the generalized adolescent group. Their "badge of delinquency" emerged as symbols, such as the fur collared anorak and the scooter, which became sufficient in themselves to stimulate the punitive sanction.⁹

This sort of symbolization is partly the consequence of the same more

-
8. R.H. Turner and S.J. Surace, "Zoot Suiters and Mexicans: Symbols in Crowd Behaviour," American Journal of Sociology, 62 (1956), pp. 14 - 20.
 9. During the inventory period, scooter owners and manufacturers frequently complained about the bad publicity that they were getting. After Clacton, the General Secretaries of the Vespa and Lambretta Scooter Clubs issued a statement dissociating their clubs from the disturbances.

or less standard mass communication techniques and the same pressures which led to exaggeration and distortion. One such practice was the misleading juxtaposition of headlines in reports of unconnected events. Certain accounts of the Whitsun 1964 events, for example, were coupled with a report of a "Mod" falling to his death from a cliff outside Brighton. Similarly after Hastings, there were headlines "Mod Dead in Sea". In neither case had these deaths anything to do with the disturbances; they were both pure accidents. A reading of the headlines only, or of early reports not mentioning police statements about the accidents, might have led to a misleading connection. This sort of effect reached its bizarre heights in a headline in the Dublin Evening Press (18/5/64) "Terror Comes to English Resorts. Mutilated Mod Dead In Park". The "mutilated Mod" was, in fact, a man of 21 - 25 wearing a "mod jacket" (?) who was found stabbed on the Saturday morning (the day before the incidents at the resorts) in a Birmingham park.¹⁰

Another highly effective technique of symbolization was the use of dramatized and ritualistic interviews with "representative members" of either group. The Daily Mirror (31/3/64) had "Mick The Wild One" on "Why I Hurlled That Chisel" and another youth who said, "I take pep pills. Everybody does here." The Daily Herald (18/5/64) quoted one boy clutching his injured head as the police bundled him into a van saying, "Carry on with the plan"; another said, "We're not through yet. We're here for the holiday and we're staying. Margate will wish it was Clacton when we're finished." The Evening Standard (19/5/64) found "The Baron" who hated "Mods and Wogs" and said, "I like fighting ... I have been fighting all my life." The Daily Mirror (8/5/64) had a new angle on "The Girls Who Follow The Wild Ones Into Battle" and who also like fighting;

10. Newspapers furthest away from the source invariably carried the greatest distortions and inaccuracies. The Glasgow Daily Record and Mail (20/5/64), for example, described Mods as being dressed in short jacketed suits, with bell bottoms, high boots, bowler or top hats and carrying rolled up umbrellas.

... it gives you a kick, a thrill, it makes you feel all funny inside. You get butterflies in your stomach and you want the boys to go on and on ... It's hard luck on the people who get in their way, but you can't do anything about that.

As admitted previously, it is impossible to prove whether or not these interviews are authentic and accurate. In certain cases they ring a patently false note; for example, the Daily Telegraph (31/3/64) interviewed a Rocker who said, "We are known as the Rockers and are much more with it." If any group had a more "with it" self image and would even use such a term, it certainly was not the Rockers. It would be fair to say that the interviews and descriptions are "composite" not in the sense of being faked, but in the sense of being influenced by the writer's conception of how anyone labelled as a thug or a hooligan should speak, dress and act. This factor may have been combined with a certain gullibility about the fantasies of self-styled gang leaders.¹¹ Clark and Barker's case study of "R" shows the importance of this effect in a crowd situation.¹² And in disaster research, prospective interviewers are warned, "People who have discussed their experiences with others in the community can rapidly assimilate inaccurate versions of the disaster. These group versions may quickly come to be accepted by a large segment of the population."¹³

Through symbolization, plus the other types of exaggeration and distortion, images are made much sharper than reality. There is no reason to assume that photographs or television reports are any more "objective".

-
11. Yablonsky has provided numerous examples of how outside observers accept at face value the fantasies of gang leaders and members. See L. Yablonsky, The Violent Gang, (New York: Free Press, 1962).
 12. "R's account of the events of the Harlem riot cannot be approached as if it were a description of the events as they actually occurred." K.B. Clark and J. Barker: "The Zoot Effect in Personality: A Race Riot Participant", Journal Abnorm. and Soc. Psychol., 40 (1945), p.147.
 13. Cissin and Clark, op.cit., p. 28.

In a study of the different perceptions experienced by T.V. viewers and on the spot spectators of another crowd situation (MacArthur Day in Chicago), it was shown how the reporting was distorted by the selection of items to fit into already existing expectations.¹⁴ Observers on the scene noted how their expectations of political enthusiasm and wild mass involvement were completely unfulfilled. Through close ups and commentaries about "the most enthusiastic crowd ever in our city ... you can feel the tenseness in the air ... you can hear the crowd roar", the T.V. could restructure the whole event to convey emotions non-existent for the participants. This effect explains why many spectators at the Mods and Rockers events found them a slight come down after the media publicity. As Boorstin remarks in discussing the effects of television and colour photography: "Verisimilitude took on a new meaning ... The Grand Canyon itself become a disappointing reproduction of the Kodachrome original."¹⁵

The crucial effect of the sharpening process is that emotionally toned symbols are produced, which eventually acquire their own momentum. So the dissemination of overwhelming public support in favour of MacArthur "... gathered force as it was incorporated into political strategy, picked up by other media, entered into gossip and thus came to overshadow immediate reality as it might have been recorded by an observer on the scene."¹⁶

In summary, the following were the main effects of the inventory phase:-

- (1) The foundation was laid for the creation of the putative deviation.
- (2) An unfavourable symbolization in regard to the Mods and Rockers and objects associated with them had been created.

14. K. Lang and G.E. Lang, "The Unique Perspective of Television and its Effect: A Pilot Study," American Sociological Review, 18 (February 1953), pp. 3 - 12.

15. D.J. Boorstin, The Image (London: Pelican, 1963), p. 25.

16. Lang and Lang, op.cit., p. 10.

(3) The expectation had been created that this form of deviation would recur.

(4) All the elements in the situation had been made sharper and more stereotypical. The foundation was laid for the dramatization of evil.

CHAPTER 14REACTION: OPINION AND ATTITUDE THEMES

The word "reaction" refers ambiguously to both the way people think about something and what they do about it. This chapter will be concerned with the former meaning: how were the images in the inventory crystallized into more enduring opinions and attitudes? These opinion and attitude themes correspond roughly to Smelser's "generalized belief systems"; the cognitive beliefs or delusions which result from the mass media and are assimilated by audience predisposition.¹

Once the initial impact has passed over, the societal reaction to any sudden event, particularly if it is perceived as a dislocation of the social structure or a threat to cherished values, is an attempt to make sense of what happened. People talk less about the event itself and more about the implications of it. Mass media and public reaction to the shooting of three policemen in London in 1966 followed this sequence: speculations about the shooting itself and a presentation of the images of the actors involved (the inventory) was replaced by discussions of the "issues": restoration of the death penalty, arming of policemen, the nature of violence in society. A similar sequence has been noted in the response of the mass media to the Kennedy assassination.²

Analyses of the reactions to the assassination all spoke of the need for interpretation: people had to make sense of what may be considered an absurd accident. They wanted an explanation of the causes of the murder, a positive meaning to be given to the situation and a reassurance that the nation would come through the crisis without harm.³ All these things the

1. Smelser, op.cit., Chap. 3.

2. E.B. Parker and B.S. Greenberg, "Newspaper Content on the Assassination Weekend" in B.S. Greenberg and E.B. Parker (Eds.), The Kennedy Assassination and the American Public: Social Communication in Crisis, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1965), pp. 46 - 47.

3. J.D. Barker, "Peer Group Discussion and Recovery from the Kennedy Assassination" in Greenberg and Parker, op.cit., p. 119.

mass media provide: they reduce the ambiguity created by cultural strain and uncertainty. In the case of mass delusions, a significant stage in the diffusion of the hysterical belief is the attempt by commentators to re-structure and make sense of an ambiguous situation. In such situations theories arise to explain what cannot be seen as random events. An outbreak of windshield pitting is explained as vandalism, meteoric dust, sandflea eggs hatching in the glass, air pollution, radioactive fallout, etc.⁴

Many of these theories and the themes to be discussed below, are based on no more than the sort of rumours present in mass delusions and have the same function: the reduction of ambiguity. Although the rumours, themes and beliefs derive mainly from the mass media, they later encounter reinforcement or resistance in a group setting. The individual is exposed to a barrage of information and interpretation during which his ideas change or crystallize: "Over time these group formulated and group supported interpretations tend to override or replace individual idiosyncratic ones. They become part of the group myth, the collection of common opinions to which the member generally conforms."⁵ These collective themes reverberate through the social system, creating the conditions on which subsequent stages are built.

This description, of course, oversimplifies the communication process by assuming a unitary set of values into which the themes are absorbed like a pool of water absorbing the ripples from a dropped stone. The communication flow is much more complicated, and information is accepted or rejected and finally coded in terms of a plurality of needs, values, membership and reference groups, etc. These variables will be discussed later under the heading of "Differential Reaction", at this stage we are concerned with analysing in more or less ideal-typical categories the opinion and attitude themes about Mods and Rockers as they appeared in the mass media and other

4. N. Medalia and O.N. Larsen, "Diffusion and Belief in a Collective Delusion: The Seattle Windshield Pitting Epidemic," American Sociological Review, 23(1958), p. 183.

5. Parker, op.cit., p. 112.

public forms. These themes derive from all the "opinion statements" on the subject; editorials, articles, letters to the press, speeches, sermons, debates, etc. What follows is by no means a catalogue of all types of opinions stated; some were so idiosyncratic and bizarre that they would each require a separate category. These are the themes which emerged with sufficient regularity to justify thinking that they had some effect on public opinion. The themes are classified into three categories:-

(1) Orientation: the emotional and intellectual standpoint from which the deviance is evaluated; (2) Images: opinions about the nature of the deviants and their behaviour; (3) Causation: opinions about the causes of the behaviour. The opinions on methods of handling the behaviour will be dealt with when considering the societal control culture. These categories are not entirely exclusive; a statement such as "it's because they've got too much money", belongs to both the Images and Causation categories.

Orientation

Disaster - As pointed out when evaluating the disaster model, the behaviour was often perceived as if it were a disaster, and this is, in fact, an orientation which endured through later opinion statements. As a direct result of the inventory, the psychological impact and social significance of the Mods and Rockers were perceived to be of disastrous proportions.

The natural disaster analogy was often explicitly drawn, perhaps nowhere more clearly than by Mr. David James, the M.P. for Brighton Kemptown during the Second Reading of the Malicious Damage Bill:

I was not in Brighton during the weekend to which references have been made, but I arrived there later to find a sense of horror and outrage felt by the people who live there. It was almost as if one had been to a city which, at least emotionally, had been recently hit by an earthquake and as if all the conventions and values of life had been completely flouted. This was deeply felt.⁶

In a previous debate, the M.P. for the constituency in which Great Yarmouth falls, hoped that the town "... will never suffer the ravages which

6. Hansard (House of Commons), June 23, 1964, Col. 274.

Clacton suffered",⁷ while another M.P. referred to "... the delinquent youth who sacked Clacton".⁸ Similar analogies were used in editorials after Whitsun 1964: "Goths by the sea" (Evening Standard, May 18th); the marauding army of Vikings going through Europe massacring and plundering, living by slaughter and rapacity (The Star, Sheffield, May 18th); mutated locusts wreaking untold havoc on the land (Time and Tide, May 21st), etc.

Most statements emphasised the threat to life and property, particularly the latter, and the picture of a town being "wrecked" was reinforced by rumours quoted about resorts armour plating their deck chairs and insurance companies offering policies to the resorts to cover them against losses incurred through Mods and Rockers as well as normal storm damage. But it was clear throughout that it was not only property that was being threatened, but "all the conventions and values of life". As the Birmingham Post (19/5/64) put it, drawing on Churchill's "We will fight them on the beeches" speech; the external enemies of 1940 had been replaced on our own shores in 1964 by internal enemies who "bring about disintegration of a nation's character."

In the same way as most disasters are determined by impersonal, inexorable forces against which human action has little effect, an irrational, unreachable element was seen in the Mods and Rockers behaviour. A widely quoted article in Police Review spoke about the "frightening" realization that when law and order - which is based on nothing more than individual restraint - is loosened, "violence can surge and flame like a forest fire". It could be compared with the football riot in Peru: "a disallowed goal and over 300 dead before sanity could be restored. Clacton, Margate and Lima have one element in common - restraint normal to civilized society was thrown aside."⁹ This orientation to crowd behaviour is identical to

7. Hansard (House of Commons), April 27, 1964, Col. 65.

8. Ibid., Col. 71.

9. F. Elmes, "Mods and Rockers," Police Review, XXII (June 1964).

Le Bon's original conception of the mob as possessing the irrationality and ferocity of primitive beings.¹⁰

Reaction from abroad sounded even more like reaction to a disaster. Italian papers forecast a tourist rush from English holidaymakers scared to go to their own resorts. At least two English M.P's returned prematurely from Continental holidays to survey the damage in their stricken constituencies. The Chairman of the Clacton U.D.C. had phone calls from Paris and Washington asking about conditions in the town.

Prophecy of Doom - As a result of the inventory, the deviance was not only magnified, but seen as certain to re-occur and, moreover, likely to get worse. The tone of some opinion statements was that of Old Testament prophets predicting certain doom and then following with exhortations about what could be done to avert the doom. So, after Whitsun, 1964, Mr. Harold Gurden, M.P., who had before the event successfully moved a resolution calling for intensified measures to control hooliganism, stated: "The latest incidents reinforce what I said and the warning I gave. This thing has got worse and will get worse until we take some steps." (Times 20/5/64).

Besides conforming to self-fulfilling prophecies, such statements illustrate Becker's point about the unique dilemma of the moral entrepreneur who has to defend the success of his methods and at the same time contend that the problem is getting worse.

It's Not So Much What Happened - A variant of the previous two themes is the type of opinion that attempts to put the behaviour "in perspective" by perceiving that the reports were exaggerated. It is not the behaviour itself which is disturbing but fantasies about what could have happened or what could still happen. Ominous visions are conjured up about what the

10. One might speculate that there was something in common in the dislike of the Mods and Rockers and Le Bon's reason for disliking the mobs he was describing, i.e. the French Revolutionary crowd which he saw as the end of an ordered social hierarchy and the beginning of mob rule.

behaviour might be leading to: mass civil disobedience, Mazi youth movements, Nuremberg rallies and mob rule.

It's Not Only This - If the previous theme looked behind what happened, this one looks all around it. Through a process of free association, statements convey that the problem is not just the Mods and Rockers but a whole pattern in which pregnant schoolgirls, C.N.D. marches, beatniks, long hair, contraceptives in slot machines, purple hearts and smashing up telephone kiosks are all inextricably intertwined. One must orient oneself not just to an incident, a type of behaviour or even a type of person, but to a whole spectrum of problems and aberrations.

The type of associated deviance varied: other deviance of a similar type (hooliganism, vandalism, violence), deviance of other types (drug-taking, promiscuity) or other more general social trends. The association was determined by attitudinal or ideological variables: so the New Statesman was worried by other youths being exploited by the "hucksters of music and sex" and the Tribune by other "educational rejects".

Associations were not only made with adolescent problems: "The society which produces the Margate and Ramsgate neurotic adolescents is also producing a neurotic middle age which cannot sleep and a neurotic old age which fills our mental hospitals."¹¹ The invariably high figures for road deaths over Bank Holidays made other associations inevitable. Under headings such as "Madness in the Sun", "The Bank Holiday of Shame" and "The Destroyers" it was made clear that bad drivers and bad teenagers could be seen as functionally equivalent. The Daily Mail (19/5/64) imagined people saying, "It's a lovely holiday - let's got out and smash something. Or kill someone. Or kill ourselves." While admitting that drivers are more murderous and roads offer the bigger danger, the Mail thought there was little to choose between the "mad variety" of wild ones on the roads

11. Canon Evans, Chancellor of Southwark Cathedral, at a Christian Action Conference, June 7, 1964.

and on the beaches.

Images

Spurious Attribution - The tendency towards spurious attribution on which the putative deviation is built, stems directly from the inventory. This tendency is not only present in "popular" statements but also in more informed attitudes and also, as Matza has convincingly suggested, in the image of the delinquent held by contemporary criminology. In all cases, the function of the spurious attribution is the same: to support a particular theory or course of action.

The initial stage in the labelling process was the use of emotive symbols such as "hooligans", "thugs" and "wild ones". Via the inventory, these terms entered the mythology to provide a composite stigma attributable to persons performing certain acts, wearing certain clothes or belonging to a certain social status; that of the adolescent.

Perhaps the first public catalogue of the auxiliary status traits attributed to the Mods and Rockers, was made by Mr. Thomas Holdcroft, the prosecutor at the first Clacton trial. In his speech, he listed the following traits:- no views at all on any serious subject; an inflated idea of their own importance in society; immature; irresponsible; arrogant; lacking in any regard for the law, for the officers of the law, for the comfort and safety of other persons and for the property of others. This composite was captured in the term "wild ones", which, however, was soon to be replaced in the mythology by the term used by the Margate magistrate, Dr. Simpson: "Sawdust Caesars". The "sawdust caesars" speech - to be discussed in detail later - made a tremendous impact: over 70% of the immediate post-Margate statements used the term or its variations ("vermin" and "ratpack"). Although less successful in passing into the mythology, other labels coined in editorials were equally picturesque:- "ill conditioned odious louts" (Daily Express); "retarded vain young hot-blooded paycocks" (Daily Sketch); "grubby hordes of louts and sluts" (Daily Telegraph); "... with their flick knives, their innumerable boring emotional complexes,

their vicious thuggishness which is not cunning but a more bovine stupidity; their ape-like reactions to the world around them and their pseudo bravery born of the spurious comfort of being in a mob ..." (Evening Standard).

Not all attribution was so emotive: "... likely to be timid and shifty, backward, apathetic, ungregarious and notably inarticulate. Individually he will probably not seem particularly vicious. He is nearly always unattractive" (Lucille Iremonger in the Daily Telegraph). Intellectual opinion produced appropriately intellectual, but otherwise just as spurious attributes: "a new Outsider without Mr. Colin Wilson's brains or the beatniks blended flamboyance or stoicism ... rarely intelligent ... rarely individualistic ... inadequate ... underdeveloped." (Guardian).

In a series of 100 randomly chosen opinion statements (Post-Whitsun, 1964) the following descriptive nouns were used:- louts (5), thugs (5), savages (2), ruffians, maniacs, hooligans, hoodlums, yobbos, brats, human wolves, lemmings, rowdies, apes, misfits and morons. Descriptive traits included:- neurotic, sick or unstable (5), show-off or exhibitionist (4), violent (4), cowardly (4), aimless or rudderless (4), half-baked, immature (3), precocious (2), dirty, unwashed (2), slick, slickly dressed (2), foolish or slow-witted (2), cynical, inarticulate. The attributes of boredom and affluence were mentioned so often as to warrant discussion as separate themes.

Another type of spurious attribution is guilt by association; all teenagers going down to the resorts were attributed with the same guilt, and hence putative deviation, as those who actually caused damage or injury. Many opinion statements, for example, drew attention to the role of girls in egging on their boy friends; a letter in the Evening Standard (21/5/64) claimed that the major stimulus to violence came from "... the oversexed, squalid, wishful little concubines who hang about on these occasions, secure in the knowledge that retribution will not fall upon them." This sort of

attribution was supported by inventory interviews of the "Girls Who Follow the Wild Ones Into Battle"-type, although traits other than enjoyment of violence were more consistently attributed to girls; particularly promiscuity and drug taking. These themes became more prominent after August 1965, when there were press reports, based on remarks made by the commander of the Margate police division, that parents summoned to the police station were shocked to find "... that their daughters have been sleeping around with youths carrying the recognized weekend kit, purple hearts and contraceptives." (Daily Telegraph 31/8/65).¹²

The process of spurious attribution is not, of course, random. The audience has certainly already created stereotypes to draw upon and, as with racial stereotyping, there is a readily available composite image which the new picture can be grafted onto. The emergent composite draws heavily on folklore elements such as the Teddy Boys, the James Dean-Marlon Brando complex, West Side Story Gangs, etc. As with racial stereotypes, there is no necessary logical connection between the components; they are often self contradictory.¹³ Thus Jews are intrusive, but also exclusive; Negroes are lazy and inert, but also aggressive and pushing; Mods are dirty and scruffy, but also slickly dressed; they are aggressive and inflated with their own strength and importance, but they are also cowardly. An image rationalizes a particular explanation or course of action; if an opposite image is perceived as being more appropriate to this end, then it is easily invoked. Such images are even mobile enough to be held simultaneously, as in a Daily Mail headline: "The're Pin Neat, Lively and Clean, But A Rat Pack".

Affluent Youth - The £75 Cheque: Attitudes and opinions are often bolstered up by legends and myths. The uncivilized nature of immigrants is illustrated by the story of empty tins of cat meat found in dustbins of Indian restaurants. Teenage sexual promiscuity is illustrated by the story of schools

12. Not for the first time, only the Telegraph and the Daily Sketch among the national papers used this sort of story.

13. G.W. Allport, The Nature of Prejudice, (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1958), pp. 190 - 193.

where girls who have lost their virginity wear a badge.

Perhaps the most recurrent of the Mods and Rockers stories was the one previously quoted of the boy who said he would sign a cheque for a £75 fine. Although it took some time to circulate, this story was still being quoted as long as two years after the "event". The affluence theme is one of the most powerful and persuasive components in the Mods and Rockers image, based as it is on the more general stereotype of teenage affluence and serving itself as a rationalization for the widely held belief that "fines won't hurt them". Even if the mythical elements in the £75 cheque story and its variants were exposed, this attitude theme would be difficult to change. It should be noted, though, that here - as elsewhere - the mass media images were much sharper than those held by the public. In the Brighton sample, 30% thought that the Mods and Rockers were working class and from Secondary Moderns, 15% were unsure and 55% thought they were affluent and from all social classes.

Divide and Rule: Generals, captains of sports teams and gang leaders are all aware of the mechanism whereby attack on one's own side is deflected by exploiting grievances or jealousies among the enemy. Similarly, the adult community, faced with an apparent attack on its most sacred institution (property) and the most sacred guardians of this institution (the police) reacts, if not always consciously, by overemphasizing differences among the enemy. The thought that violence might be directed towards oneself and, worse still, might be attributable to defects in one's own society, was neutralized by overemphasising the gang rivalry between the Mods and Rockers. This tendency may again be traced back to reports of "the warring gangs clash again" type and is attributable less to conscious and malicious policy than to the fact that the "warring gang" image is the easiest way for the ignorant observer to explain such a senseless and ambiguous crowd situation:

... what in fact may be a confused situation involving miscellaneous youths with marginal membership and varied motives is too often defined by observers as a case of two highly mechanized and organized gang groups battling each other over territory. They project organization onto the gang and membership status onto a fellow curiosity seeker.¹⁴

This effect was compounded by the later commercial exploitation of the Mods and Rockers division. The apotheosis of the Divide and Rule theme was the suggestion that the problem could be solved by letting the two groups fight it out in a park or sports field.

Hot Blooded Youth or Lunatic Fringe: The themes discussed so far have not been threatened by counter themes, but in answering the question: "how representative are the Mods and Rockers of young people in Britain as a whole?", we find two apparently contradictory opinions.

On the one hand, there is the recurrent ascription to the whole adolescent age group of a number of stereotypical traits, making up what Friedenberg calls the status of a "hot blooded minority": adults see adolescence delinquency and aggressive sexuality as functionally equivalent.¹⁵ In other words, the entire age group and particularly the teenage culture, is endowed with spurious deviation. Partly because the teenage culture is nowhere near as pervasive in Britain, as it is in America, this type of identification is not as strong; most adults can distinguish between delinquents and the rest. Incidents such as the Mods and Rockers happenings, however, tend to have the effect of blurring these distinctions and lead to reflections on the state of youth problem. On the basis of the "It's Not Only This" theme, disturbing images are conjured up: all young people are going to the dogs, there is an adolescent malaise, this is just the top of the iceberg. Educationalists talked about "letting our teenagers down" and invariably the "Boredom" and "Affluence" themes referred to the whole age group. Articles were headed "Facing The Facts About Youth", "What's

14. Yablonsky, op.cit., p. 210.

15. Friedenberg, (1963), op.cit., p. 151. Friedenberg suggests other interesting parallels between racial stereotyping and the assignment to the adolescent of minority group status.

Wrong With Young People Today" or (as in foreign papers) "British Youth in Revolt". Numerical estimates are difficult to make, but somewhere near a half of the opinion statements expressed this theme. As usual, the popular press provided an archetypal statement:

For years now we've been leaning over backwards to accommodate the teenagers. Accepting meekly on the radio and television it is THEIR music which monopolizes the air. That in our shops it is THEIR fads which will dictate our dress styles... We have watched them patiently through the wilder excesses of their ban the bomb marches. Smiled indulgently as they've wrecked our cinemas during their rock and roll films ... But when they start dragging elderly women around the streets ... etc. (Glasgow Sunday Mail 24/5/64).

To counteract this theme, however, we find in the great majority of opinion statements what might be called the "Lunatic Fringe" theme. The Mods and Rockers are perceived as an entirely unrepresentative minority of young people:- most young people are decent and conforming, and the Mods and Rockers were giving them a bad name. The Lunatic Fringe theme occurs in most editorials and public utterances of M.P's, youth leaders and other self-styled experts who pontificated after the events. It pervaded the debate on the Second Reading of the Malicious Damage Bill:-

The Bill has been provoked by the irresponsible behaviour of a small section of young people, and I emphasize again that it is an extremely small section.

- Mr. Charles Morrison¹⁶

... one cannot really judge the moral standard of our youth by the behaviour of those eccentrics who produced the hooliganism at the seaside resorts which resulted in the introduction of the Bill.

- Mr. Eric Fletcher¹⁷

In the strong form of this theme, the "rest" are seen as not only conforming and decent, but positively saintly. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Maudling) thought the Mods and Rockers untypical of "this serious, intelligent and excellent generation". According to one paper:-

16. Hansard (House of Commons) June 23rd, 1964, Col. 252.

17. Ibid., Col. 294 - 295.

There are two kinds of youth in Britain today. There are those who are winning the admiration of the world by their courageous and disciplined service in arduous mountain, jungle or desert territory - in Cyprus, on the Yemen border, in Borneo. And there are the Mods and Rockers, with their flick knives ... etc. (Evening Standard 18/6/64).

In the 110 opinion statements from public figures, there were 40 explicit references to this theme.

At first glance, the "Hot Blooded Youth" and "Lunatic Fringe" themes would appear to be incompatible; one can either say that the whole younger generation is going from bad to worse and that the Mods and Rockers merely exemplify this trend, or that the younger generation are as good or better than any other and that the Mods and Rockers are the exceptions to the rule. It should be comparatively simple, then, to compute which view is more widely held. In fact, this is not so. As in the process of stereotyping, and as is clear from cognitive dissonance theory, attitudinal logic is not necessarily "logical". A logical rationalization for the two themes appearing simultaneously - as they often did - might run like this: "I know in the pure statistical sense that the number involved in this sort of thing must be a minute proportion of the whole age group, yet so many things that young people get up to today disturb me ("It's Not Only This") and who knows what this sort of thing will lead to ("It's Not So Much What Happened")? So I can't help thinking that this is evidence of a much deeper malaise affecting youth in general."

In practice such an argument is hardly necessary, because in the same way as the first theme is part of the more general short circuit function of stereotyping, the Lunatic Fringe theme also has an important function: to reassure the adult community that all is well, they can rest secure in the knowledge that not the whole generation is against them. When the theme was repeated in the courts, as it often was, in the form of statements by police, counsel, and magistrates about how well-behaved the majority of young people had been in contrast to the offenders - one can see its other function in ensuring that the denounced person is made to look fully

deserving of his punishment by contrast to the ideal counterconception. This is one of Garfinkel's conditions for a successful status degradation ceremony:

The witnesses must appreciate the characteristics of the typed person and event by referring the type to a dialectical counterpart. Ideally, the witnesses should not be able to contemplate the features of the denounced person without reference to the counterconception, as the profanity of an occurrence or a desire or a character trait, for example, is clarified by the references it bears to its opposite, the sacred.¹⁸

Causation

A Sign of the Times: From the "It's Not Only This" orientation, we would expect that the behaviour was seen not as the sickness itself, but as a symptom of something much deeper. Although the image of the actor is predominantly a free-will rather than a deterministic one, the behaviour is seen as related to a contemporary social malaise. The predominant explanation is sociological rather than psychological; the opposite of the tendency found in the Northview Survey. This seems to reflect an impatience with psychological explanations which are equated with a "soft" line; even the "bad" or broken home explanation was hardly ever used.¹⁹ Another consequence of seeing the behaviour as an inevitable result of the way society is going, is that situational factors are played down as causes.

The Mods and Rockers were seen, then, as "holding up a mirror to the kind of society we are" (Scotsman 8/6/64). The aspects of the social malaise most commonly mentioned were: the decline in religious beliefs, the absence of a sense of purpose, the influence of the do-gooders approach and the coddling of the welfare state. These factors are all part of a general swing; in fact, the "swing of the pendulum" was the most frequently used metaphor: there was a reaction to the strict discipline of the Victorians,

18. Garfinkel, op.cit., pp. 422 - 423.

19. In the only published research on the Mods and Rockers, Barker and Little (op.cit., p. 9) write, "We must shoot down the broken home cliché as well." This is an example of the tendency to make unjustified assumptions about public attitudes to delinquency. There is no need to shoot down a cliché which is seldom used.

but when society sees what has happened (i.e. the Mods and Rockers), the pendulum will swing back again.

Although the pendulum argument has been associated with a particular ideology, arguments from other positions share its basic "Sign of the Times" orientation: "There is something rotten in the state of Britain and the recent hooliganism at Clacton is only one manifestation of it." (Tribune, 10/4/64). Where the Daily Telegraph rails against "our modern welfare society", writers such as those in Tribune complain of "a society sick with repressed violence" and others put forward ideas which sound like status-frustration or opportunity structure theory.

It's Like A Disease: One of the most misleading and misconceived analogies in regard to explaining delinquency is the attempt to compare it to a disease.²⁰ People are somehow "infected" by delinquency, which "spreads" from person to person, so one has to "cure" the "disease". In regard to hooliganism, with its distinguishing feature of large public gatherings, this sort of analogy is used even more often and can be propped up with popular versions of mass hysteria theory. Many observers likened the Mods and Rockers to a spreading social disease. The Guardian talked about an "ailment" to be "cured" and in Dr. Simpson's memorable words, some were "... infected with this vicious virus".

One of the most vocal proponents of this theory was Mr. W.R. Rees-Davies, the M.P. for the constituency which includes Margate:-

It spreads like a disease. If we want to stop it, we have to be able to get rid of those children from the school, and quickly ... We must immediately get rid of the bad children so that they cannot infect the good.²¹

You must weed this type out ... put them in a special school so that the others won't be infected ... it's a contagious germ.²²

20. In criminology, the Gluecks are most responsible for perpetuating this analogy.

21. Hansard (House of Commons) April 27th, 1964, Col. 52 and Col. 59.

22. Interview, November 27th, 1964.

Cabalism: In this theme, the behaviour which was to a large degree unorganized, spontaneous and situational, is seen as having been well planned in advance as part of some sort of conspiratorial plot.

Sheatsley and Feldman attempt to explain the finding from the polls after the Kennedy assassination that the majority believed that Oswald did not act alone.²³ They call this belief "cabalism" and leaving aside the possibility that this belief might be true, (a possibility they do not admit) their interpretation of this tendency has interesting parallels. "Rather than indicating widespread paranoia and demonstrating the consequences of extremist propaganda (sic) ... in many cases cabalism provides the most easily understandable and acceptable explanation."²⁴ People who are reluctant to use the mental illness explanation can, by assuming conspiracy, remove some of the capriciousness from the situation. In another study, only 14% of a sample questioned about a Mad Bomber scare in New York City, failed to associate the bomber with some political group and about 75% pictured him as a Communist, Socialist, Anarchist or Fascist.²⁵ In a study of phenomena more closely parallel to the Mods and Rockers - riots and disturbances at recreational or sporting events - the same tendency to cabalism was noted:

Several reports of disturbances attributed careful preplanning to a small cadre of dedicated instigators, who allegedly circulated rumours before the event and selected targets on the scene. Actual proof of "planning", however, as opposed to mere repetition of common rumours, is difficult to obtain.²⁶

With the Mods and Rockers, the strong form of the cabalism theme consisted of assertions that the events were masterminded, perhaps by a super gang with headquarters in some cafe on the M.1. The weaker form of

23. P.B. Sheatsley and J.S. Feldman, "A National Survey of Public Reactions and Behaviour," in Greenberg and Parker, op.cit., p. 174.

24. Ibid.

25. C. Winick, "How People Perceived the Mad Bomber," Public Opinion Quarterly, 25 (Spring 1961), p. 33.

26. R. Shellow and D.V. Roemer, "The Riot That Didn't Happen," Social Problems, 14 (Fall 1966), p. 223.

the theme merely asserted the role of leaders; a tightly knit core of criminally motivated youths (to paraphrase a cabalistic explanation of another crisis, the seamen's strike in 1966), who led a gullible mob into a planned battle. The Daily Telegraph talked about "destructive riots which are carefully organized and planned in advance ... the police underestimated the degree of organized malice."

Such themes are attributable to the inventory interviews with self-styled gang leaders and also reports of secret meetings by "top level" policemen and Home Office officials to consider "strategy for the next attack". The "fight against crime" metaphor lends itself to the counter image of the fight against law and order.

Boredom: Boredom is the most frequently used single causal concept in regard to the Mods and Rockers. It evokes, however, two types of themes.

The first blames society, in particular the schools, youth clubs and churches, for having failed to provide young people with interests, opportunities, creative outlets or a sense of purpose. In a widely publicized sermon, the Bishop of Southwell asked young people to "forgive the older generation that has too often failed to engage your energies." Boredom is seen not only as a plausible cause, but it is related to defects in the social structure. The application of opportunity theory to leisure goals may be seen as a sociologically sophisticated version of this theme.²⁷

The other boredom theme points to the increased opportunities available to the present younger generation not even dreamt of by today's adults, and concludes that if anything like boredom does exist, it is a defect in the psychological make-up of young people themselves. They suffer, as the Margate Entertainment Manager put it, from "chronic restlessness". If they have to look for kicks outside what society has munificently

27. D. Downes, "Clacton and the Dead End," Observer (6/4/64), and "What to do about Mods and Rockers?" Family Doctor, August 1965, pp. 469 - 471.

provided for them, it is because of their own greed, hedonism and ungratefulness:

I will not myself accept the proposition that hooliganism is an indictment of society at large. It is purely an indictment of those who cannot think of anything better to do in the most beautiful and varied country in the world.²⁸

In this view, boredom is dismissed as a "fashionable excuse" or a "fancy theory": "... laziness, selfishness and lust are still the important causes."²⁹ There is in this theme a note of hurt and bewilderment, which echoes the eternal parental reproach: "after all we've done for you ...". The strong form of this theme actually asserts that the cause of the behaviour is that "we've given them too much". Boredom or "looking for kicks" was the most frequently used causal explanation by the Brighton sample - about 35% - and a further 23% thought that the main cause was simply "too much money".

Of the opinion statements that mentioned boredom, about 35% endorsed the "not enough opportunities" theme, the rest the "opportunities not taken" theme. Despite the ideological gap between these orientations, they tend to provide a common rationale for solutions of the "give them an outlet and a sense of purpose" variety, whether these take the form of "put them in the army" or "build a better youth service". The boredom theme also implies for some a "looking for kicks" image, which gives the behaviour a wanton and deliberate aura. This might lead to the rejection of positivistic-type explanations even among those predisposed to accept psychological or sociological determinism. They concede that while delinquency in general might be caused by broken homes, lack of opportunity and similar factors, the Mods and Rockers were "just out for kicks".

28. D. James, MP., in Brighton and Hove Herald (23/5/64).

29. L. Seymour, M.P., Hansard (House of Commons) April 4, 1964, Col. 42.

CHAPTER 15REACTION: THE RESCUE AND REMEDY PHASES

This chapter is concerned with "reaction" in the sense of what people did or thought should be done about the Mods and Rockers. Although retaining the disaster terminology to cover the whole phase, I will use three further categories to describe the reactions to deviance:-

(i) Sensitization; (ii) The Societal Control Culture and (iii) Exploitation.

Sensitization to Deviance

Any item of news thrust into the individual's consciousness has the effect of increasing the awareness of items of a similar nature which he might otherwise have ignored. Psychological cues are provided to register and act upon previously neutral stimuli. This is the phenomenon of sensitization which, in the case of deviance, entails the reinterpretation of neutral or ambiguous stimuli as potentially or actually deviant.

Sensitization is a form of the simplest type of generalized belief system, hysteria, which "... transforms an ambiguous situation into an absolutely potent generalized threat."¹ Ambiguity, which gives rise to anxiety, is eliminated by structuring the situation to make it more predictable. On this basis, anxiety, say, about an unidentified flying object, can be reduced by defining the object as a flying saucer and then assimilating similar phenomena into this cognitive framework. Sensitization to deviance rests on a more complicated belief system because it involves not only redefinition but the assignment of blame and the direction of control measures towards a specific agent thought to be responsible. This corresponds to Smelser's "hostile belief".² So, in the case of the zoot suit riots, the weeks immediately preceding the riots saw an increase in

1. Smelser, op.cit., p. 83.

2. Ibid., pp. 101 - 109.

suspicion and negative symbolization and the emergence of hysterical and hostile beliefs about the Mexicans' responsibility for various community troubles.³

The first sign of sensitization following initial reports was that more notice was taken of any type of incipient deviance that looked like hooliganism and, moreover, that this deviance was classified as part of the Mods and Rockers phenomenon. In the days following the first two or three major happenings, newspapers carried reports of similar incidents from widely scattered localities. In the week after Margate (Whitsun 1964) for example, incidents were reported from several London suburbs and Nottingham, Bromley, Windsor, Coventry, Waltham Cross, Kingston, Blackpool and Bristol. This build-up of reports has its exact parallel in the initial stages of mass hysteria. In Johnson's classic study, the first signs of hysteria were calls reporting gassing symptoms or prowlers, following an initial report, headed "Anaesthetic Prowler on the Loose", of a woman supposedly having been gassed.⁴ The police found nothing, but within a few days dozens of reports came in, elaborate precautionary measures were taken and there was intense police and public activity to apprehend the Phantom Anaesthetist. An identical build-up is described by Medalia and Larsen following initial reports of car windshields being damaged;⁵ and by Jacobs in Taipei after reports of children being slashed by razor blades or similar weapons.⁶ There is little doubt that many of the hooliganism incidents after the inventory were "real", having been stimulated by the type of publicity which made many young people easily provokable and on the lookout for trouble. What is being suggested, though, is that whether or not the incidents were genuine, public sensitization determined the way they were reported and, indeed, whether they were

3. Turner and Surace, op.cit., p. 20.

4. D. Johnson, "The Phantom Anaesthetist of Mattoon," J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol., 40 (1945), pp. 175 - 186.

5. Medalia and Larsen, op.cit.

6. Jacobs, op.cit.

reported at all. The following is one such incident:-

On the 20th May, 1964, two days after Margate, 23 youths appeared in West Ham magistrates court, charged with using insulting behaviour. The boys had apparently swarmed over the pavement pushing each other and shouting after they had come out of a dance hall in Forest Gate the night before. The police tried to disperse them after there had been a lot of horseplay. The Evening News (20/5/64) under the heading "23 Mod Crowd Youths Fined" noted that the boys wore Mod clothes and reported the chairman of the bench saying, "You must all know that this sort of thing cannot be allowed to go on."

The first point to make about the report is that without sensitization, this sort of incident might not have been interpreted as being part of the Mods and Rockers phenomenon; it might have been written off by spectators and policemen alike as "horseplay" or another "dance hall brawl". A manifestation of public sensitization was the number of false alarms received by the police. In Stamford Hill, for example, the police stated after answering a false alarm, "People are a bit jumpy after the trouble on the coast". The low threshold at which the public became "jumpy" enough to call the police was paralleled by increased police vigilance, partly in response to public pressure. In Skegness, for example, following relatively minor incidents on a Saturday night, during which the police arrested 4 youths and intervened in a dance hall fight, reinforcements were sent for on the Sunday. According to the local paper, it was clear that this action was taken because of threats of "Clacton and Margate trouble"; the reinforcements "... enabled the police to put on the biggest show of strength that Skegness has known. And it did the trick." (Lincolnshire Standard 22/5/64.) A similar event occurred at Woking, where fears of a Mods and Rockers battle at the fair spread around the town. Acting on these rumours and a request from the fair's proprietor, the police patrolled the fair and kept in radio contact with reserves. There was no trouble at all. (Woking News and Mail 29/5/64.) Later in the month, on police advice, a big road scooter rally in Battersea Park was called off to avoid Mods and Rockers hooliganism.

It is apparent from many reports that the police and court's actions were consciously affected by the original incidents. This is less clear in the West Ham magistrate's remarks but in a number of other cases, the reference was more explicit. In Blackburn, for example, the Police Superintendent, prosecuting two youths charged with using threatening behaviour (they had been in a crowd of 20 flicking rubber bands at passers by), said in Court:

This case is an example of the type of behaviour that has been experienced in many parts of the country during the last few weeks and it has been slowly affecting Blackburn. We shall not tolerate this behaviour. The police will do everything within their power to stamp it out. (Lancashire Evening Telegraph 29/5/64)

As might be expected, such sensitization was even greater in the resorts themselves. The week after Whitsun 1964, the police in Brighton stopped a coach load of young people and ordered it out of town. Magistrates, especially in Brighton and Hastings, made it clear in their pronouncements from the bench that they would regard hooliganism and related offences as manifestations of the Mods and Rockers phenomenon. As such, this type of deviance would be reacted to in terms of the inventory images and subsequent opinion themes.

The other significant point arising from the Forest Gate incident, is the type of headline given to the report. Invariably, other incidents received similar treatment: "Mods and Rockers Strike Again", "More Teenage Violence", etc. It is inconceivable that this type of symbolization could have been used without the inventory build up and it is also unlikely that these reports would have been given the prominence that they were given. Throughout this period, the press, itself sensitized to signs of deviance, was the main mechanism for transmitting the sensitization to others.

It did this, not only by reporting and reinterpreting hooliganism type events, but, as in the inventory period, creating stories out of non-events. So, for example, after Whitsun 1964, the East Essex Gazette (Clacton) carried the headline "Thugs Stay Away from N.E. Essex". A number of other

"all quiet here" stories were printed. Another type of non-story was the reporting of an incident together with denials by local figures, such as Chief Constables, that the incident had anything to do with the Mods and Rockers. These negative stories have the same cue effect towards the deviant symbols as the positive stories. Sensitization occurs because symbols are given a new meaning; disaster studies show how in sudden disasters, or where the precipitating agent is unknown, warning cues are assimilated within the normal frame of reference - the roaring sound of a tornado is interpreted as a train, or the sound of water in a sudden flood is interpreted as a running faucet.⁷ The effect of the media build-up is to make people aware of signs such as clothing cues, which supplied the tags for ready identification.

Press reports during this period not only used but elaborated on the previous symbolization. Incidents in the days immediately following a Bank Holiday, for example, were invariably reported as "revenge battles". These usually had nothing to do with the original incidents and were merely "ordinary" hooliganism being re-interpreted. Another type of assimilation of news into the mainstream of the belief system was shown by a Daily Telegraph report (18/5/64) about the drowning of three boys from an overturned punt at Reading. The headline read "Mods and Rockers See Three Drown". In fact, although Mods and Rockers were present on the river bank, they were just as peaceful as the hundreds of other holiday-makers with them. The owner of the punt specifically stated (in an interview in the Daily Mail) - that the boys who hired the punt were "not the Mod and Rocker type".

Right through the sequence then, each incident is taken as confirming the general theme. Turner and Surace describe the identical process:

7. J.P. Spiegel, "The English Flood of 1953," Human Organisation, 16 (Summer 1957), pp. 3 - 5.

Once established, the zooter theme assured its own magnification. What previously would have been reported as an adolescent gang attack would now be presented as a zoot-suit attack. Weapons found on apprehended youths were now interpreted as the building up of arms collections in preparation for zoot-suit violence.⁸

In summary the effects of sensitization appear to have been:-

(i) greater notice being taken of signs of hooliganism, (ii) re-classification of such events as Mods and Rockers activities, (iii) crystallization of the symbolization process started in the inventory. The crucial issue is not whether the incidents were "real" or not, but the process of their re-interpretation. The line between this process and pure delusion is not easy to draw. Although both the Phantom Anaesthetist and the Phantom Slasher were demonstrably psychogenic phenomena, they started off with real events, which had to be reacted to in a particular way. "Mrs. A." who started off the Mattoon incident actually had a mild hysterical attack, but the crucial point was her dramatic interpretation of her symptoms which aroused press interest. As the news spread, similar symptoms were reported, more exciting stories were written and the "affair snowballed".⁹ Jacobs reports the identical effect: reports of slashings were "both a product of and helped to intensify the hypersuggestibility and hysteria so characteristic of the affair."¹⁰

This snowballing effect is identical to deviance amplification. One does not want to make too much of this analogy, because the Mods and Rockers after all were not imaginary phantoms, but the parallels in the diffusion of the belief systems are remarkably close. For one thing, in both phenomena, the dominant vehicles for diffusion are the mass media. Even the sequence of reporting described in mass delusion studies had exact parallels in the Mods and Rockers reports: for example, when the actual

8. Turner and Surace, op.cit., p. 20.

9. Johnson, op.cit., p. 186.

10. Jacobs, op.cit., p. 326.

incidents tailed off, the papers held the excitement alive with other types of reports (non-stories, opinion statements, descriptions of local reaction). Features on the resorts described the feeling of relief that it was all over, mingled with apprehension that more might come: "Giving A Collective Sigh of Relief", "Margate is Quiet, But Licking its Battle Scars", "A Town in Fear - What Can Be Done to Stop More Fights?" Compare these quotes with a Mattoon paper during the equivalent phase: "Mattoon's 'mad anaesthetist' apparently took a respite ... and while many terror stricken people were somewhat relieved, they were inclined to hold their breath and wondered when and where he might strike next".¹¹ Several attacks were reported on the night of that item.

There is a further type of sensitization worth noting:- what may be termed the "widening of the net" effect. A characteristic of hysteria is that the wrong stimulus is chosen as the object of attack or fear. This process may be observed during the protracted manhunt following sensational crimes or jailbreaks: in the wave of hysteria all sorts of innocent people or actions are labelled as suspicious. This is the hypersuggestibility by which hooliganism was re-classified, and when one combines it with the type of free association in the "It's Not Only This" theme, the result is that a number of other non-hooligan deviants are drawn into the same net of sensitization. In the phase after the inventory, other targets became more visible, and, hence, candidates for social control.

One such target was the practice of sleeping rough on the beaches which is usually tacitly condoned in seaside resorts. During the summer holidays after the hooliganism publicity, however, towns like Brighton and Margate began to take a stricter line towards this activity. In Brighton, August 1965, the police rounded up fifteen year old girls sleeping on the beach and took them to the police station. No charges were

11. Johnson, op.cit., p. 180.

made but parents were contacted to come and fetch their daughters. This was "... part of the Town's new policy to make parents responsible for their daughters' safety". (Evening Standard 30/8/65.) The Daily Mirror (31/8/65) referred approvingly to the "morals patrols". Other groups caught in the net were more puzzling; for example, all teenage weekend campers were banned from Sheepcote Valley Camping Ground outside Brighton. This type of teenager perhaps shares nothing more with the Mods and Rockers than the status of being adolescent.¹²

The most important targets affected by sensitization, though, were the beatniks. Immediately after Clacton, there were rumours in Hastings about a plan to spray the caves near the town with a strong smelling chemical to make them uninhabitable by beatniks. In November 1965, the Bournemouth Private Hotel and Guest Houses Association campaigned to ban beatniks from the town and a similar resolution was passed by the Great Yarmouth Hotel and Guest House Association. This resolution made it clear that no differentiation was to be made between the Mods and Rockers and the Beatniks, they all had the same symbols: "... these people ... are easily identified by their unkempt locks, their bedrolls, their scooters and motor cycles, etc."

To talk about this widening of the net, does not imply that before the Mods and Rockers these resorts welcomed beatniks with open arms. In many cases, though, there did exist an uneasy tolerance, particularly by the police who are well aware of the distinction between the beatnik and the potential hooligan. This was traditionally the situation in Brighton, where only a few weeks before Clacton, the Chief Constable was quoted as

12. One is reminded of Sutherland's example of the fear aroused during the manhunt for a violent sexual offender: "Timid old men were pulled off streetcars and taken to police stations ... and every grandfather was subject to suspicion". Sutherland, op.cit., p. 143.

saying about the beatniks, "They are no nuisance at all."¹³ Clacton and subsequent events decreased the local tolerance quotient and opened the door to the moral entrepreneurs. The Brighton and Hove Gazette (5/5/64) warned about the danger of letting the beatniks sleep on the beach and cause damage during the summer. It quoted protests from traders and advocated having powerful floodlights turned on the beaches. At various times during 1964, local councillors suggested hosing the beatniks off the beach or waking them up with searchlights on their faces at 5 a.m. A local M.P. called for a total ban on beach sleeping. On the whole, the police resisted such pressures, holding the view that the beatniks were neither harming anyone nor breaking any particularly important rules. One result of sensitization, though, was, in some instances, to narrow the gap between the moral crusaders and the rule enforcers. And in areas far away from the scenes of the Mods and Rockers events - for example, in Devon and Cornwall - the phenomenon was used to justify new control measures against beatniks, beach sleepers and others.

The Societal Control Culture

Sensitization is merely one mechanism involved in the amplification of deviance. Although the official agents of social control were just as susceptible as the public to this mechanism and, in fact, by their own actions also magnified the deviance, we have to consider their role in the reaction stage quite separately. Their's is not the pristine, relatively unorganized response to on-the-spot deviance but the organized reaction in terms of institutionalized norms and procedures. The social control agents correspond to the organizations responsible in the rescue and remedy phases for dealing with the consequences of disaster; the police, medical services, welfare organizations, etc. The sum total of the organized reaction to deviance constitutes Lemert's "societal control culture".

13. See "Beachniks - Brighton is Tolerant, But With Reservations," Municipal Journal (14/2/64).

The aim of this section is to describe some common elements of the control culture that developed around the Mods and Rockers. In response to what pressures did the control culture operate? How was it affected by previous stages in the sequence? How did the established agents of control adapt to the deviance and what new forms of control were developed? These questions will be answered by looking at three common elements in the control culture: diffusion, escalation and innovation. The reaction of three main types of social control will then be described in detail: (i) the police; (ii) the courts; and (iii) informal action at the local level, particularly in the form of "action groups" directed at forming an exclusive control culture.

1. Common Elements

(i) Diffusion: The first most visible feature of the control culture is its gradual diffusion from the area where the deviant behaviour makes its immediate impact. This feature is analogous to the way in which the social system copes with disaster in the rescue and remedy phases: the emergency rescue system on the spot is eventually supplemented or replaced by agents from the suprasystem (e.g. national or even international organizations). Similarly in cases of mass hysteria studied, the scare was felt far beyond its immediate victims. In Taipei, the control agencies involved spread from local to provincial to national police forces.¹⁴ In Seattle, the Mayor declared the damage no longer a police matter and made an emergency appeal to the Governor and the President for help.¹⁵

In response to the Mods and Rockers, involvement diffused, (not, of course, in a straight line) from the local police force, to collaboration with neighbouring forces, to regional collaboration, to co-ordinating activity at Scotland Yard and the Home Office and to the involvement of parliament and the legislature. In this process, a number of other agents

14. Jacobs, op.cit.

15. Medalia and Larsen, op.cit., p. 180.

were drawn into the control system; for example, R.A.F. planes were used for airlifts of police and A.A. and R.A.C. patrols helped by warning the police of any build up of motor bike or scooter traffic on roads leading to the resorts.

(ii) Escalation: It was not only the number of control agents that was extended, but the whole scope and intensity of the control culture. A crucial determinant of this escalation process is the generalized belief system that emerges from the inventory. It is this belief system which serves to legitimate the action of control agents and which is eventually assimilated into the existent mythology of the control culture. The exaggeration and negative symbolization provided the immediate legitimation: if one is dealing with a group which is vicious, destructive, causing the community a financial loss and repudiating its cherished values, then one is justified in responding punitively. The identical process occurred in the zoot suit riots: the new symbols provided the sanction to regard Mexicans as no longer associated with the favourable theme, but "... evoked only the picture of persons outside the normative order, devoid of morals themselves and consequently not entitled to fair play and due process."¹⁶ If one conceives of the situation as catastrophic and moreover thinks it will happen again, get worse and probably spread (Disaster - Prophecy of Doom - It's Not so Much What Happened - It's like A Disease) then one is justified in taking elaborate and excessive precautionary measures. This sort of relationship between belief systems and social control is illustrated nicely in social policies toward drug addiction:

If the addiction problem can be inflated to the proportion of a national menace, then, in terms of the doctrine of clear and present danger, one is justified in calling for ever-harsher punishments, the invocation of more restrictive measures and more restrictions on the rights of individuals.¹⁷

16. Turner and Surace, op.cit., p. 20.

17. I. Chein et al, Narcotics, Delinquency and Social Policy, (London: Tavistock, 1964), p. 8.

It was in terms of the "doctrine of clear and present danger" that the control agents operated and it was the logic of their own definition of the situation which forced them to escalate the measures they took and proposed to take to deal with the problem. This orientation is reflected in the opinion statements where the phrases that most frequently appear are "tighten up", "take strong measures", "don't let it get out of hand", etc. The dominant themes were retribution and deterrence, together with protection of society which was given a special legitimation by invoking the image of those who had to be protected: innocent holidaymakers, old people, mums and dads, little children building sandcastles and honest tradesmen.

(iii) Innovation: The final common feature of the control culture was that it was not only extended in degree, but also in kind, by the actual or suggested introduction of new methods of control. This reaction corresponds to "innovation" in Cohen's adaptation of Merton's typology to conceptualize responses to deviance.¹⁸ To Cohen, innovation as a response mechanism denotes the disregard of institutionalized limits on the choice of means, e.g. McCarthyism or use of third degree. Our definition includes this aspect, but also the type of innovation that is open to control agents and not to deviants - to change or propose to change the institutionalized limits themselves through legislative means.

The reaction of the control culture was innovatory in the sense that the present range of control measures was found wanting; both in its implementation and substance. Any changes or proposed changes were again legitimated by invoking the belief system. If, for example, one is dealing with an affluent horde of scooter riders, then "fines won't touch them" and one has to propose innovatory measures such as confiscation of scooters or forced labour camps. The same beliefs which justify escalation, may also justify the innovation (in Cohen's sense) which is involved in the

18. Cohen, (1959), op.cit., p. 465.

suspension of certain principles governing individual liberty, justice and fair play. Those police and court practices - discussed later, which involved such suspension or were merely novel, were at first regarded with suspicion, or dismissed as being over-reactions. They eventually became accepted and routinized: various Council vans converted into squad cars became no longer a novelty in Brighton.

The Margate Opinion statements were analysed to determine the extent to which the mass media reflected the innovatory response. The results are presented in Table 45. Although the non-specific solutions are more difficult to classify, a fairly large proportion of them are innovatory in the sense that they call for a tightening up of existing measures rather than just an efficient implementation of them. As for the specific measures, nearly all were innovatory to some extent, but more particularly the largest single category: the demand to give more powers to the police.

TABLE 45

Opinion Statements on Solutions to the
Mods and Rockers Problem

Number of Statements Discussing Solutions	300
Number not proposing specific solutions	160
Number proposing specific solutions	140
<u>Non-Specific Solutions:</u>	
% "Hard" (stiff sentences, clamp down hard, more discipline, tighten up, etc.)	81%
% "Soft" (strengthen home life, build up citizenship, creative outlets, etc.)	19%
<u>Specific Solutions</u> (Single most important solution proposed in each statement):	
More powers to police (road blocks, tear gas, dogs, commando equipment, fire-hoses, etc.)	28%
Corporal Punishment	14%
Longer Prison or Detention Centre Sentences	9%
Heavy Fines or Compensation	9%
National Service	9%
Non-military National Service (building roads, digging the channel tunnel, etc.)	8%
Disqualify from driving or Confiscate bikes	7%
Cut out all publicity	7%
Attendance Centre type schemes (especially work in public, like mending deck-chairs)	3%
Others	6%

The true innovators either listed several solutions in different permutations or else spelt out their plans in intricate detail. They tended to be innovators in Cohen's sense. The following are four such solutions, representative of the various degrees of sophistication in this reaction:-

1. Ban the wearing of Mod clothes, issue a "get your hair cut" order (a law to be passed to keep men's hair reasonably short), let it be known that mob violence will be dealt with more strongly - especially by the use of hose pipes, birching and hard work on the land.¹⁹
2. Use fire hoses, repayment of damage and probation orders with special conditions forbidding "yobs" to ride motor vehicles or travel more than six miles from home, forbid "each convicted yob" to associate with others convicted, forbid them to drink, to leave home on the next Bank Holiday or to stay out after 9 p.m.²⁰
3. Further power to be given to the police by using road blocks to intercept troublemakers; an extension of the Vagrancy Act to deal with beach sleepers; the greater use of remand in custody as a punishment (Seven days inside and the hated compulsory bath, can have a salutary effect on the young hooligan with no previous convictions"); police dogs; detention centres; attendance centres; the publishing of names and addresses of juveniles found guilty of the Margate type of offence.²¹
4. Because of the ambiguities involved in defining "unlawful assembly intended to provoke a breach of the peace", the common law should be changed to prevent hooliganism. Power should be given to the police, whenever they find it necessary "to stop a gang travelling on road vehicles on the basis that it constitutes unlawful assembly, to confiscate the vehicles without compensation, leaving the members of the gang the burden of proving that they were an innocuous cycling club".²²

Tables 46 and 47 show the extent to which innovatory responses occurred in groups drawn from the public - the Brighton and Northview samples respectively.

Support for innovatory proposals was particularly clear in the Northview sample. The principle of restitution was the dominant one; not simply

19. D. Pulson, Liverpool Daily Post (23/5/64).

20. J. Lucas, Daily Herald (19/5/64).

21. J.B. White, J.P. in Daily Telegraph (22/5/64). It is implied rather than explicitly stated that remand in custody before conviction is intended.

22. Comment in Justice of the Peace and Local Government Review LXXVII (June 13, 1964), pp. 401 - 402.

TABLE 46Brighton Sample: Single Most Favoured
Solution to the Mods and Rockers Problem

<u>Solution</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
On-the-spot measures such as fire hoses; "instant justice"; more powers to police	15	23.1
Detention Centres	14	21.5
Fines, compensation	13	20.0
Army, National Service	9	13.8
Corporal Punishment	8	12.3
Others, Don't Know	<u>6</u>	<u>9.2</u>
	65	99.8

TABLE 47Northview Sample: Judgments on Appropriate
Punishments for the Mods and Rockers

<u>Punishment</u>	<u>Average* Weight</u>	<u>Rank Order</u>
Full Repayment	1.45	1
Work Scheme	2.00	2
Heavy Fines	2.33	3
Detention Centre	2.34	4
Confiscate Licences	2.67	5
Confiscate Vehicles	2.84	6
Punish Parents	2.97	7
Corporal Punishment	3.20	8
Borstal	3.25	9
Probation	3.40	10
Army	3.50	11

*Scale:

Very much in favour	1
In Favour	2
Undecided	3
Against	4
Strongly Against	5

through financial reparation but by supporting the "work scheme" idea: this involved visible restitution (repairing broken windows or sweeping the streets) organized along para-military lines. Other work that was suggested included cleaning hospitals, observing in casualty wards and taking spastic

children on holidays. One respondent (a headmaster) suggested that the offenders should be taken on naval exercises to see how tough they are, "if they have the courage, it will make them into men." The confiscation of bikes or licences was also a consciously applied innovatory principle, and one magistrate went further in suggesting that the offenders should be given hammers to smash up their own bikes: "a childish action should be met with a similar punishment."

2. The Control Agents

The Police: As society's officially designated agents of civil power, the police play a crucial role in the labelling process, both in the immediate reaction to deviance, as well as the ongoing reaction in later stages of the sequence. Their immediate definitions of the situation will be described when analysing the impact phase.

At this stage, police action may be conceived as part of control and sensitization processes. The police had to react to any perceived threat to law and order in terms of their perception of their allocated social role. Sensitization may have operated indirectly in that the police were spurred to action not so much out of conviction, but to satisfy the public that they were doing their job properly. This normal effect was heightened by the peculiar pressures to protect the town's image that are exerted on holiday resort police forces by civic and commercial interests. This factor is particularly operative in the holiday season. To these pressures must be added the on-the-spot factors such as strain caused by undermanning, lack of sleep and inadequate specialized training in crowd control. These situational pressures and difficulties, combined with an assimilation of the inventory images to create the type of cultural and structural pre-conditions which must be spelt out before studying the initial social reaction.

The elements of diffusion, escalation and innovation can all be distinguished in the police reaction. In the first place, the preparations

for each Bank Holiday Weekend became increasingly complex and sophisticated. At the initial incident in Clacton, the police were almost totally unprepared, but in the course of the amplification process, an organization and set of practices were built up specifically geared to Bank Holiday hooliganism. Police action in this respect was often highly ritualistic. Even when it was clear that the behaviour was dying out, the operations were mounted on the same scale. The simplest response of the police to their definition of the situation and the pressures placed on them, was to implement the "show of force" principle and to increase the sheer numbers of officers on duty. It became standard practice to cancel police leave for the Bank Holiday weekend. In Brighton, Whitsun 1964, the total amount paid out in police overtime was £2,000 - four times the cost of the Clacton damage before the holiday began. At the next weekend, August 1964, bringing reinforcements by air from the Metropolitan area and feeding them cost Hastings £3,000. Table 48 shows the overtime cost to Brighton over the next four Bank Holidays.

TABLE 48

Police Overtime Costs, Brighton, Easter 1965 - Easter 1966.

<u>Bank Holiday</u>	<u>Cost of Police Overtime</u>
Easter 1965	£5,600
Whitsun 1965	£3,700
August 1965	£2,700
Easter 1966	<u>£5,000</u>
Total	£17,000
minus £1,000 normally spent on overtime each Bank Holiday	<u>£4,000</u>
Extra Cost	£13,000

Information supplied by Chairman of the Watch Committee at meeting of Brighton Council, 28th April, 1966.

Not only was leave cancelled for the local force, but reinforcements were used from neighbouring forces and the network of co-operation was extended to Scotland Yard. In August 1964, by calling on the Metropolitan Police "Sky Squad" and neighbouring forces, the Chief Constable of Hastings trebled the existing police strength on the spot. Before Whitsun 1965,

plans were made at the Home Office to use the R.A.F. to fly reinforcements. Increase in numbers was accompanied by an increase in the range of equipment used. At a fairly early stage wider use was made of truncheons by some forces and others introduced police dogs and police horses. Brighton pioneered the conversion of vehicles borrowed from civil defence, water, public health and education departments, into police vans with two-way radios. Other forces, such as Clacton, favoured walkie-talkie communication.

Although each local force had their own specific variations, most used similar control tactics, at first on an ad hoc basis and later as considered policy. These tactics included:-

1. Keeping "suspicious" looking youths, who might cause trouble, pinned into one spot, usually on the beach.
2. Keeping crowds on the pavements moving along in order to avoid any obstruction.
3. Keeping certain previously designated "trouble spots" free of likely looking Mods or Rockers.
4. Immediate arrest of actual troublemakers.
5. Harassment of potential troublemakers, e.g. by stopping scooter riders to produce their licences or confiscating studded belts as dangerous weapons.
6. Separating the Mods and Rockers, preferably by breaking them up into small groups.
7. Rounding up certain groups and giving them "free lifts" to the roads leading out of town or to the railway station.

Given the highly charged emotional atmosphere at the time and police antagonism towards the Mods and Rockers, these policies or their variants produced responses that could be classified as innovatory. Forced by their own definitions, the police adopted practices involving a suspension of principles, such as neutral enforcement of justice and respect for individual liberty. Such abuses of power included the unnecessary involvement of the public in the crowd control tactics. Holidaymakers, adults and youth alike, found themselves caught up in the overzealous application of these tactics - stopped if they were walking too fast, moved along if they were walking too slow, planted on to the beach when they wanted to go elsewhere, their protests not only ignored but putting them under threat of arrest.

Most harassment was reserved for the young people who could be identified through the process of symbolization. Clothing styles, hair styles and scooters were made grounds for regarding someone as a legitimate target for social control and in a crowd situation such symbols tended to blur. The practice of keeping certain previously designated trouble spots clear was certainly innovatory. A group congregating in such a spot, even if this was a bus shelter and they were sheltering from the rain, would risk arrest if they refused to move. The position is not analogous to, say, a certain spot being temporarily designated as a no-parking area; the assumption here is that the motorist would have somewhere else to park. The Brighton police apparently assumed that the only alternative would be to "get out of town". In certain cases, purely on the basis of symbolization, young people were, in fact, forced out of town - either by being given "free lifts", or turned away from the station.

Harassment was usually more subtle than straight expulsion. This particularly took the form of stopping scooters to examine the drivers licence or the machine's roadworthiness. Such practices can be interpreted as either the ascription of secondary status traits (anyone who drives around dressed like that must be driving illegally) and hence providing an excuse to pin a charge, or simply to make things so unpleasant and inconvenient for the scooter-boys that they would move away.

In Brighton, Easter 1966, some teams of uniformed police officers, kept up continuous patrols, stopping groups of teenagers, lining them up and searching them for drugs or weapons. Working on the widening-of-the-net principle, those sleeping in cars, under deckchairs and boats were woken, searched and ordered to move on. Some were taken to the police station and made to strip. The drug scare at that time provided the rationalization: "It is impossible to search them thoroughly without taking them to the police station and making them strip."²³ In fact, only one drug charge was

23. Police Spokesman quoted by Daily Sketch (12/4/66).

made. Between 5.30 and 6.00 a.m. on Whit Monday 1966, the Brighton police were observed using a particularly innovative technique - they would place "No Waiting" signs in front of cars at that time legally parked, wake the occupants up and point to the sign outside the car and tell them to move off. A prominent citizen of Brighton with whom I was observing this practice, humourously referred to it as "knocking up cars". When asked what the police did if the youths in the car objected, he replied, "Well, we can always knock them off for obstruction."

Much publicity was given to the technique, evolved by the Southend police. It was even quoted by a Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeal in addressing the Chicago Crime Commission on the need for the police to get broader powers of search and seizure:

You may have heard how the Constables of Southend, England, deal with the teenage hooligans known as "Mods" and "Rockers" when they visit that seaside resort. Chief Constable McConnach says, "Anything which reduces their egos is a good thing. I do not encourage any policeman to arrest them. The thing to do is to deal with them on the spot - we take away their belts. We have a wonderful collection of leather belts. They complain that they cannot keep their trousers up, but that is their problem entirely."²⁴

It is clear that besides the innovative component, these sort of techniques also involve the control agents in "the dramatization of evil". Deviants must not only be labelled, but be seen to be labelled; they must be involved in some sort of ceremony of public degradation. A common rationale behind many police techniques is that the youth should be "shown up" or "have their egos deflated". At the initial incident at Clacton, the police provided a striking example of this public dramatization. Following an incident in which 20 - 30 youths were refused service at a cafeteria, the police frogmarched two youths to the police station, with about 100 others following behind, jeering and shouting. At 7.30 on the last evening of the Whitsun 1964 weekend, the Brighton police rounded up all

24. J.E. Lumbard, "The Citizen's Role in Law Enforcement," Journ. Crim. Law, Criminol. and Pol. Sci., 56 (March 1965), p. 69.

the Mods and Rockers in the vicinity of the beach and marched them in a cordon through the streets to the Station. This "sullen army" (Evening Argus 19/5/64) was watched along the route by a crowd of onlookers. They were then escorted on to the train. Care was taken that no one would turn back from the first station out of Brighton: any young person with long hair or jeans had to convince the police that he lived in Brighton or Hove before being allowed out of the station. Thus could innovation and dramatization be based on symbolization.

Such extensions or abuses of police power might be regarded by some as marginal and legitimate. Others were more serious, involving allegations of wrongful arrest. In the Barker-Little survey, 20 out of 34 codable answers to the question, "Why did the police arrest you?", involved charges of arbitrary arrest. These boys claimed that they had either been doing nothing or moving away from trouble when arrested. Even allowing for what is thought of as the typical delinquent response of self-righteousness, this is a fairly high proportion. The following case is typical; (Barker and Little comment that they thought the respondent was being honest).²⁵ The boy claimed that he had been playing "childish games" on the beach with other Mods and came off the beach with a piece of wood which he had been kicking about on the sand. He tossed it on a pile of rubbish by the steps. "A policeman said: 'Pick that up laddie' and like a fool I did. He arrested me and I was charged with carrying an offensive weapon." The boy saw that, faced with an apparent riot, the police needed to arrest somebody to deter others. He pleaded guilty in court because he thought it would be best to get it over with and was fined £75 for this and threatening behaviour (his first offence).

I personally observed three similar incidents and, in addition, friends and relatives of other boys were contacted who had stories of wrongful arrest. One such story concerned a boy who had volunteered to go

25. Barker and Little, op.cit., p. 7.

along with the police as a witness after two friends had been arrested for throwing stones. On arrival at the police station, despite protests, he was arrested and charged as well. Somewhat more substantial evidence is contained on a report prepared for the National Council of Civil Liberties on the incidents at Brighton, Easter 1965. This was the highwater mark of police over-reaction. Over 110 arrests were made, the vast majority of them for offences directly or indirectly provoked by the police activity, i.e. obstruction or using threatening behaviour. There were very few cases involving damage, personal violence or drugs. There was only one offensive weapon charge: a boy carrying a steel-toothed comb.²⁶

Nine separate allegations of wrongful arrest were made in letters to the N.C.C.L.²⁷ These came from independent sources and there is no apparent collusion. It was difficult to follow up all these cases, but at least three resulted in successful appeals. (In at least another fifteen cases, not known to the N.C.C.L., there were successful appeals for wrongful arrest or disproportionately high sentences). All these letters made the same general complaint: that the police had decided in advance to take strong measures or to arrest a certain quota and had thus made arbitrary arrests before any offence was committed or provoked offences to be committed. The following are extracts from two such letters:-

... a friend came up and greeted us perhaps a little louder than he should have, and was pulled aside by a police sergeant and reprimanded for doing so.

While waiting for him, my friends and I were told to "move on" by a police officer who as he said this, pushed my friend Dave. He replied to this statement that he was waiting for our friend who was still talking to the police sergeant. The policeman then said the same thing again, still pushing Dave, "Move on". My friend Dave replied that he was moving on which of course he was. The policeman told my friend not to

26. I was informed from unofficial sources that the police had been reprimanded after the weekend for being too enthusiastic. This might have been in response to a report in The Times critical of the police, the high number of appeals involving allegations of wrongful arrest and publicity generated by the N.C.C.L. In any event, there appeared to be a change in policy by Whitsun, when, although there were just as many police present, they were considerably less active.

27. The original copies of these letters and other documents were studied. Initials only are used, and other identifying information altered in all quotations from these sources.

give him any lip, my friend then asked what he had said to be lippy, the policeman then shoved my friend against a beacon by a zebra crossing saying that he had told him to move on and he was to get across there; my friend was just about to go across the crossing when a car pulled out in front of him, stopping him from crossing; the car was only there for a few seconds and within that time the policeman said to Dave, "I told you to move you're under arrest ...". A police van pulled up and my friend was literally thrown into the van. (Letter from C.A.F.)

I was overtaken by a group of Rockers (25 or 30) who were walking along the pavement chanting "Digadig - Dig" and generally behaving in a manner which I understand would be likely to frighten some people. I was not part of this group. I was not chanting, shouting or in any way behaving in a manner which did or could have frightened anyone or lead to any breach of the peace ... my friend and I were merely walking to catch the train. Just as the Rockers had passed us a police van drew alongside the kerb and police jumped out of the van. I distinctly heard one policeman say: "He will do". I was grabbed, punched in the mouth and bundled into a police van. I offered no resistance nor did I give any abuse - I was much too surprised at the unexpected turn of events to say or do anything. (Statement from T.P.M.)

T.P.M. and his friend P.W., arrested at the same time, were found guilty after being remanded in custody for ten days. Later both had their appeals allowed at Brighton Quarter Sessions, one of them being awarded costs.

These reports also indicate another aspect of police activity - corresponding more closely to Cohen's "innovation" - the unnecessary use of force. The police often used violence in handling crowd situations, e.g. by pushing and tripping young people from behind as they moved them. Force was particularly used in making arrests even when the offender had not struggled or resisted. A freelance photographer (J.G.) trying to photo such an incident had his camera smashed and after complaining and refusing to move away, was arrested. The court was told that he was "leading a mob of screaming teenagers across the beach" and he was charged with obstructing a constable whom he claims not to have seen till after his arrest.

Such specific claims are difficult to substantiate; observation in Brighton over that weekend though, bears out the fact that such violence was not uncommon:-

Outside the aquarium, about a dozen Mods were brought up from the beach following an incident. The police formed a rough chain across the pavement leading to the van. As each boy was shoved into the van he got a cuff on the head from at least three policemen in the line. I also saw a Sergeant kicking two boys as they were hurled into the van.

(Notes, Brighton, Easter Monday 1965, 11.30 a.m.)

A number of further allegations were made, either in the N.C.C.L. letters or to myself which involved abuses which could not be substantiated by observation as they did not occur in public. It can only be said that these allegations of police misconduct after arrest were internally consistent. A repeated complaint was of the use of force in the police van - three boys writing to the N.C.C.L. claimed that they had been punched, kicked or held face downward on the floor during the ride to the station. Every letter complained about the conditions in custody in the Brighton Police Station. Most were placed in overcrowded communal cells, together with the usual weekend drunks, from time of arrest up to anything like three days.²⁸ They were refused water or washing facilities and, in one case (T.P.M.), given only two bread and tea meals in the 27 hours between his arrest and his removal to Lewes Prison to be remanded in custody. Another boy claimed to have been given only bread and marge for 48 hours. All the boys, including one with a kidney complaint whose father's representations about this were ignored by the Chief Constable and Magistrates Clerk, had to sleep on the concrete floor. Six separate allegations were made that the police had beaten up some of the boys in the cells. The nephew, wife and mother of a 22 year old man arrested for letting down the tyres of a police van claimed to have witnessed police brutality in the station when they visited him. Another complaint, made in three letters and repeated by some of the boys in the Barker-Little sample, was that the police coerced boys into pleading guilty:-

28. The Brighton police denied a N.C.C.L. charge that 60 youths had shared a cell by saying that because of lack of space "they were put in the cell corridor." (Guardian 28/4/65)

A policeman came three times to the bars ... and made the statement that those who pleaded guilty would be dealt with sooner and more leniently while those who pleaded not guilty would be held at least a week in remand. (Letter from J.G.)

It should be stressed that such allegations represented very much a minority view. One of the most unambiguous of public attitudes - and one that was fed back to reinforce the actions of the police - was of support and admiration for the police. The foundation for this attitude was laid in inventory reports about "How the Police Won the Battle of Brighton". These reports polarized the images of the good, brave policemen with the evil, cowardly mob. The Daily Mirror (19/5/64) for example, reported on how 200 Mods advancing on the Margate Town Hall were routed by one brave policeman. In fact, the Mods were milling around, rather than advancing and there were at least four policemen. But the counterconceptions had to be stressed between "The Hoodlums and the Real Heroes"; the police, self-controlled and patient had to meet a provocative, jeering mob, hundreds of whom were "... turned away by a handful of men in blue."

These images were definitely absorbed by the public. Of the total number of post-Margate opinion statements, less than 1% were critical of the police, mentioning, for example, their provocative tactics or their hypersensitivity to leather jackets or long hair. The rest only had praise for the police, or went further to make the familiar charge that the policeman's hands were tied and that he should be given more powers. In the Brighton Sample, 43 (i.e. 66.2%) agreed with the methods used by the police, a further 13 (20%) thought that the police should have been tougher and only 9 (13.8%) criticized the police for being unfair or provocative.

Additional signs of public support for the police could be seen in the courts, where prolonged applause from the public benches followed statements by the Chairman complimenting the police. The same reaction occurred during Parliamentary debates. Letters to local papers in the resorts were mainly in praise of the police, "this gallant bulwark of society" (Brighton and Hove Herald 23/3/64). The Hastings and St. Leonards Observer (8/8/64)

published 15 letters about the Mods and Rockers: 13 expressed gratitude to the police, one did not mention them and one writer complained about his son and daughter being unjustifiably harassed by the police. This last letter resulted in 10 letters in the next issue denouncing the writer's attitude and accusing him of being emotional, unbalanced and waging a private vendetta against the police. These letters again expressed gratitude to the policeman "... and his allies (sic) the magistrates." One writer said: "If I had a thousand pounds, I would give it to the police. What would we do without them?" and another called for money to be sent to the Police Convalescent Home "... as tangible appreciation for the police winning the Battle of Hastings, 1964". Such calls did not go unheeded: besides the hundreds of letters sent to them directly, the Brighton police received over £100 for the Police Benevolent Fund and, according to a local journalist, were embarrassed by the sheer volume of congratulations that poured in.

The Courts: Whereas police decisions and procedures leave unknown the number of deviants not labelled and processed, court decisions and procedures enable the next stage of the flow-chart to be more precisely observed. One can record in quantifiable terms the proportions who are processed and sent on to the next stage and one can also "measure" this decision in terms of the severity of the sentence.

The high points in escalation were the sentences given at Whitsun 1965 (Brighton). In keeping with the control agent's dilemma, any quiet weekend after these sentences, was claimed as proof of their deterrent value and any trouble was either played down or used to justify the need for increased and still harsher penalties. Comparable figures for each incident unfortunately could not be located because the hearings were not always reported in full, and, in the case of sentences passed after remand or bail, not reported at all as the interest had by then died down. Attempts to obtain fuller figures from official sources were not successful.

Tables 49 and 50 summarize the available information for the first of these two incidents.

In the case of Brighton, Easter 1965, so many were arrested (between 110 - 120) and the situation in the two sittings of the court so confusing, that estimates of the numbers actually charged ranged from 70 - 110. Of the actual charges it is only clear that the greatest number were for "Wilfully Obstructing the Police in the Execution of their Duty" or "Use of threatening Behaviour Whereby a Breach of the Peace was Likely to be Occasioned."²⁹ These two accounted for nearly three quarters of all sentences. Others included assaulting the police (about 7), unlawful possession of drugs (5) and a few each of malicious damage, obscene language and stone throwing. Because virtually every offender was remanded in custody, it is difficult to trace all subsequent sentences. It is only clear that greater use was made of the Detention Centre - a trend throughout the period - and fines were increased. These cases supplied the greatest proportion of successful appeals; in one case the Recorder substituted a £25 fine for a sentence of three months in a Detention Centre because it was a first offence. The press reported very few of the successful appeals.

The use of the remand in custody by the Brighton magistrates in Easter 1965 warrants special attention as this was a consciously applied innovatory principle. It was clear that the magistrates were using their power to remand as a "form of extra-legal punishment",³⁰ in order to provide the youths with a short taste of imprisonment.

The grounds on which bail can be refused, especially for juveniles,

29. Section 51, (1) Police Act 1964 and Section 5, Public Order Act, 1936.

30. Editorial comment, The Observer (25/4/65).. A senior magistrate in the Northview sample claimed that word had gone round the Magistrate's Clerks at the time to make greater use of the remand in custody; he commented himself: "although it's not strictly legal and is rather naughty, a remand in custody for more than a week is a good idea."

TABLE 49Court Action - Margate, Whitsun 1964

<u>Charges</u>		<u>Sentences</u>	
Threatening behaviour or threatening words	37	Conditional discharge	1
Threatening behaviour plus offensive weapon	3	£25 Fine	1
Offensive weapon	5	£50 "	30
		£75 "	6
Malicious damage or wilful damage	-	Detention Centre (3 months)	6
Assault plus offensive weapon	1	Detention Centre (6 months)	1
Assaulting police	-		
Obstructing police	<u>-</u> 46	Jail (3 months)	<u>1</u> 46

Note: Because of incomplete information it is impossible to match the offences with the sentences.

TABLE 50Court Action - Hastings, August 1964

<u>Charges</u>		<u>Sentences</u>	
Threatening behaviour		Case dismissed*	1
Abusive behaviour		Conditional discharge	1
		£10 Fine	1
		£20 "	3
		£25 "	2
		Detention Centre (3 months)	13
		Detention Centre (3 months + £50 fine)	2
			23
Malicious Damage		Detention Centre (2 months)	1
Wilful Damage		Detention Centre (3 months)	2
		Detention Centre (4 months)	1
			4
Obstructing Police		£10 Fine	1
		£20 "	4
			5
Offensive Weapon		Detention Centre (3 months)	1
		Detention Centre (6 months)	4
			5
Assaulting Police		Detention Centre (6 months)	2
		Prison (3 months)	1
			3

*All except this case bound over for £25
to keep the peace for 2 years.

are fairly limited³¹ but it was quite apparent that these grounds were not being applied to individual cases and that bail was refused as a matter of principle. The Chairman of the Magistrates, Mr. H. Cushnie, was widely quoted as saying that bail would not be entertained at all, no matter what surety was offered.³² While most newspaper reports of the court procedure quoted the magistrates' reason for remand as being in order to enable the police to make enquiries,³³ this, in fact, was not the reason given in court when bail was opposed. Inspector W. Tapsall, prosecuting, said that his opposition was, firstly on the grounds that if the boys were allowed to go free on bail justice would not be done and, secondly, that the public must be protected. The first of these grounds is not a legal one and the second not easily justified. Often on the basis of no other evidence than the reading of the charges, a boy who had done nothing more than refuse to "move along" would be certified as an "unruly person". The result was that many relatively minor cases, including those involving juveniles, were remanded in custody in prison for up to three weeks. In one case two juveniles, eventually fined £5 each for obstruction, spent 11 days in Lewes Prison.

The punitive and arbitrary use of remand was illustrated in one case where the accused, after already being remanded in custody once for eleven days, was again refused bail and "sentenced" to a further week in custody. A few minutes later he was taken back to the court and informed that the constable whom he was alleged to have obstructed, was going on leave, so the "sentence" would be reduced to four days to enable the case to be heard before the constable's holiday. Few knew the procedure for

31. See Sec. 31, Children's and Young Persons Act 1933 and Stone's Justices Manual, 1963, Vol. 1, p. 322.

32. At Whitsun 1964, the Brighton magistrates, in fact, granted bail to a 17 year old arrested for insulting behaviour. The amount of bail was £1,250.

33. For example, The Times (20/4/65).

appealing against being remanded, and in one case referred to the N.C.C.L., a boy (D.H.), who did know the procedure, was refused a form to apply to the Judge-in-Chambers for bail. This is a serious allegation in view of the fact that a test case brought by the Council on behalf of a 16 year old boy (J.L.J.) resulted in his immediate release from prison on bail.

There were a number of other unusual actions by the courts. In two cases (Hastings, August 1964 and Brighton, Easter 1965), there were rulings by the magistrates that the names of all juveniles be published. The Hastings Chairman (Mr. A.G. Coote) also ordered in certain cases that fingerprints should be taken. The Brighton Chairman (Mr. Pascoe) announced that warrants would be issued for the arrest of any father who failed to attend the court. In at least one case a father who was not notified of the date of the hearings was subjected to the indignity of his name being published as being "too busy" to attend his son's hearing. Parents who were present at the preliminary hearings were often rudely addressed by the Magistrate or Clerk, not allowed to say what they wanted to and their offers to stand bail were, of course, refused. It was hard for some of the parents to escape the conclusion that their attendance too was a form of "extra-legal punishment".

The court actions - and those of the other control agents - must be seen as the logical result of the way the control culture had defined the situation. The logic of this definition - a product of, and in turn a determinant of the inventory images and attitudes - left the magistrates no doubt about their role: they had to clamp down hard, make an example of these offenders and deter others. This type of logic imposed by the assimilation of a belief system, is not, of course, unknown in the history of criminal trials. The immediate parallel that suggests itself is the Teddy Boy phenomenon of the Nineteen Fifties; control agents then acted in ways identical to their reaction to the Mods and Rockers a decade

later.³⁴ Tony Parker, in his account of the trial of Michael Davies, has described vividly how Davies was sentenced "... not so much for what he might have done, as for being a symbol of something which the contemporary public found abhorrent and threatening to their stable way of life."³⁵ He suggests that the build up of prejudicial and melodramatic headlines ("Edwardian Suits - Dance - Music - and a Dagger") meant that not only Davies's alleged offence was on trial, "... but everything about him, and all he had the misfortune to represent."³⁶ The boy stabbed to death on Clapham Common was a symbol of what the public had expected the Teddy Boys to be capable of.

The Davies case was an extreme example. What one could see in the hundreds of routine Mods and Rockers offences processed by the courts, were other facets of the complex relationship between belief systems and action, and the use of situational logic to justify control measures. One might quote the case of J.F., a boy sentenced to three months in a Detention Centre for using threatening behaviour in Brighton on Whit Monday, 1965.³⁷ He had thrown a make-up case (?) at a group of Rockers being chased by Mods. On Appeal, his counsel said that F. has passed six "0 levels" and wanted to sit for three more. He had never been in trouble before and was shocked at his first contact with the law. A letter was read from his headmistress saying what a disgrace it was that a school prefect and house-captain with an example to show, had shown it this way. The Deputy Recorder allowed the appeal because, although the Detention Centre would give F. a chance to study, he would not get the same facilities as at school. The sentence was altered to a conditional discharge. Nevertheless, maintained the Recorder, the magistrates were absolutely right in

34. For details on the Teddy Boys see Cohen and Rock, op.cit.

35. Tony Parker, The Plough Boy, (London: Hutchinson 1965), p. 235.

36. Ibid., p. 236.

37. Information from Evening Argus (23/6/65) and Justice of the Peace and Local Government Review (14/9/65).

taking the line that they did in the circumstances at the time. They had to have regard to the deterrent effect on others. Those who did not have the advantage of F's background were seen as justifiable offerings on the altar of general deterrence.

The extent to which action was influenced by the generalized belief system rather than judgments on the individual offender on the one hand, or generalized principles of sentencing on the other, can perhaps best be indicated by quoting some pronouncements by magistrates in giving their judgments. The following extracts are all by the Chairman of the Hastings Bench, Mr. A.G. Coote, at Whitsun 1964;³⁸ They are representative of other pronouncements at the time:-

In considering the penalties to be imposed, we must take into account the overall effect on the innocent citizens of and visitors to the Borough. Though some of the offences committed by individuals may not in themselves seem all that serious, they form part and parcel of a cumulative series of events which ruined the pleasure of thousands³⁹ and adversely effected the business of traders. The Hastings bench has always taken a stern view of violent and disorderly conduct and we do not propose to alter that attitude. In pursuance of that policy we shall impose in these cases penalties - in many cases the maximum - which will punish the offenders and will effectively deter other law breakers.

We shall find that because of the prevalence of this type of occurrence and the necessity of condign punishment we must send you to prison.

Your conduct is of the kind we are determined to end in this borough.

This sort of statement leads on to a consideration of the dramatization element in the societal control culture. This element is illustrated with particular vividness in the court, the perfect stage for acting out society's ceremonies of status degradation. The ceremony not only publicly labels the deviant, but functions to stir up public indignation to a still higher pitch.

The ritualism of the courts was emphasized by the atmosphere in which

38. Main source; Hastings and St. Leonard's Observer (15/8/64) (emphasis added).

39. Mr. Coote himself was one of these "thousands". During the hearing he revealed that he himself was in a crowd which had to go into Woolworths for safety during an incident.

the hearings took place. Invariably the preliminary hearings were arranged at times when courts do not usually sit: Bank Holidays, Sundays and, in one case, till midnight. Extra drama was sometimes provided by the use of special buildings. These arrangements were made - and publicly announced - as long as two weeks before the Bank Holiday as if to give notice of the impending ceremony. In Margate, the court was surrounded by a "horde of screaming teenagers", the doors were guarded by a strong force of police and another twelve policemen mingled with the crowds in the public gallery. The courts were invariably crowded and in the case of Brighton at least, where I observed a number of hearings, it was apparent that a number of spectators attended in the spirit of a gladiatorial display. After an "interim statement" made by the Chairman at one sitting, the crowd broke out into spontaneous applause. Sentences, particularly when accompanied by homilies, were often greeted by loud clapping. The question of guilt or innocence did not take up much time, and the mock trial element in the proceedings was brought home to some relatives who claimed that the police had told them before the trial to bring along enough money for the fines. The monotony of the ritual hearings with the repeated certification of the offender as an "unruly person" was livened only by audience participation and the occasional screams, scuffles and bangings from the cells below.

The magistrates themselves acted out their role in meaningless exchanges with witnesses or relatives and outbursts of ritual hostility toward the offender. Parents were often informed too late to be present at the hearings and when they were there, they were subjected to the following type of questioning:

Chairman: Did you know that your son was in Brighton?

Father: Yes

Chairman: Did you know that he was in the Automat in the early hours of yesterday morning?

Father: No

This exchange was greeted by gasps of surprise in the audience and

"I told you so" looks between the magistrates, the implication clearly being that the father was somehow responsible for his son's supposed offence, and should have known, although sixty miles away at the time, of his son's presence in the Automat. Most direct hostility was reserved for the offenders, as in the following encounter between Mr. Coote and a 17 year old boy, fined £20 for obstructing the police:-

Chairman: Various police forces were trying to avoid something dreadful happening and were forced to keep you on the move.

Defendant: We were trying to get home

Chairman: It was a pity you came here in the first place.

Defendant: Yes, it was.

This dramatization of deviance, so important in creating the polarization effect, was illustrated nowhere more clearly than in the public pronouncements of the Margate magistrate, Dr. George Simpson, at Whitsun 1964. Perhaps never before have the obiter dicta of a local magistrate been so widely quoted. Virtually every court report quoted his "Sawdust Caesars" speech in full and his terminology significantly influenced the mass media symbolization and the process of spurious attribution. His phrases were widely used as headlines: "'Sawdust Caesars hunt in pack' says magistrate"; "'Clamp down on Mods and Rockers - a Vicious Virus' says J.P." "Town Hits Back on Rat Pack Hooligans", etc.

Any ambiguity and any unanswered questions about the nature of the deviance and the deviant's confrontation with social control were resolved by Dr. Simpson's verbal structuring of the situation; as a commentator on the press pointed out: "... by Tuesday, papers were being influenced not by what happened, or even what their own reporters were telling them what happened, but by what Dr. Simpson said had happened." (Spectator 22/5/64).

The melodramatic atmosphere already having been created, Dr. Simpson opened the show by issuing a warning that any interruption or disturbance would be most rigorously dealt with. What noise there was, added to the drama: the crowds outside, and the audible reaction to the scale of the

finer including cries from the boys' girl friends and even gasps of surprise from policemen on hearing that boys they had arrested for threatening behaviour had been given £50 or £75 fines. The first of the 44 youths to come before the court was a 22 year old from London who pleaded guilty to using threatening behaviour.⁴⁰ It is worth quoting in full the message he received because it was really meant for a much wider audience:-

It is not likely that the air of this town has ever been polluted by the hordes of hooligans, male and female, such as we have seen this weekend and of whom you are an example.

These long-haired, mentally unstable, petty little hoodlums, these sawdust Caesars who can only find courage like rats, in hunting in packs, came to Margate with the avowed intent of interfering with the life and property of its inhabitants.

Insofar as the law gives us power, this court will not fail to use the prescribed penalties. It will, perhaps, discourage you and others of your kidney who are infected with this vicious virus, that you will go to prison for three months.

The following are a few of Dr. Simpson's further comments:-

It's a pity you didn't stick to your knitting (to a 19 year old knitting worker fined £50 for carrying an offensive weapon).

Margate will not tolerate louts like you (to an 18 year old, given 6 months in a detention centre).

To a 19 year old plumber's mate accused of carrying a roll of newspaper with coins in the middle as an offensive weapon: I don't suppose you were using this newspaper to further your literary aspirations?

Defendant: I'm sorry. I don't understand.

Simpson: Never mind, you'll understand what I'm going to say now: £50.

Perhaps your school will consider a framed reproduction of your conviction (to a 17 year old grammar school boy fined £75 for possessing an offensive weapon and using threatening behaviour).

On the second day of the hearings: It would appear that you have not benefited from yesterday's proceedings. We listened to these paltry excuses and there is no doubt that you were a part of the dregs of these vermin who infested the town yesterday and the day before, and we think the penalty must be appropriate.

It is strange to see this procession of miserable specimens, so different from the strutting hodigans of yesterday.

40. 36 out of the 44 youths pleaded guilty. It has been noted that many did so on police "advice". Others believed that those who pleaded not guilty were given heavier sentences. Barker and Little note that "the strained atmosphere of the courthouse seems to have been responsible for this misconception". (op.cit., p. 6)

The follow-up to this ceremony was the inflation of Dr. Simpson into a folk hero: he personalized the forces of good against which the forces of evil were massed. Like all such folk heroes, he, single-handed - "a small man in a light grey suit" (Daily Express 19/5/64) - had overcome sheer brute strength. "The Quiet Man Who Rocks the Thugs", had his personality, career and views on various social issues presented to the public. He told reporters that he realized from the beginning that he was dealing not just with a local fracas but with something that had become a national problem. It had reached "colossal national proportions" (disaster); he was aware of a "general pattern of deliberate viciousness" (it's not only this), scooters and motor bikes were "almost in the nature of offensive weapons" and he wished he had the power to deprive hooligans of their means of transport (innovation).

His justice was not that of the impersonal, faceless representative of social control. Like Batman saving Gotham City, he had saved his own town, where he had lived as a beloved local family doctor for twenty four years. On the Sunday night before the hearings, he had, according to the Daily Mail (19/5/64), toured Margate with his wife to see the gangs. His wife described what they saw:-

We saw for ourselves how tired the policemen looked. We have lived in Margate for twenty four years and last night was dreadful. The town was full of dirty grubby teenagers. It must not be allowed to happen again ... I think my husband did the right thing. These people have got to be taught a lesson.

On the day after the hearings, many newspapers carried photographs of Dr. Simpson, quietly strolling along the deserted Margate beaches, "surveying the Whitsun battleground", and contemplating how nice it was "to be able to walk along here again without fear of being molested" (Daily Express 20/5/64). At the same time as he rejoiced in the problem having been dealt with satisfactorily - "I think I taught them a lesson in court on Monday" - he had to remind society that the problem was still there: "it may take more than one dose of nasty medicine to persuade these thugs

that this behaviour does not pay."

3. The Formation of an Exclusive Control Culture

The courts and the police, as officially designated agents of social control, had to operate in terms of a socially sanctioned role. They could not opt out of this role; they had to take some action. Their action was also limited to rule enforcement, rather than the creation of new rules. The fact that these limits were often exceeded, is attributable not to their absence, but to the perceived innovatory aspects of the behaviour itself and the subsequent sensitization and belief system. Rationalizations such as "new situations need new remedies" account for those aspects of the control agents' actions exclusive to the particular deviance being controlled.

It would, however, be an incomplete analysis of the control culture to look only at the official control agents, and the ways they deviated from operational norms. Social control is much broader in scope, including as it does informal mechanisms such as public opinion on the one hand, and highly formalized institutions of the state on the other. The reaction to the Mods and Rockers may be conceived of as diffusing from the relatively unorganized on-the-spot reaction of the local community - the pristine form of the social reaction in the amplification model - to an increasing involvement of other individuals and groups. We have seen how this diffusion produced a generalized belief system - mythologies, stigmas, stereotypes, etc. - but it also produces or tries to produce new methods of control. The informal societal reaction is extended and formalized, the ultimate formalization being achieved when new laws are actually created.

This section will be concerned with the ways in which local reaction moved towards the creation of an exclusive control culture with methods - as well as a belief system - specifically directed towards the Mods and Rockers. This type of development has been documented in regard to the abolition of slavery, the prohibition movement, the attempts to control

prostitution and the passing of the Marijuana Tax Act. Sutherland has provided the classic account of the sequence by which action groups and individuals attempt to obtain statutory control by innovatory proposals - in this case in regard to the sexual psychopath laws.⁴¹

The process is similar to that of social problem creation, a sequence already illustrated in regard to vandalism. It starts with the initial perception by some people of a condition which is trouble-making, difficult or threatening, and requiring action. A specific rule is then deduced from the general value which is felt should be protected or upheld. The rule is then applied in particular circumstances or, if thought necessary, new rules are created. This is the sort of fixed sequence of awareness/policy determination/reform envisaged by Fuller and Myers and we have already observed some of the defects of this model. As with the amplification model, it assumes too mechanistic a flow and does not recognize that unqualified rejection is not the only possible reaction to deviance.

Even less deterministic accounts, however, have to take into account certain universal conditions, such as legitimacy and enterprise. Values must always be present to legitimate blowing the whistle (i.e. enforcing existing rules) or attempting to pass new rules. Thus, Becker describes the values behind the Marijuana Tax Act, such as the Protestant ethic of self control, humanitarianism and the disapproval of action aimed solely at achieving ecstasy.⁴²

The success of the process depends on enterprise: someone takes the initiative on the basis of interest and uses publicity techniques to gain the support of the public and powerful organizations. In addition to invoking legitimating values, the moral entrepreneur supports his case with

41. Sutherland, op.cit.

42. Becker, (1963), op.cit., p. 136.

the belief system: the inventory images and the opinion and attitude themes. Often, crusades are justified on the basis of deviation which is wholly or partly putative. As Sutherland showed, all the propositions on which the sexual psychopath laws are based, are demonstrably false, or at least questionable.⁴³

In regard to the Mods and Rockers, we can distinguish a process whereby members of the public, acting as informal control agents, brought pressure to bear for rule-creation; that is, they referred their "local" problem to the legislature. It is significant that the action took this form rather than merely pressing for more efficient action by the control agents. In sudden unexpected forms of deviance, the institutionalized agencies are often thrown off balance and any deficiencies they have become obvious. They are sometimes themselves blamed for the deviance: this is a common reaction following political assassinations which expose inadequacies in security arrangements. In the case of the Mods and Rockers, though, there was widespread support for the police and the courts; it was believed that they were doing their job as best they could but were handicapped by being given insufficient powers or by having to deal with a problem that was really the Government's. Blame and responsibility were thus shifted upward in the hierarchy. This is similar to the pyramidal conception of social problems in regard to vandalism. Students of natural disasters have noted a similar scapegoating process: those involved in the disaster are usually exonerated - "they only did their job" - and government figures become targets for attack and protest in a situation for which they had no

43. Sutherland, op.cit., p. 142. See Schur (op.cit.) for a recent account of the misconceptions in public policy towards abortion, homosexuality and drug addiction. Putative deviation in regard to drug addiction policy was originally documented by Lindesmith; recent useful discussions include J. Mandel, "Hashish, Assassins and the Love of God," Issues in Criminology, 2 (Fall 1966), pp. 149 - 156 and R. Smith, "Status Politics and the Image of the Addict," Ibid., pp. 157 - 175.

conceivable direct responsibility.⁴⁴

The whole process in which informal agents step in and attempt to institutionalize new control methods is, in fact, analogous to the process in a disaster whereby the emergency or therapeutic social system refers the problem to the "suprasystem" or "restorative social system". The crude responses of the emergency social system meet the immediate needs for food, shelter and rescue in a disaster in the same way as the police and courts met the immediate problem presented to the community by the Mods and Rockers: the identification and labelling of the deviants, the protection of person and property, the handing out of retribution, etc. The slower responding organizations of the suprasystem then come into action; with the diffusion of news, the disaster (depending on its nature and the type of inventory that is made about it) may be defined as a national problem. There follow public meetings, enquiries, petitions, and, as in the case of rule creation, the demand is made that emergency systems be given more power or that the suprasystem take over. I will describe the demands made on the suprasystem as well as those emergency measures, which eventually became routinized and ritualized.

The first step is to see how those immediately affected defined the problem. Clearly, hooliganism is not a "crime without a victim" and the development of exclusive control measures depends, in part, on the way in which the victims articulated the way they had been affected. As could be expected from the orientation themes, the initial reaction by the victims in the local community was to define what happened as disastrous. In fact, it was the initial reaction of self-styled spokesmen of the seaside resorts which did so much to arouse the hysteria and subsequent sensitization. The

44. H.R. Veltfort and G.E. Lee, "The Coconut Grove Fire: A Study in Scapegoating," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38 (April 1943), p. 141, and R. Bucher, "Blame and Hostility in Disaster," American Journal of Sociology, 6 (March 1957), p. 471.

pattern was set after Clacton, with the various panic statements made to the press: "I've seen riots in South America, but this was almost mob rule" (Mr. J. Malthouse, the manager of a seafront hotel); "Clacton would be one gigantic wreckage tonight except for our fine British bobbies" (Councillor E. Payne, Chairman of the resort's publicity council). Similar statements were made after the subsequent events, "We were on the very edge of a total riot. Only a little more hysteria next time and it will be quite beyond control. And at the moment there is nothing that can really stop a next time happening." (Mr. A. Webb, President of the Brighton Hotels Association). This sort of reaction was played up by the press: Brighton was "a town seething with anger and resentment" (Evening Argus 18/5/64); Margate was "a town in fear ... hopelessness ... and bubbling anger" (Evening Standard 19/5/64) and the owner of a cafe "damaged in the riots" pleaded with the reporter not to publish his name: "They will come back and smash up my shop. I want no more trouble. Go away."

Some local people evidently translated their fears into action; there were rumours after Clacton and every other event, of vigilante squads being formed by local tradesmen to protect their property. After Easter 1964, although there was only a very minor incident in Margate, some local residents there were sufficiently sensitized by the Clacton build-up, to start preparations for the summer. Amusement caterers armed themselves with children's baseball bats, and the manager of a seafront coffee club wanted every establishment to have a doorman armed with a tear gas missile to keep the gangs away, (Isle of Thanet Gazette 3/4/64).

It is difficult to judge how representative this sort of reaction was. Clearly, newspaper reports exaggerated the intensity of the feeling and the vigilantes and tear-gassers were very much in the minority. Only a small number of tradesmen were personally affected by the disturbances; most only heard about them at second hand. Nevertheless, in seaside resorts depending almost wholly on summer visitors, the fear of loss of trade was a very real one and in such avenues of community opinion as editorials and

letters in the local press, council debates, and public speeches (e.g. on school prize giving days), a genuine anxiety was reflected. The first precondition for the development of exclusive control culture was therefore present: the definition by certain people of the situation as inimical to their interests and that something should be done about it.

It is important to be clear about the nature of these interests because it is the perception of what interests are to be protected, that shapes the subsequent campaigns for rule creation. In the last analysis the "interests" may derive from Ranulf's "disinterested tendency to inflict punishment". In the immediate sense, though, interests were presented in purely financial terms. The campaigns for action were based on appeals to commercial interest and the leading figures behind these campaigns were often leaders of commercial and business organizations. Chambers of Commerce and Hotel and Guest House Associations were among the most prominent pressure groups, and the Council intervention was based on protecting the towns' holiday trade; its "good image". The commercial interest can be seen operating in the sequence of statements made by these individuals and organizations: the first reaction was expressed in panic statements but as soon as it was realized that these statements might, in fact, operate against the towns' interest by creating a scare situation,⁴⁵ these statements were modified and local figures objected that press reports had been exaggerated. This sort of objection was made after Clacton by the Chairman of the U.D.C. and after Margate by the Mayor:

I consider that the whole affair has been badly mishandled in that nation-wide publicity has been given to the activities of a comparatively few witless hooligans. Had they been ignored and even if they are ignored from now on these louts will be cut down to size and their minor disturbances will be dealt with locally in a proper manner. Can it now be agreed to let local people deal with local events?

45. Others, besides sociologists, know of self-fulfilling prophecies.

The commercial interest gave the demands a peculiar form: "if this happens again, people won't come here on holiday; we must get rid of the Mods and Rockers either by driving them out, or by not letting them in in the first place; we don't care where they go - let them go and wreck up Margate (or Hastings, or Brighton, or Eastbourne) as long as they don't come here." These demands echo the sanction of banishment used in tribal and other homogeneous communities and correspond to the primal in-group aggression towards the deviant enshrined in our folklore by Westerns in which the outlaw is "ridden out of town."

At this point there appears a contradiction within the demands. Although many local people were, like the Mayor of Margate, dismayed with the publicity, rather than "seething with fear and anger", they knew that nothing would be done if the problem were defined in purely local terms. To create rules, a problem must not only be conceptualized in mass-appeal terms, it must also be defined in such a way that it is seen as the legitimate responsibility of the suprasystem. In other words, it is not enough to "let local people deal with local events"; the event had to be magnified to national proportions and the responsibility for it shifted upwards. So after the initial Clacton event there were immediate calls for Home Office enquiries and "the Government", "do-gooders" or "reformers" were made scapegoats.

This shifting upwards of responsibility has, in fact, its own commercial motive. Because the "looking for kicks" image was so prevalent, it was realized that to define the problem in purely parochial terms would reflect on the resort's facilities. Whereas outside opinion (e.g. in the Northview survey) interpreted "boredom" in its broadest sense, local people thought in terms of on-the-spot boredom and were anxious to dispel any ideas that a lack of recreational facilities in the resort could have caused the trouble: "there's plenty to do in X; if they were bored it's not our fault".

Having described three preconditions for rule creation - an awareness of the problem, a definition of it in terms of self interest, and a definition of it as within the scope of the suprasystem - we must see the specific form in which the demands were made. The first type of demands (by local figures either individually or as spokesmen for various organizations) were initially not for specific policies, but merely undifferentiated appeals for assistance. There were calls for Home Office enquiries, for the laws to be "tightened up", for the courts and the police to be given "more powers". A statement by the Chairman of the Hastings Bench is typical of such generalized appeals:

... the three justices sitting today are unanimous in their view that it is now time for Parliament to consider what measures shall be adopted to crush this form of mass hooliganism, which is now patently repetitive at holiday times. If nothing is done, thousands of innocent people will continue to suffer fear, injury and damage to property.

A similar generalized build-up took place in editorials, letters to the press and in statements by local M.P's. At an early stage some specific policy proposals were also made, and these increased under the impact of sensitization and the crystallization of opinions. Out of 23 letters printed in the Evening Argus in the four days after Whitsun 1964, seven specifically proposed corporal punishment.

The disaster analogy was often made explicit in the suggestion that the government should be given emergency powers, such as setting up of road blocks at the main entrance to target towns "and turning back ... any scooters, motor vehicles or larger vehicles on which doubtful looking teenagers travelling Entry by rail could also be restricted ... we did these things successfully during the war." (Editorial, Hastings and St. Leonards Observer 8/9/64). The vigilante-type solutions also appeared - as in the examples from Margate quoted earlier and in such proposals as those of a Brighton restaurant proprietor in 1964, who wanted to arm with cudgels 1000 of Brighton's decent young people, and send them to "beat the hell out of these Mods and Rockers." (Evening Argus 18/5/64)

The next stage was the attempts by organizations to formalize policy statements and, in some cases, abortive action groups were formed. This is the stage at which resolutions are passed, petitions signed and deputations sent. After Whitsun 1965, the Great Yarmouth Hotels and Guest Houses Association called for the banning of Mods, Rockers and beatniks:

We cannot believe that it is not possible ... to find some legal way of putting this town completely out of bounds to these people ... We call upon all other trade associations and persons who hope to continue to carry on their business in Great Yarmouth to join us and demand that some positive action is taken as the time for compromise is past. (Caterer and Hotel Keeper 1/7/65)

In August 1965, sixty Margate traders called for new legislation in a petition which was sent to the Chamber of Commerce and passed on to the M.P. In September, a meeting of the Brighton L.V.A. supported a proposal for protest action by Brighton traders against light penalties imposed on hooligans. A committee member, who was also on the Chamber of Commerce, intended to ask the next Chamber meeting to make representations to the Watch Committee and local M.P's. At the same time in Margate, the Isle of Thanet L.V.A. decided to press local police to receive a deputation and one member stated:

It's time that the business people of the town did something about this. Let's try to protect ourselves. Every licensee should urge his customers to sign a petition so that we can get a law passed to ensure that anybody found sleeping out at night will be prosecuted on sight. (Morning Advertiser 4/9/65)

A feature of appeals at this stage is that the opinion and attitude themes are articulated more clearly and the proposals show all the inventory elements and the subsequent sensitization. An example of this is the net-widening effect in the call to ban beatniks and beach sleepers as well as Mods and Rockers, and in campaigns in seaside resorts against hooliganism at other times of the year.⁴⁶

46. See Morning Advertiser (the trade paper) during 1965 for an increase in references to hooliganism in public houses.

This type of agitation for the establishment of an exclusive control policy was not confined to local organizations. At a fairly early stage, those individuals whose opinions are invariably quoted by the mass media on "youth problems" proclaimed their solutions: vicars, youth workers, probation officers, respectable pop stars,⁴⁷ J.P's and headmasters. Speeches were made at conferences, church services, prize giving days and passing out parades. Although these pronouncements, together with the whole battery of the mass media, helped to create a separate control culture in the sense of spreading the mythologies and stereotypes, they did not directly lead to exclusive control policies. The demands made were too vague, not addressed to anyone in particular and not made by organized pressure groups. There were one or two exceptions to this. For example, at the annual general meeting of the Magistrates Association in October 1964, the following resolution was debated:

That in view of the recent troubles between gangs of young people, this Association urges the Home Secretary to introduce further legislation, possibly by the extension of the principle of the Attendance Centre, whereby these delinquents are not only punished but the punishment is such as to direct their energies into productive channels for the benefit of the community.

After considerable discussion the resolution was defeated by 103 votes to 84; although another resolution was carried which seems to have been directed at the Mods and Rockers:

That this Association urges the provision of powers whereby disqualification from holding a licence or confiscation of the vehicle could be ordered in certain cases where a motor vehicle is used for the furtherance of crime or for certain breaches of the peace.⁴⁸

At a certain ill-defined point, these sporadic campaigns were formalized into fully fledged "action groups". These groups can be seen as germinal social movements. Although they are difficult to classify in

47. See, for example, " 'They are Just Louts', Says Dreamer Freddie", Daily Mirror, (23/5/64).

48. Forty-Fifth Annual General Report of the Magistrates Association, pp. 64 - 65. See also B. Buchanan, "Punishment for Disorderly Gangs," Magistrate, 20, 12 (1964), pp. 170 - 171.

terms of the categories developed in the literature on such movements,⁴⁹ they meet most of the formal criteria and correspond closely to what Smelser calls "norm-oriented movements".⁵⁰ These movements are preceded by and undertaken in the name of norm-oriented beliefs,⁵¹ (the opinion themes). All of Smelser's value laden stages were present before the action groups were formed: there was strain (deviance); anxiety; an identification of the agents responsible; a generalized belief that control was inadequate; a belief that the trouble can be cured by reorganizing the normative structure itself ("there ought to be a law") and finally, the formulation of specific proposals to punish, control or destroy the agent.

An example of such a sequence is the hysteria generated by a few sex crimes committed in quick succession, agitated activity in response to this fear arousal, the setting up of special committees and finally the passing of sexual psychopath laws.⁵² In content as well as development, the Mods and Rockers action groups were also similar to such social movements in that the advocated programmes entailed the rigorous implementation of folk prescriptions; for example, better law enforcement and stiffer penalties.⁵³ These action groups are also similar to the organized moral enterprise in regard to the vandalism problem.

I shall describe two groups which arose wholly in response to the Mods and Rockers disturbances. Although these groups gathered a great deal of momentum, they left behind them almost no organizational residue, few of their policies were implemented and they failed in producing any

49. See, for example, R.H. Turner and L.M. Killian, Collective Behaviour, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1957) Part 4, and H. Toch, The Social Psychology of Social Movements, (Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill Co., 1965).

50. Smelser, op.cit., pp. 270 - 312.

51. Ibid., pp. 109 - 120.

52. Sutherland, op.cit.

53. Turner and Killian, op.cit., pp. 501 - 502.

direct legal change. Nevertheless, their activities are of considerable interest both in terms of illustrating the belief system and reaction built around the Mods and Rockers, and in highlighting some more general features of the sociology of law enforcement and moral enterprise.

The "Seatown" Council Group was only in the most rudimentary sense a group at all. In April 1966, twelve senior Aldermen and Councillors tabled a motion urging the Council to press the government to create an enforced work scheme for convicted Mods and Rockers. The motion received wide publicity, under such headings as "Make The Rockers Dig" and "Hard Labour Plan For The Rowdy Mods".

The exact text was as follows:-

That despite the unceasing efforts of the police and notwithstanding the imposition of heavy fines on offenders or even their being sentenced to periods of detention, Public Holidays continue to be characterized in seaside resorts and other places by disturbances created by bands of so called Mods and Rockers, to the disturbance of residents and visitors, to the diversion of the police from other duties and to the excessive strain upon them and the undoubted detriment of the resorts concerned.

Accordingly this Council Resolves:-

That H.M. Government be urged to take steps to legislate that these offenders might be sentenced to periods of enforced work for the public benefit and to make the necessary arrangements therefore.

It is further resolved:-

That copies of the foregoing resolution be forwarded to the local Members of Parliament, the Association of Municipal Corporations and the British Resorts Association with requests that they give their full support.

The scheme was elaborated in press statements by one of the main signatories of the motion, Alderman F., who had in mind the formation of a Labour Corps, run on similar lines to an Army glasshouse. The youngsters "should be given a short haircut, strict discipline and made to work on the roads or other national projects."

Immediately after the motion was announced, contact was made with Alderman F. who referred me to the other major figure behind the motion, Alderman K., who in the next four months, through letters, discussions and a questionnaire, provided the main source of information about the

group. At the time of the motion being tabled, Alderman K. was Chairman of the Watch Committee. He is also a journalist who for many years had contributed a regular feature on the Bank Holiday for a local newspaper. In this dual capacity, he was often able to quote himself.

The motion was debated two months later, by which time there were 17 signatures. It was carried by a clear majority: approximately 40 in favour and 10 against, with about 20 abstentions (mostly from the minority Labour group). On the basis of the debate (during which verbatim notes were taken) and information from Alderman K., the following appear to be main arguments behind the attempt to achieve normative change.

The main reason for any action would be to put an end to behaviour that was causing Seatown a loss of trade and was damaging its image. The action then, would be purely on the basis of rational self-interest. To some this self-interest involved another dimension: "... our moral obligation to protect and honour the name of Seatown,"⁵⁴ and the problem was perceived on a wider screen (It's Not Only This):

Of course the incidents in Seatown and other places are clear indications of more serious trouble. This is largely concerned with the obvious attitude of some young people that they must be allowed to do exactly as they wish and must not be restrained in any way however annoying their conduct may be to others.⁵⁵

Seaside towns are not for thugs but for good family people who want to enjoy themselves in peace and happiness. But from Blackpool to St. Ives this is not possible today.⁵⁶

The appeal for action was often highly personalized:

If those who oppose the motion had any relative injured by these thugs, they would be taking a different position.⁵⁷

Individual cases were used to support the appeal, as, for example, a story, quoted in the debate by Alderman F., about a honeymoon couple in Seatown being pushed around by a group of thugs; the husband couldn't defend himself

54. Alderman F. (Debate, Seatown Council 23/5/66).

55. Alderman K. (Questionnaire).

56. Alderman F. (Debate).

57. Alderman Miss S. (the new Chairman of the Watch Committee) (Debate).

because of their sheer numbers:

His wife was in tears and he was trembling with rage when he saw me. "Alderman," he said, "I can't tell you what an indignity I've suffered on my honeymoon. A bride of a week and I didn't have the courage to defend her. For the rest of our lives our memories of our honeymoon will be marred by that experience."⁵⁸

The next step was to define the problem in such a way that legislative action was the only suitable solution. The police and courts had not defaulted in their duties, but their weapons were inadequate to deal with an entirely new problem. The novelty of the problem was consistently stressed: the greater numbers and the greater mobility which demanded deterrence on a new scale and, above all, the greater affluence which made fines anachronistic and ineffectual. What was needed was a period of discipline directed to turning out better citizens and, as the only existing institutions which do this - the Detention Centres - were costly and in short supply, something new must be devised. The Labour Camp scheme was the logical answer imposed by this definition of the situation.

In the course of the debate most of the polar arguments against this position were raised: the troublemakers were only a small hard core and one shouldn't be driven into panic measures which might effect the gullible ones who were simply following the crowd; this sort of problem has existed before; all had been done to meet the problem - particularly by the police - and the law properly enforced was enough; the problem was, in fact, already diminishing; the type of legislation proposed would be retrograde, panic legislation "which would put the clock back 100 years" and was "... the thin end of the wedge leading to enforced labour camps",⁵⁹ that if Seatown

58. The use of atrocity stories to legitimate forms of control is, of course, a technique well known to moral entrepreneurs. Becker quotes a story of an entire family being murdered by an addict which was used by the Federal Narcotics Bureau in campaigning for the Marijuana Tax Act. (op.cit., p. 142). Advocates of L.S.D. control similarly use stories of "trippers" walking in front of cars or stepping out of 20 storey windows. See Mandel, op.cit., for a well documented account of the mythical nature of one such story.

59. Councillor G. (Debate).

should do anything, it should be to attract all sections of the community: these youngsters should be welcomed to Seatown so that they could see it as "a place to be looked after, not to give trouble in".⁶⁰ These counter arguments received little support in the debate. The extent to which the motion was supported locally is difficult to gauge in the absence of a reliable measure of public opinion. Alderman F. claimed to have received 108 letters about the plan; only two not in favour. Alderman K. also claimed wide local support:

Apart from this particular issue there is overwhelming support from the local press and the vast majority of those who have written to the Press supporting much stronger action to deal with the grave nuisance of these completely anti-social hooligans. Seatown has no sympathy at all for the modern "head shrinking" approach to this grave problem.

Although such claims might be accurate in regard to the official media of public opinion and the professional moral entrepreneurs, evidence will be discussed later which suggests that public opinion gravitated away from the extremes at both ends, ("Clamp down, keep them out" and "Welcome them") and took up an indeterminate position somewhere between apathy and the punitive extreme. In any event, the proposal left behind little sustained interest either among its formulators or the wider public and was not incorporated in any legislation.

The next action group to be dealt with met with roughly the same fate although it had more immediate impact, was more diverse in its aims and methods and set up a much more formal organizational framework. It is also of particular interest in providing an insight into the characteristics of an exemplary, if extreme, moral entrepreneur. This action group is the "Beachside" Safeguard Committee.

Beachside had experienced the Mods and Rockers disturbances since their earliest beginnings in 1964. The resort was particularly affected in 1965

60. Councillor B. (Debate).

when the usual concern was voiced by Councillors and local newspapers. None of these protests was carried very far though, and it was only after incidents in Easter 1966 that any organized community action was taken. These incidents themselves were not very different from previous Bank Holidays, nor were many more arrests made. The moral enterprise of one individual - "Geoffrey Blake" - was the new element in the situation. Although the following account of the action group draws upon a number of sources, the picture of Blake's own involvement derives entirely from a series of interviews with him during May 1966.

Blake, the proprietor of a small private hotel near the seafront, had long felt that "something should be done". The Easter disturbances were the last straw; during and immediately after the weekend, he discussed his views with a friend, also a hotel owner. He decided that the best thing to do would be to call a public meeting. He had some experience in public relations and knew that this was the best way to get publicity. From the beginning, the campaign was run with a certain professionalism.

Letters were written "on behalf of a group of private citizens" to various public figures and bodies inviting them to a public meeting to try to find "a severe and final deterrent"; people were "being frightened by these ignorant louts". Letters went to the M.P. for Beachside, the Chief Constable, the Town Clerk, the Clerk to the Magistrates and the Secretary of the Beachside Hotel Association. An advert was printed in the local paper calling the public to a meeting to discuss the "scourge of the Mods and Rockers". Blake obtained full national publicity and before the meeting in April four national papers carried stories of the campaign. In the subsequent few weeks he gave two radio and four T.V. interviews, and claimed to have received "about eighty" letters of support and "numerous" phone calls from all over the country. All these sources congratulated him on his action as a public-spirited citizen, offered him various suggestions and wished him good luck "with the cause".

The meeting was attended by some 400 members of the public and about the same number, according to Blake, had to be turned away. No official council representative attended. The meeting's chairman, elected from the floor (Beachside's Conservative M.P. for 15 years until the previous election) said that he was "astonished at what can only be called the virtual boycott of the meeting by leading citizens". Blake attributed the council's boycott to their "typical burying their heads in the sand attitude ... they are right out of touch". More realistically (in view of their subsequent co-operation) the eventual chairman of the Safeguard Committee, Mr. "Hale", attributed the Council's boycott to their antagonism towards Blake's methods.⁶¹ They resented his usurpation of their duties and his implication that they had failed to grasp the urgency of the problem.

The meeting discussed procedural questions, considered what sort of organization should be set up, and listened to concrete suggestions about what to do with the Mods and Rockers. The most favoured suggestion was re-introduction of the birch; other suggestions were: more severe fines, conscription, and stopping the youths before they came into the town. In Blake's words, "it was generally waving the stick at them".

The main outcome of the meeting was the formation of the Safeguard Committee aimed at putting the enterprise on a representative and organized basis. Its brief was to press civic leaders to inform the Home Secretary of the local demand for action: he should be pressed to "restore law and order to this ancient County Borough". The meeting also wanted to deplore the adverse publicity which had blown the matter up. The Committee consisted of some thirty members representing various local organisations such as:- Chamber of Trade; Chamber of Commerce; Hotel and Guest House Association; Licenced Victuallers Association; Hotel and Restaurants

61. Interview (20th May, 1966).

Association; Ratepayers Association; Taxi Association; Motor Coach Association; Townswomen's Guild; Fruiterer's Guild; Newsagents Association; Amusement Parks Association, etc.

The Committee was broken down into a deputation of four under the Chairmanship of Hale, a local businessman. The other members were Blake himself, a representative of the Chamber of Commerce and a representative of the Licenced Victuallers Association (an ex-policeman).

On 17th May, the deputation met a group of Council officials: the Mayor, the Deputy Mayor, the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of the Watch Committee, the Town Clerk, the Deputy Town Clerk and the Chief Constable. The local paper reported that "both sides drew a veil over the talks" ("Beachside Mail" 20/5/66) and no statements were made. Hale confirmed that the meeting was secret, but revealed that the Police and Corporation had given them a sympathetic hearing and had promised co-operation. The deputation in turn had conceded that their methods - particularly in calling a public meeting - were mistaken in appearing to put the Council on trial.⁶² Hints were made that among the plans considered was the use of helicopters to bring reinforcements and the application of strong-arm methods by the police to break up the gangs. Forms were obtained from the Chief Constable for the enrolment of fifty special constables to help the police during the approaching Whitsun weekend.

It is difficult to trace the history of the group beyond this stage. Whitsun was remarkably quiet in Beachside. It is extremely unlikely that this was due to the presence of special constables; the fact was, that there were very few young people present at all to make any trouble.⁶³

62. It is extremely unlikely that Blake himself made this concession; his whole enterprise was based on the perception that the authorities had failed. Hale - although recognizing that without Blake the enterprise would not have started - was highly critical of Blake's methods and motives.

63. During a conversation with Blake over this weekend, he apologised that I had to come down all the way and not seen any trouble. This is another example of the moral entrepreneur's interest in seeing deviance perpetuated to justify his actions.

Enquiries could not establish how many special constables were on duty, if any. If the young people were kept out of town by some other ingenious scheme, this was not generally known and in any event, was either unsuccessful or not used in August when, in fact, there were considerable disturbances in the town. The Committee appears to have disintegrated, leaving behind, though, a fair impact on local opinion and having directly influenced policy at least temporarily. It is possible that the Police and Council would have acted without the Safeguard Committee but the Committee and all the publicity generated by Blake probably precipitated some action.

What sort of individuals are the moving forces behind such action groups? Becker distinguished two species of moral entrepreneurs - rule enforcers (control agents) and rule creators. The prototype of the rule creator is the moral crusader or crusading reformer; he is the man who, with an absolute ethic, sets out to eradicate the evil which disturbs him. Although Becker noted that not all supporters of moral crusades are so pure and single-minded in their motives, he did not describe these other types.

Supporters of the Mods and Rockers action groups may be divided into the genuine crusaders and the pragmatists. The crusader is moved by righteous indignation as well as self interest. Unlike the pragmatist, he sees the action as "a cause" or a "mission" and he sees the enterprise as continuing even after the short term goals are achieved. Indeed, objective evidence means little to him; as Smelser notes of norm-oriented beliefs in general; if evil occurs, it is as predicted, if not, plans were changed because of trickery.⁶⁴ Typically also, the crusader sees beyond the immediate problem and locates it in a much wider context. Although individuals like Alderman K. showed some of these characteristics, it was Geoffrey Blake who clearly exemplified them all.

64. Smelser, op.cit., p. 113.

It is not being claimed that the following profile of Blake - drawn directly from interview notes - is typical of supporters or even crusaders. We have no way of knowing this. At the same time, Blake was "representative" in the sense of personifying so many elements of the belief system about the Mods and Rockers.

Personal Information: Aged 40; working class parents. On leaving school, served an apprenticeship; was active in the Union which he now thinks has "gone to the dogs" since being absorbed into the bigger trade union structure; the unions have got too powerful: "It's another sign of the masses taking over, you lose your sense of identity in the bigger organization". Navy during the war. Interested in music and entered into show business through jobs such as press agent and publicity manager. Eventually managed a famous pop star. Knows "everything about the publicity world" and cynical about it: "there's nothing they won't do to get money. You can give me all this crap about the press and T.V. having a duty to the public, but really there's only one thing they're after and that's a good story to sell". Bought the hotel 2½ years previously because he couldn't stand the pace of life in London; he wanted to slow down. Fond of Beachside and wouldn't go anywhere else in this country but wouldn't mind going to New Zealand or America. Sees himself as a candidate for emigration "because of the way things here are going."

Perception of the Problem: On the surface, he stresses that the protection of commercial interests is his main motive. He claims there is objective evidence for the incidents having effected the town's holiday trade:- one 60-bedroom hotel had only two bookings over Easter, his own bookings went down and he knows of other cancellations. A seafront novelty shop which normally does £1,000 of business, took only £40. People "had been terrorised by the mobs. In my hotel people were staying in the whole day; they were too terrified to move about £4,000 has been lost through cancellations. In the 15 weeks of the peak season, we have about 7,000 people per week down here. It's a family resort and they are the ones who are scared away. Must we lose these thousands of people and our living because of fifteen hundred to three thousand ignorant louts? And if we lose a thousand "innocent" Mods and Rockers, so what? ... What we're trying to do in Beachside is to protect our safety and our town. All traders have to live and this is my home; they are therefore depriving me of my living. This is the most blatant misuse and abuse, what the Trade Unions would regard as the most serious crime possible: depriving a man of his living."

It is clear, though, that Blake had other motives and orientations. "It's not just the commercial questions; it's also a humiliation. I mean that we should have to stand by and not be able to do anything." The problem was not just Beachside's: "It's not just our problem, it's a national problem and that's why I'm willing to give you all the information I can. Perhaps our experience will be able to help others ... These hooligans are not just hooligans in Beachside, they're hooligans at home as well, during the week and not just Bank Holidays." It was not just a question of damage or violence: "... authority was getting into disrespect, it was being blatantly refuted ... this is like a disease running rife, if it goes unchecked, there's no knowing

where it will end ... This is mob rule and it must be brought to heel; you've got to start stemming the flood before it's too late ... We must make some stand."

Individual action had to be taken, because the "powers that be" had failed to see the urgency of the problem. "It's an immediate problem and therefore you have to take immediate steps - it's like road accidents: if you clamp a 15 m.p.h. speed limit everywhere, road deaths will immediately go down, it's as simple as that ... You must look at it like this: there's a break in the dike and therefore you've got an immediate problem: how to stop up the dike. It's just this that the authorities don't see. It's no good sticking your head in the sand and putting across a high moral tone. This might pay off in 10 years' time, but it's no good now. You might be making things better for 1976, but it won't help in 1966. It's not that I don't think of these deeper implications ... It's like a drowning man; he doesn't want to invest in a life boat ... I know that to do your type of research properly it will take ten years to find things out, but what use is that to us now? ... You need an emergency law, something like the Emergency Tax."

How specifically had the official agents failed? "The Council have been blatantly inactive ... They don't want to get their hands dirty. The police could aid us, but if you ask me, the Chief Constables are just concerned with keeping their crime rates down so they don't want many arrests; their heads are in the sand, just like anybody at Whitehall. Do you remember that film "Carlton-Browne of the F.O."? ... they file something away and pretend it doesn't exist ... they didn't even use the reserves over Easter. Mind you, the policemen themselves are doing great jobs, but their hands are tied. They're the ones who wear the handcuffs today, not the criminals ... in the same way as the church has lost its power, so has the policeman."

You've got to have the right line of authority to deal with this sort of thing - ripping up cinema seats. But if the police try to use their authority, you get cries about a 'police state'. This is just crap."

The courts are also found wanting: "There was this case last month of the Recorder commuting a 6 month detention centre sentence to a fine ... and then I heard a rumour that the £50 fine was not allowed because it was too difficult to collect. ... People don't see the need for a radical solution to a radical problem. Look at something like kicking a policeman in the face - you know what the sentence here for that was? A £2 fine."

What sort of solution? Any solution had to be applied urgently and it had to be drastic. "A serious problem demands a serious solution. Many solutions we have suggested have met with the cry about 'protecting citizen's rights'. They say we are taking civil liberty; but what about the terror they strike in others so you can't walk along the front safely? No sane man will attack someone and just beat him into the ground. You have to deal strongly with this lot."

He favours most ideas put forward at the public meeting; above all, any method should effect the offender personally. "Anything that's personal must work. That's why I'm sure that bringing back the birch will work; it must work. Take the Isle of Man; they used the birch when they had this trouble and as far

as I know, none of those thugs ever went back. It's the only way: something personal, something that will hurt. It also doesn't cost the ratepayers much and it's also immediate and decisive and not long drawn out. Look, if you read in the paper "Two boys were birched at "Beachside" today", that's it, isn't it? It's not "Severe fines were imposed following incidents a week ago" which is then followed by an appeal!"

Blake also favoured schemes to exclude the Mods and Rockers from the town in the first place: "Why not stop them before they come in? After all, an Englishman's home is his castle, and we're trying to protect our castle ... I'd like to see them totally banned from Beachside ... It would be quite easy; you just have to station a few policemen on the two bridges and road leading into town. Yes, banning them would be just the job; I wouldn't mind if we had something like the Chateau D'If to send them to."

Another effective means of punishment would be public ridicule: "They should be exposed to public ridicule. This is what the Vicar suggested. He would like to see the pillory used; this would really work. They want to do things in public, therefore they should be ridiculed in public."

Other innovatory ideas were to "... form some groups of citizens to go round inspecting things. If they saw anyone giving trouble, they could jump out of their car and clamp a heavy ball and chain on these thugs' feet, so heavy they couldn't walk. This would soon put a stop to it ... Or you could get hold of a corporation dustcart with a cage, put the thugs into this and drive them around the town."

There were also suggestions to improve law enforcement by the police: "Why was the Unlawful Assembly Law not put into action? A Court could be set up in any public building and the court could then ban these people, take them to the town boundaries. Look it up in "Moriarty's Police Law" - the Riot Act, Unlawful Assembly, Breach of Peace - it's all there ... The police tried to keep them moving, but this isn't enough. They just moved up and down the front terrorising people. Large police patrols with dogs would be just the thing. You see, dogs will bite immediately and you can't argue back to a dog. A bite or two and that's it."

These and other measures should be applied to all the youths involved. "It's all very well talking about getting the ring-leaders, but I don't think this will get you anywhere. O.K. the German thing was caused by their leaders, but first you had to shoot the soldiers, didn't you? Then you get the leaders."

His general viewpoint on punishment is that "The public must know that their wrongs are being judged severely. It's like this dog here; if I tell him to jump down, he knows what will happen to him if he doesn't listen. And the same with my little boy; people do things if there's proper authority behind what they're told."

"You'll always have crime, I know that; people will chance anything, they'll chance their life even. But look at these Great Train Robbery sentences: 30 years; now if somebody's about to steal a 3/6 Post Office book, he'll think about those 30 years before he does anything. Or take the abolition of hanging. You blokes say that you can show statistics to prove that hanging doesn't make any difference; well I don't know if it does good in general. But if it saves 10 out of 200 that's enough, isn't it? ... All the world

is busy turning the other cheek, but there are some things you have to rebuff ... I like the idea of these road gangs in Finland; my brother came back from a holiday there and told me how they get them all on the road gangs; traffic offenders and all. They say there is much less crime there now. Or take Saudi Arabia, where they cut off a hand for theft; that must be effective! ... You see, what the brains of the country are forgetting is what we feel like. They have to try and do something; the government is so damn inactive that they don't care for the people, they don't bear them in mind.

Perception of Causes: Immediate factors were important, for example, the publicity and the influence of the mob: "The mass hysteria gets them; you see bank clerks dressed up as Mods. They do things they wouldn't do by themselves." But there are fundamental, long term causes: "Basically, I think it all stems from boredom: Boredom, plus the affluent society, this is the basic problem. If they had to work they would have no time for all this ... there's too much done for them and therefore they've got time and money on their hands. The automation and everything must make them bored with life; craftsmanship is gone, everything is mass produced. And they just have to switch on the T.V. to be entertained. You've got to keep them away from all sorts of temptation, just like the cows you keep away with electric fences ... What else do they have to do except sign on at the Labour? They don't even have to do it twice a week now. This is a national problem; if Labour gets back again, this country will go to complete economic ruin, and then they'll have to work, won't they? It might be a good thing from this point of view.

"We've got to deal with it severely now, but this doesn't mean that I don't see the roots of the trouble; which is that we've let them down. It's neglect by their parents, that's what it is, a sheer lack of interest. There's no sense of authority any more; at home there's too much familiarity with 'mum' and 'dad' and this leads to contempt of all authority ... There's no respect any more for law and order. It's really a question of the masses taking over. You have some Four Star hotels in Beachside; in the old days you had to be somebody to get in there, now anyone can go, there's no more respect... All this business about giving them a vote at eighteen. What ideas do they have at eighteen? You'll be having a Mod as Prime Minister next. It's mass rule like the masses of the Chinese; it's going to get just the same here with no birth control being used ... There is too much emphasis on the mass; you have all these coloured people coming in here. Well, I don't want to live with them, Japs or anyone else. They've got their own places; Ghana, Palestine, these places have got home rule now, so these people should go back to their origins. But M.P's are too concerned with national issues to see these things; they don't see that people in their own constituencies don't want, for example, to live with immigrants ... The power of the Trade Unions is another thing, they now rule the world; the mass is ruled by the mass ... Public opinion? Well, the way public opinion works is like this: the intelligent people think about something, then the less intelligent, then the even less intelligent, and then the voters! I'm going to live in the jungle if the country goes on like this; we're going back, I'm sure of that. It's nothing but mob rule; the mob is ruling and Trafalgar Square is their rebel headquarters.

When there were troubles after the First World War, people said, 'It's the aftermath of the war' and they've used the same excuse after the last war. But it's been 20 years now, so there must be other causes; though perhaps we're due for another war now ... You can spend 10 years trying to find out these deep causes, but for

us it's an immediate problem; we've got to earn our livelihood.

The picture is clearly not just that of the archetypal crusader, who is fighting for a "cause" and "making a stand". It is a picture that is also familiar to those acquainted with the authoritarian personality syndrome and its correlates: cynicism and destructiveness, authoritarian submission, extreme punitiveness, puritanism, racial prejudice,⁶⁵ projection, fear of the masses. Although it must be repeated that no claim is being made about the representativeness of such attitudes in the official or unofficial control cultures, it is clear that a sociology of law enforcement and creation must, without psychological reductionism, take into account such personality factors and their structural origins.

The question now is how much of the agitation and action group activity permeated through to the legislature, the body to which appeals were ultimately addressed? In the first place, individual M.P's took an immediate interest in disturbances in their own constituencies. Their appeals were similar to those of others in calling for the suprasystem to take over or augment emergency system arrangements. Immediately after Clacton, the M.P. for Harwich, Mr. Julian Ridsdale, urged stiffer penalties and said that he would welcome an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Home Secretary. He assured local traders and hoteliers that their commercial interests would be protected and that the hooliganism wouldn't happen again. He specifically proposed to increase the penalty for malicious damage exceeding £20, to a prison sentence of up to five years. At the same time, the Home Secretary called for reports on the outbreaks and other M.P's made generalized appeals: "Jail These Wild Ones - Call by M.P's" (Daily Mirror, 1/4/64).

65. There is evidence in regard to this attitude that Blake experienced little dissonance between cognition and behaviour; some time after these interviews, he received national publicity again, this time for asking a West Indian guest to leave his hotel. Blake announced that his policy was not to accept coloured or foreign guests. This incident was one of the first of its kind referred to the Race Relations Board and was used as the test case to establish whether anti-discrimination legislation applied to private hotels.

As the events built up, appeals became more specific, more influenced by the belief system, and articulated in a more formalized framework. After Whitsun 1964, full reports from the affected areas were sent to the Home Secretary and arrangements were made for a joint meeting of Chief Constables. A Birmingham M.P. forecast that the wave of hooliganism could become a general election issue and tabled a series of questions, including a suggestion that the police should be given new powers to act against those who incite their companions to violence, without being actually involved themselves. Other M.P.'s announced that they intended calling for a return of corporal punishment for hooliganism. A Brighton M.P., Sir William Teeling, came to London after watching the weekend events to put questions to the Prime Minister. His idea was to revive the type of National Service Act which sent Bevin Boys to work in the mines and other types of national non-military service. There should also be "reconditioning centres" like those run by the Ministry of Labour in the days of pre-war unemployment. The boys could be drafted into building projects, and become the equivalent of the Foreign Legion. If necessary, this labour could be used for building the Channel Tunnel.⁶⁶ Teeling had a private meeting with the Home Secretary, in which plans were proposed to establish police reinforcements in camps on the South Downs during Bank Holiday weekends. Forces ready to move at a moment's notice could be drafted from London. Although this might have occurred without the M.P.'s intervention, this policy was put into practice by the next Bank Holiday.

After the initial events of 1964, the subject of the Mods and Rockers directly or indirectly entered into Parliament in the following sequence:-

31st March: Drugs (Prevention of Misuse) Bill Published.

8th April; House of Lords: Earl of Arran tables resolution calling for the raising of the minimum driving licence age for certain vehicles from 16 to 19. "... in view of the invasion of Clacton by young motor cyclists on Easter Sunday and the consistently heavy casualty rates among the youngest age groups".

66. These ideas, which received wide publicity, may have influenced the Seatown Council Group.

15th April; House of Commons: Mr. Frank Taylor tables resolution "That this House in the light of the deplorable and continual increase in juvenile delinquency and in particular the recent regrettable events in Clacton urges the Secretary for State for Home Department to give urgent and serious consideration to the need for young hooligans to be given such financial and physical punishment as will provide an effective deterrent."

27th April; House of Commons: Two hour debate on Mr. Gurden's motion, "Juvenile Delinquency and Hooliganism."

4th June; House of Commons: "Seaside Resorts (Hooliganism)": Statement by the Home Secretary.

4th June; House of Lords: "Hooliganism and Increased Penalties" (Statement by Home Secretary Read)

23rd June; House of Commons: Malicious Damage Bill, Second Reading.

2nd July; House of Commons: Malicious Damage Bill, Third Reading.

The Drugs (Prevention of Misuse) Bill, was obviously conceived and drafted well before the Clacton event a few days earlier. The Bill, nevertheless, was presented by the mass media as if it were a result of what had happened at Clacton and, moreover, its supporters justified it by employing images from the Mods and Rockers inventory.

Clacton, in fact, provided one of the first big scares about drug use among juveniles. Press headlines such as "Purple Heart Happy Hoodlums" and "Drug Crazy Youths" were fairly common and the effect of these images was shown in the concern expressed that there was a causal connection between pep pills and hooliganism. A local M.P. wrote:-

One of the difficulties was that these young people had taken purple hearts ... there was undoubtedly a man selling purple hearts along the front at the time and it was felt that very strong action should be taken against him.⁶⁷

There was no clear evidence of much drug usage at Clacton; there is even less evidence of any causal connection between hooliganism and the use of amphetamines.⁶⁸ The result of all the publicity, however, was massive

67. Letter from Mr. R., M.P. for "Rockbay" (18/11/64).

68. A research report on the association between amphetamines and general delinquency does in fact quote a case of a boy (with a highly disturbed background) who took large doseages at both the Clacton and Brighton events in 1964. There is no evidence, though, that such a pattern is typical; in any event, the amphetamine users in the research sample were

support for what The Times (31/3/64) called "hastily constructed legislation" and the Economist (4/4/64) "a singularly ill conceived bill". One index of the ineffectiveness of the Bill (which aimed to reduce peddling by increasing the penalties for possession to fines of up to £200 and/or six months in prison) was shown by the fact that in the next three years the amount of drug usage in seaside towns increased rapidly.⁶⁹ There was an apparently random relationship between policy and problem in the sense that a patently ineffective policy was supported, partly at least, for the "wrong" reasons, whereas, when the "right" reasons presented themselves, no policy was forthcoming.

The first actual Parliamentary debate on the Mods and Rockers took place on the 27th April, a month after Clacton. The debate was on a motion, from Mr. Harold Gurden, noting "... with concern the continuing increase in juvenile crime and outbreaks of hooliganism among young people" and calling for more intensive measures to deal with the problem. The context of this motion was clear:

I use the word hooliganism, as implying vandalism in the context of the recent events at Clacton, where, I was glad to learn today, the courts have imposed heavy fines on those concerned.⁷⁰

Extracts have been previously quoted from this two hour debate; nothing in its content suggested that M.P's were in any way immune from absorption of the inventory images. It is interesting, though, to note that, in the course of this long debate, the seaside incidents were only mentioned explicitly five times and the term "Mods and Rockers" not at all. There had not yet been time for the symbolization process to take its full effect. Two months later, during the Second Reading of the Malicious

68. (Continued from overleaf:) not any more likely to have committed violent crimes than the non-users. The authors' conclusion that any relationship between delinquency and drug taking is parallel rather than causative is borne out by observation at the resorts. See P.D. Scott and D.R.C. Willcox, "Delinquency and the Amphetamines," British Journal of Psychiatry, 111, (September 1965), pp. 865 - 875.

69. This increase is evident from the number of drug offences brought before the courts, and from personal observation in clubs in Brighton and discussion with youth workers.

70. Mr. H. Gurden, Hansard (House of Commons), 27th April, 1964, Col. 31.

Damage Bill, the images had crystallized; twelve of the sixteen Members spoke about the seaside resort events and seven specifically referred to "Mods and Rockers". All other symbols were also more sharply drawn.

It was the Home Secretary who, in the first debate, showed some insight into the way the deviance had been exaggerated:

Some of the reports of what happened at Clacton over the Easter weekend were greatly exaggerated ... At Clacton more than 1,000 young people came by one means or another, apparently with little money on them, intending to sleep wherever they could find some form of shelter. The weather was bad over the Easter weekend and there was little or nothing to do. They became bored, tempers flared and a certain amount of fighting broke out. There was⁷¹ nothing like a riot or gang warfare. Clacton was not sacked.

He went on to note that acts of assault, theft or malicious damage were isolated and committed by a small group of individuals. After the Whitsun events, the Home Secretary made a formal statement in response to nine specific questions that had been tabled. The statement again noted that the numbers involved were not large, paid tribute to the work of the police, endorsed the salutary deterrent effect of sharp sentences, and, while rejecting suggestions for giving the courts new powers (confiscation of vehicles, corporal punishment, etc.), proposed to deal with malicious damage.⁷²

The decision to focus on malicious damage is interesting in view of the fact that in the earlier debate, the Home Secretary had specifically stated that the penalties for dealing with vandalism were entirely adequate and he did not see the need for changes in the law. A few weeks later, under the immediate influence of the Whitsun inventory, he announced that he would ask Parliament to widen and strengthen the powers of the courts. The Malicious Damage Bill was introduced soon afterwards, and became effective on 31st July.

71. Mr. H. Brooke, Ibid., Cols. 89 - 90.

72. Mr. H. Brooke, Hansard (House of Commons) 4th June, 1964, Cols. 1249 - 1252.

The effect of this enactment (the Malicious Damage Act, 1964) was to extend the jurisdiction of the magistrates courts and to increase the maximum fine from £20 to £100.⁷³ It was made clear, also, that powers to order compensation were not confined to cases where a fine had already been imposed.

It was clear from the Home Secretary's original statement of intent and the subsequent debate on the Second Reading, that, while the Act was obviously to apply to vandalism in general, it was an emergency measure directed specifically at the Mods and Rockers. As such it may be seen as a normative formalization by the control culture. Firstly, the Act was justified by M.P's and others almost wholly by appeal to the belief system. It would be a severe deterrent against violence and vandalism; it would "... re-establish and reinforce the principle of personal responsibility;"⁷⁴ It recognized the affluence of the potential offenders: "We must not forget that many of these youngsters are the sons and daughters of comparatively well-to-do people. All that is necessary in their case once they are fined is to get their parents to pay the fine so that their little darlings can go free. There is no punishment for these youngsters at all".⁷⁵ Secondly, the measures were exclusively hailed as direct reprisals against the Mods and Rockers: "Brooke Hits Hooligans in the Pocket", "Brooke Rocks the Rockers", "New Move to Stamp Out Mod Violence", etc. The specificity of the Act was shown in Mr. Brooke's own statement: "I hope that, with the help of the House, it (the Act) will be in operation before the August Bank Holiday."⁷⁶

This statement underlines the ritualistic element in the Bill which,

73. For details, see Table 3, Chap. 4.

74. Mr. C. Curran, Hansard (House of Commons) 23rd June, 1964, Col. 1219.

75. Sir W. Teeling, Ibid., Col. 261.

76. Ibid., Col. 242.

even on admission of its supporters, proposed fairly modest changes. In fact, the legislative changes took place in direct response to the demands to the suprasystem for "something to be done - and soon". As the Home Secretary stated:

I want the Bill also to be a reassurance to the long suffering public. They were long-suffering at these holiday places, for many of them had their Whitsun holidays or their Whitsun trade spoiled by these young fools. I want to reassure them by showing them that the Government means business.⁷⁷

This reassurance was a true ritualistic response to deviance in the sense that Cohen intended: "... affirmations and gestures of indignation by means of which one aligns oneself symbolically with the angels, without having to take up cudgels against the devil".⁷⁸ Whatever the "devil" was in the seaside resorts, it was not vandalism. Parliament was not simply being misled by inventory exaggeration of the amount of vandalism; the two Members representing seaside resorts who spoke during the debate, went out of their way to inform the House that in fact there was very little damage done: "In the main the Bill deals only with damage, there was practically no damage done in Brighton"⁷⁹; "I know that Brighton, which is a much bigger place, had all the damage and we had relatively little, with much talk and not very much harm."⁸⁰

The explanation for directing exclusive normative control against what was really putative deviation, lies in the nature of vandalism as the most visible manifestation of the phenomenon and the one most calculated to evoke social condemnation. To align oneself symbolically with the angels, one had to pick on an easy target; the fact that the target hardly existed was irrelevant; it could be, and already had been defined.

In summary, we may conceive of the response of the official control culture to the deviance in question as having been mediated by a belief system and having in turn generated a set of beliefs to rationalize the

77. Ibid.

78. A.K. Cohen, (1959), op.cit., p. 465.

79. Sir W. Teeling, Ibid., col. 259 - 260. 80. Mr. W.Rees Davies, Ibid., Col. 284.

control methods chosen. The methods and beliefs were supplemented by the attempts of unofficial agents to create an exclusive control culture. The whole amalgam of the societal reaction survived its original creation in the form of mythologies and stereotypes. Some control methods, as well, survived after their original need had disappeared and those rules that were created, were of ritualistic value, relating to putative deviation and not evidently effective. The burden of the analysis of the "Impact" period will be to show that the societal reaction did not have the effect that was intended or anticipated, but, in fact, increased or amplified the deviance.

The Exploitative Culture

Without precisely defining what he meant, Lemert drew attention to the phenomenon of deviance exploitation.⁸¹ His examples of the special exploitative culture which surrounds deviants were confined mainly to direct exploitation on the basis of the deviant's marginal status or aspirations to normality. Thus, the physically deformed, the aged, widows, the mentally ill, members of minority groups, ex-convicts, are preyed upon by fraudulent individuals and organizations offering patent medicines, faith cures, youth restorers, skin lighteners and other treatments or services. Not all exploitation is so crude though; there is also what Lemert called "the socioeconomic symbiosis between criminal and non-criminal groups".⁸² This refers to the direct or indirect profit derived from crime by persons such as bankers, criminal lawyers, corrupt policemen, court officials and lawyers involved in 'fixes'. The deviant may also be exploited as an object for amusement; the historical use of hunchbacks as court jesters survives in the contemporary practice of exhibiting those with more bizarre physical deformities at circuses and fairgrounds.

81. Lemert (1951), op.cit., pp. 65 - 68. See also Goffman's discussion of the stigmatized person's proneness to 'victimization'. E. Goffman, (1963), op.cit., p. 9.

82. Lemert, (1951), op.cit., p. 310.

I will categorize all the above types of exploitation to which Lemert and Goffman confine their analysis, as commercial exploitation. There is, however, another type of exploitation illustrated in Erikson's study of the early Puritans' reactions to deviance. This is the use of the deviant, in public communication, to defend or announce an ideology, for example religious or political. This pattern is exploitative in the sense that the deviant is being used for the actor's own ends, without any regard to the consequences of this use on the deviant himself. This will be referred to as ideological exploitation.

The commercial exploitation of the Mods and Rockers is obviously connected with the more general market in teenage consumer goods. While the stereotype of the scheming millionaires who "exploit" innocent teenagers into buying clothes and records against their will is grossly oversimplified, it is nevertheless clear that the market is quick to seize a peg on which to display its products.⁸³ The Mods and Rockers division was ready-made for this, and commercial interests were able to widen this division by exaggerating consumer style differences between the two groups. Special Mod boutiques, dance halls and discoteques were opened, a book was published called "Dances for Mods and Rockers", and in at least one large dance hall in South London, a white painted line was drawn in the middle of the floor to separate the Mods and Rockers. Consumer goods were advertised using the group images; some of the very shops in Brighton which had protested about loss of trade caused by the disturbances were selling "The Latest Mod Sunglasses". Clubs and coffee bars in seaside resorts were advertised as "The Top Mod Spot of the South" or "The Mods' Own Club".

This type of symbiotic relationship between the condemners and the

83. A well known non-commercial salesman, Billy Graham, promised before his 1966 visit to London, to preach on the theme "Mods and Rockers for Christ".

condemned, the "normal" and the "deviant" was shown nowhere more clearly than in the mass media treatment of the Mod-Rocker differences. The Daily Mail quiz "Are You A Mod or Rocker?", published immediately after Clacton, was only the most notorious example of this. The whole inventory phase may be seen as an exploitation or manipulation of symbols by the mass media; even symbols at times must be seen to stand for some real event, person or idea, and if these did not manifest themselves, then they had to be manufactured. Seaside resorts were invariably full of journalists and photographers, waiting for something to happen, and stories, poses and interviews would be extracted from the all too willing performers. One journalist recalls being sent, in response to a cable from an American magazine, to photograph Mods in Piccadilly at 5.00 a.m. on a Sunday morning, only to find a team from Paris Match and a full film unit already on the spot. "Mod hunting", as he remarks, "was at that time a respectable almost crowded subprofession of journalism."⁸⁴ The fact that those who were hunted were willing performers, does not make the pattern any less exploitative; presumably hunchbacks were not always unwilling to perform the jester role. A boy persuaded by a photographer to pose kicking a telephone kiosk, is in a real sense being exploited. It is clear that people who denounce deviance may, at the same time, have a vested interest in seeing deviance perpetuated; at least temporarily, until the phenomenon loses its "sales value".⁸⁵

84. Laurie, op.cit., p. 57.

85. Social scientists are not immune from this sort of involvement with their subject matter. The research worker who, in spite of himself, hopes that the phenomenon will take a particular form in order to prove his theories, is guilty of some sort of "academic exploitation". When the object of study is deviant behaviour, there is an even greater chance of involvement: "Many criminologists have an intense (and perhaps vicarious) personal interest in the criminal exploits of their subjects. Many are intrigued voyeurs of the criminal world." L. Yablonsky, "Experiences with the Criminal Community," in A.W. Gouldner and S.M. Miller (Eds.) Applied Sociology, (New York: Free Press, 1965), p. 71.

Ideological exploitation involves a similar duality in the sense that the exploiter "gains" from his denunciation of deviance and would "lose" if the deviance proved, in fact, to be less real and less of a problem than is functional for his ideology. This type of exploitation occurs as part of the sensitization process as it involves the use of the Mods and Rockers symbols in previously neutral contexts. At annual meetings of Chambers of Commerce, Boy Scout and Air Training Corps ceremonies, school prize-givings, mayoral inaugurations and in numerous other public contexts, the Mods and Rockers symbols were used to make an ideological point. Audiences were told what to do to prevent themselves or others from becoming Mods and Rockers or congratulated on not already being Mods and Rockers. The events and their symbolic connotations were used to justify previous positions or support new ones:

The men in the B.B.C. who feed violence, lust, aimlessness and cynicism into millions of homes nightly must squarely consider their responsibility.⁸⁶ One of the main reasons for what happened is the present Government's attitude to working class adolescents as fair game for blatant exploitation by commercial interests,⁸⁷ "consider now the effect of T.V. violence in relation to happenings at Brighton and Margate and use your great power to help provide an answer.⁸⁸ The true criminals are the maledministrators of this country, an inadequate educational system, lack of decent housing and all the amenities that make a decent citizen. ⁸⁹

Exploitation was often for more specific ends: the President of the National Association of Chief Educational Welfare Officers called for more officers to be recruited: "The matter is urgent if we wish to avoid these Clacton and Brighton affairs spreading into other parts of the country". Similarly, a Marriage Guidance Council called for volunteers to run group discussions for young people. Numerous youth clubs called for more funds

86. Resolution passed at Moral Re-armament Easter Conference, 30th March, 1964.

87. From speech by Mr. F. Willey, Labour Chief Front Bench Spokesman on Education, addressing a meeting of the National Association of Youth Service Officers, 3rd April, 1964.

88. Telegram sent by Women of Britain Clean Up T.V. Campaign to Director General of B.B.C., June 1964.

89. Letter to Tribune, April 10th, 1964.

to build up facilities which would prevent the Mods and Rockers "disease" from spreading. All such appeals, which, of course, negatively polarized the Mods and Rockers even further, were made in terms of interest group perspectives (particularly useful for political parties as 1964 was election year). The fact that the deviance was reacted to in terms of such perspectives, and that the Mods and Rockers were all things to all people, was shown in those situations where the Mods and Rockers were not, in fact, denounced, but actually welcomed for ideological reasons. So, for example, some of the Provos and members of the Destruction in Art movement hailed the Mods and Rockers as the avant-garde of the anarchist revolution. On his arrival in London, the Provo leader, Berrnard de Vries, was optimistic about the spread of the movement in Britain and was sure that if the Mods and Rockers were given opportunities for demonstrations and happenings, they would turn pacifist.⁹⁰

Like other aspects of the societal reaction, the exploitative culture both reflects and - as will be suggested - creates the amplification of deviance.

90. Times 23/6/66. See also M. Wardron, "Class, Anarchism and the Capitalist Mentality," Anarchy, 68 (October 1966), pp. 301 - 304, who includes the Mods and Rockers in a list of strugglers against authority such as the pacifist movement, Oxfam, the campaign against the destruction of wild life, the Welsh Nationalists and the I.R.A.

CHAPTER 16WARNING AND IMPACTThe Warning Phase

For very obvious reasons, disaster researchers have devoted considerable attention to studying the warning phase; reactions to warnings are of crucial significance in determining the effect of the disaster. Research has concentrated on the stages in the psychological reaction to threat, paying particular attention to the defence and coping mechanisms which inhibit a realistic assessment of the approaching disaster.¹ The culmination of a sequence involving recognition and validation of the appropriate cues, emotional responses such as fear and anxiety and a definition of the alternative actions available in the situation, may be disbelief or distortion (the danger will occur later than expected, it will be worse elsewhere). The final outcome of the reaction depends on familiarity with similar situations and factors such as anxiety level or "set".²

Parallel factors operated in the warning before each Mods and Rockers event. A crucial difference, though, was that very few of the factors tending to produce denial, disbelief, defence and other end-products described in disaster research, operated. While there was no warning to the initial Clacton event, the inventory build up and reaction to this and subsequent events was such that the widely disseminated warnings and threats were generally believed. Few were predisposed to erect the elaborate defence mechanisms that are used, for example, to discount the

-
1. See, for example, I.L. Janis, "Psychological Effects of Warning," in Baker and Chapman, op.cit., pp. 55 - 92; S.B. Withey, "Reactions to Uncertain Threat," Ibid., pp. 93 - 123; and "Sequential Accommodations to Threat," in Grosser et al, op.cit., pp. 105 - 114.
 2. "If a person is 'set' to expect a disaster, a minor suggestion will raise the probabilities of occurrence in his mind considerably so that reaction to the disaster, whether it is imminent or not, is precipitated." Withey, in Baker and Chapman, op.cit., p. 114.

possibility of nuclear warfare. The inventory, particularly the prediction factor, was crucial in building up a reaction to deviance identical to the sensitization which occurs in an "effective" disaster warning:

If a threat cannot be denied, there is likely to be an increased sensitization to the danger, so that cues to danger result in overreaction and emotional and sometimes precipitous behaviour. Where threat cannot be discounted, aggressive and projective behaviours begin to develop and scapegoating, polarising of antagonists, and other hate and fear situations are generated.³

The analogy between the warning phase of a natural disaster and a situation close to the Mods and Rockers disturbances is also used by Thompson in his description of the tension in a resort prior to an expected Hells Angels invasion: "As the weekend began, the atmosphere at Bass Lake was reminiscent of a Kansas hamlet preparing for a tornado."⁴

While factors described by Withey could be observed throughout the whole sequence of the reaction to the Mods and Rockers, they were condensed and concentrated before each single event. Having already described the sensitization process in general, we will now note two characteristics of the warning phase as it developed. The first is the tendency for the warning system to become more complicated and formalized and to start earlier; the second is the increasingly unreal and ritualistic nature of the system as evidenced by the number of false alarms and warnings out of proportion to the imminent threat.

Initially, the warning system operated only locally and was confined to certain seaside resorts on the South Coast. Although there was nothing intrinsic in the Clacton event to expect that it would be repeated, the way it was reacted to, made the threat of a repeat performance very real to the other resorts. It needed only one interview with a Rocker who said, "Next time Brighton will get it" to increase the threat. The

3. Withey, in Grosser et al, op.cit., p. 112.

4. Thompson, op.cit., p. 112.

atmosphere of expectation and apprehension before the Bank Holiday immediately after Clacton, can be gauged from the local press.

A few days before Whitsun, a Brighton paper carried a story headed: "Rioting Rockers Plan Raid on Brighton Soon" (Evening Argus 13/5/64).

It was claimed that a number of seaside towns had been warned by letter and anonymous phonecalls that they would be targets for the next Mods and Rockers "invasion". Details were given of police preparation ("we will crack down on them immediately") and on the Saturday, there was another report "Seaside Towns Ready for Trouble" in which it was disclosed that police leave had been cancelled in Brighton, Eastbourne and other resorts. At about the same time an editorial in another Brighton paper (Brighton and Hove Gazette 15/5/64) carried a warning about "... the riot raising rockers who, rumour has it, have it in mind to do a Clacton on Brighton". In case the action properties of this warning cue had not been assimilated by the public, readers were urged: "... if they see signs of a 'little Clacton' brewing, they should give the police their active support in reporting it." This type of warning is equivalent to inhabitants of a flood area being told to evacuate when sirens sound; the difference is that their evacuation would be functional in reducing the effects of the disaster, while the Brighton inhabitants sensitized to report signs of a 'little Clacton' would, in fact, be "creating" deviance in the original sense of transactionalism.

Warnings in Margate at that time were more specific as there had been minor incidents there over Easter. The build-up in the Isle of Thanet Gazette in April and May, with articles such as "Put Them in The Stocks", and stories of local vigilantes, leaves little doubt that the Mods and Rockers were expected. As early as April 3rd, an editorial noted that the Easter hooliganism "... can be construed as a foretaste of the type of behaviour which will be rife on our seafronts during the coming holiday season, unless swift and effective action is taken right now ..."

After the second wave of incidents confirmed expectations, warnings became articulated at a much broader level. The national press and other sources of public opinion made it clear that the Mods and Rockers were now an institutionalized threat to seaside resorts. Symbolization made the cues for recognizing incipient deviance ("little Clactons") much easier to pick up. Warnings were sounded earlier and the threat was expressed in terms of certainty and not probability. So, by August 1965, the Evening Standard (27/8/65) carried a prominent report describing police preparations and quoted a police spokesman about leave being cancelled "... as a precaution against the usual riots between rival teenage gangs" (emphasis added).

As the societal control culture moved towards diffusion, escalation and innovation, so did the warning system become more formalized and bureaucratized. Shortly before August Bank Holiday, 1964, the Home Office Airborne Police Scheme to fly reinforcements in R.A.F. Transport Command, was publicized. The local paper, in a report headed "Town is Ready for All Comers" announced that besides elaborate police preparations, special arrangements had been made to open the Town Hall courtroom over the weekend. (Hastings and St. Leonards Observer 1/4/65). These were not only warnings, but stage-setting ceremonies.

Certain Chief Constables institutionalized the practice of formal press conferences to explain preparations. Elaborate plans were made well in advance and national institutions such as the Home Office began to take a co-ordinating role. These "secret" plans were judiciously leaked well before the expected event ostensibly to warn the Mods and Rockers what was in store for them, but also to re-assure the public that something was being done. A week before Easter 1965, the Sunday Telegraph (11/4/65) carried a detailed report of a Home Office conference a week previously, attended by the Commissioner of Police and Chief Constables from all forces in Southern England which might be affected. At the same time, in Clacton arrangements were made to station a squad on the main road junction on the

outskirts of the town to transmit warnings to a seafront patrol equipped with walkie-talkie sets. In 1966, an even more sophisticated warning system was set up. The Chief Constable of Hastings revealed at a conference of senior police officers at Leicester University that a secret network of plain clothes police and informers were operating in clubs and coffee bars.⁵ Agents who had infiltrated the ranks of Mods were passing information direct to Scotland Yard and had apparently noticed a sinister development - the rise of self-appointed mob leaders. According to the Chief Constable, danger signs of this advanced planning could have been noticed well in advance at football riots and the organized interruption of political meetings during the General Election. The police now had their own early warning system to detect such signs; "These people will not be able to get together without our knowing something about it beforehand."⁶

As in the cases of mass delusion described previously, the situation was ambiguous enough to allow for a number of false alarms to occur. Unfulfilled expectations, however, did not lead to a breakdown in the warning system or the erection of psychological defences against threat; if things did not happen, this could be explained in terms of the effectiveness of the deterrent ("they know we won't stand for them in X") or a change in the invasion plan. When public interest in the Mods and Rockers died down, and there was consequently less need for such rationalizations, the warnings became less publicized - despite the fact that the behaviour itself had not considerably changed its pattern. The deviance was now a regular occurrence, so there was no need for formal warnings. One merely had to consult a calendar to find out the date of

5. See report in Daily Mirror (31/3/66): "Spies Warn the Yard of Mods on the Warpath."

6. See Withey's remarks about "overreaction" and emotional behaviour. One might speculate that such fantasies about planning (cabalism) and spies infiltrating coffee bars, provided control agents with a satisfaction analogous to gang leaders' fantasies about gang life.

the next ceremony.

The Impact

We come now to a crucial stage in the sequence; the effect of the reaction on the behaviour itself. In the original transactional model, the immediate dependent variable is not in fact "behaviour" but the actor's self image. The present study does not directly look at this variable (by using, for example, a self-concept test). With certain impressionistic exceptions, we are limited to using the overt behaviour as the dependent variable and assuming that this behaviour is consonant with the actor's self image. Given the design of the study, the analysis throughout this section is tentative; the explanations are offered as guidelines which appear to make sense of the data.

The Crowd and the Setting

It is necessary to begin with a description of the atmosphere during the impact phase of a typical incident. It should be noted firstly that the young people present constituted a crowd or series of interlocking crowds rather than a group (or gang) or even less, two highly structured opposing groups (or gangs). If one were to use, for example, Yablonsky's organizational continuum,⁷ the Mods and Rockers would fall - together with collectivities such as youth riots and lynch mobs - at the least defined end. The crowds on the beaches were very far removed from the image of cohesive groups presented in the inventory, and even less defined than "near groups" which fall midway on the mob-group continuum. Leadership was more spontaneous, actions and emotions were more momentary and less premeditated, organization was weaker and goals were less clearly defined than most descriptions of the incidents lead one to believe. Moreover, the crowds could not even be characterized by the stereotypical picture of crowd or mob mentality perpetuated by Le Bon's original descriptions. There was little of the initial psychological homogeneity which is supposed to characterize crowds; this developed only through continued interaction

7. Yablonsky, (1962), op.cit., p. 229.

and even at the height of crowd activity, there was differential participation. Some "members" became leaders only to be eclipsed when the situational demands changed, some were active participants, most were just onlookers. This was not the active collectivity of Le Bon's revolutionary mobs or Roper's lynch mobs, but was, on the whole, a passive and uncertain crowd waiting to be entertained.

To this description one must add an understanding of the situation in which the crowds found themselves at the resorts; this corresponds closely to the generalizations about riots and disturbances in connection with sporting and recreational events reviewed by Shellow and Roemer: an influx of outsiders into a small town or amusement centre and their high visibility in terms of interest, age group and overt symbols such as dress.⁸ For a large proportion of working class adolescents, the Bank Holiday weekend at the sea is a ritualistic pattern of behaviour and anyone who has taken part in the ritual would intuitively understand Laurie's remark that: "... perhaps it is not taking things too far to look for an explanation (of the Mods and Rockers disturbances) in the character of the British weekend at the sea."⁹ Any awareness of such situational factors, makes explanations of the "mobs hell bent for destruction" type seem increasingly irrelevant.

The most striking characteristic of the majority of young people coming down was their sense of drifting aimlessness and their lack of any specific plan; in this respect they were not different from most adults on holiday. Although the attribution of boredom is often a value judgment, resorted to by the outside observer who finds the behaviour of others dull and uninteresting, I am convinced from observation on the Weekend Project and other participation, that the overwhelming sensation present was boredom. This was often articulated, as, for example, in the following

8. Shellow and Roemer, op.cit., p. 22.

9. Laurie, op.cit., p. 131.

conversation overheard between two fifteen-year-old girls sitting huddled together on a windswept Brighton beach. It conveys something of the atmosphere of aimlessness and ennui so characteristic of the situation:

First Girl: What's the time?

Second Girl: Three o'clock.

First: Blimey, we don't have to sit around here another three hours do we?

Second: We could get a train before.

First: Well, but you never know.

(Notes, Easter Sunday, 1966)

Similarly, a user of the Weekend Project was heard to say, only half-jokingly to one of the volunteers, "Well, we're bored at home so it's a change to come down here and be bored at Brighton." Such statements make sense in terms of the discontinuities in leisure values stressed in Downes' type of subcultural theory. This boredom was accompanied, though, by the perpetual hope (which, under the impact of the inventory and the subsequent societal reaction, became a more conscious expectation) that something would happen; after all, "you never know". A conversation with a Weekend Project volunteer who had misinterpreted the situation from his own middle class perspective, conveys the dominant mood:

Volunteer: Was Brighton what you expected?

15 Year Old Mod: Well, I didn't expect anything, I don't think.

Volunteer: No?

Mod: Well, you know, I just thought I'd see what was happening, and if things turned out right, then we'd have a ball, wouldn't we?

It is clear in the context that for "things to turn out right" would mean that there would be trouble or excitement, as defined by fights between Mods and Rockers, baiting of the police, throwing girls into the sea, "buying up some pills", or "finding a bird". If these things happened, one could "have a ball"; there was no specific plan in coming

down other than to take part in or (more likely) to watch any sign of fun. Only a quarter of the Barker-Little sample admitted to going down to Margate expecting trouble. It is significant though, that all of them expected trouble at the subsequent weekend's gathering: as trouble became defined as institutionalized, the hope that something would happen became a definite expectancy.

The inventory reporting can be seen as having a reinforcing effect on an already existing predisposition to expect and look forward to trouble. Constant repetition of the violence and vandalism images and reports about preparations for the next "invasion" generated an atmosphere in which something had to happen. With the exception of those "trouble-makers" who, like Matza's positivist delinquents, actually did correspond to their stereotype, the young people coming down constituted a massive audience. Usually this was an audience at a non-event, but the non-event had to be made into an event in order to justify the journey and the pre-definitions of what the situation would be. Whatever little initial homogeneity there was in the crowd, could be attributed to this expectancy factor, as reinforced by the societal reaction. A group of boys walking down the beach could get caught up in a nexus of mutual misunderstandings; ego thinking that alter will perform a certain role and expect the same of him, while at the same time alter perceives ego in identical terms and both perceive that the publically defined situation was making demands of them.¹⁰ Once a dominant perception is established the tendency is to assimilate all subsequent happenings to it. It is in this context that one must view the relatively trivial incidents which attracted attention and

10. This type of formulation owes much to the writings of R.D. Laing: see especially R.D. Laing et al, Interpersonal Perception (London: Tavistock 1966), Chap. 3. The possibility of such multiple misinterpretations in regard to gang delinquency is also suggested by Matza: The idea of a commitment to delinquency is a misconception both of delinquents and the sociologists who study them: "Instead there is a system of shared misunderstandings, based on miscues, which leads delinquents to believe that all others situated in their company are committed to their misdeeds." (Matza, op.cit., p. 59.)

sometimes triggered off trouble. Through the process of sensitization, incidents which would not have been defined as unusual or worthy of attention during a normal Bank Holiday weekend, acquired a new meaning:

Two boys stopped to watch a very drunk old tramp dancing about on the beach. They started throwing pennies at his feet. Within 45 seconds there were at least 100 people gathered round and in 60 seconds the police were there. I turned my back on the crowd to watch the spectators gathering on the promenade above and by the time I turned back, two policemen were leading a boy away from the crowd. (Notes, Brighton, Easter, 1965)

Other similar precipitating, or potentially precipitating, incidents were road accidents, a Roker walking past a group of Mods, a group of youths being refused service in a bar or cafe and scooter riders being stopped to produce their licences. Where these incidents did not occur "naturally" they had to be created. Even though malice or damage might have been the end result, the initial step in the process was less likely to be organized malice than, in Matza and Sykes' term, "manufactured excitement". Boys, usually the younger ones, could be observed self-consciously and deliberately trying to attract attention with ploys such as throwing stones at a paper policeman's helmet floating on the sea, ducking girls into the water, ganging up to bump someone on the dodgem cars or riding on the children's merry-go-round.

The air of expectancy thus generated can be conceptualized in terms of the "milling process"¹¹ characteristic of crowds gathering around a road accident or similar event. This refers not only to the restless, excited physical movement, but the process of communication in which individuals try to restructure an ambiguous situation by seeking cues in the reaction of others. It is this type of restructuring which marks the next crucial stage in the impact, for without it, a concentrated and even excited crowd would have soon disintegrated. A socially sanctioned meaning was given to the situation by seeing others act and through the

11. The term originally used by Park and Burgess; for an analysis of milling and other forms of social contagion see Turner and Killian, op.cit., pp. 58 - 62.

development of rumours (which are themselves a form of milling).¹² As a consequence of milling, individuals become more sensitized to each other and some sort of common emotional tone develops, mediated by the type of circular reinforcement described earlier. A shared definition eventually emerges about what is happening.

The content of this emergent situational definition owes a great deal to the societal reaction. The mass media provided the images and stereotypes with which ambiguous situations could be restructured; so a stone-throwing incident might not have progressed beyond the milling stage if there were no readily available collective images to give meaning to the activity. These images provide the basis for rumours about "random" events; so, an incident in which a girl was carried on a stretcher to an ambulance was variously explained by the crowd gathering round as "this bloke with her must have knifed her", "too many pills if you ask me", "these Rockers birds just drink all the time".

Different versions of such events are circulated and eventually assimilated into one theme that receives collective sanction.¹³ Each link in the chain of assimilation involves preconceptions derived from sources such as the mass media; without publicity about "stabbings on the beach" or "drug orgies" the rumours about the girl being carried to the ambulance would have assumed an entirely different form.

The form and content of the rumours are important because they serve to validate a particular course of action: the deviant, as well as the control agent, uses collective imagery (which may be objectively false) to justify action. This type of process is paralleled in the genesis of other types of violent outbreaks such as race riots. The sequence includes:

12. Ibid., p. 60.

13. This formulation of the spread of rumours is derived from the standard analysis in G. Allport and L. Postman, The Psychology of Rumour, (New York: Henry Holt, 1947).

(i) murmurs of unrest before the outbreak; (ii) the spread of specifically threatening rumours ("something is going to happen tonight"); (iii) the precipitating spark (which may itself be an inflammatory rumour, for example, of police brutality) and (iv) fantastic rumours spread during the disturbance, for example, of murder by the other side; these are used to justify violence.

The following are examples of these four types of rumours during the impact phase; in each case the imagery is partially, at least, derived from mass communication sources: (i) "I heard a bloke say the cops at Southend are really getting tough this Easter"; (ii) "There's going to be trouble on the pier tonight when these Rockers get there"; (iii) "Let's go - there's a big fight at the station"; (iv) "There were thirty of them beating up one of our blokes." In Clacton, the specific rumours circulating were those alleging hostility from the "other side": in this case, local residents. There was a story of a group being refused breakfast at a cafe, and another about an old woman stopping three boys in the street and shouting abuse at them about their clothes. In later incidents, numerous rumours spread to reinforce the Mods-Rockers barrier ("The Mods are wearing lipstick this time", "you can smell the grease on those Rockers; they never wash.") Later on, stories of police brutality and intimidation were particularly common; ("The beat this bloke up in the cells"). One legend current in Brighton in Easter 1965, was about a drunken policeman brawling with some boys in a cafe; they didn't know that he was a policeman and when he was getting the worst of the fight he screamed a "signal" and his friends arrived to arrest most of the boys there.

The truth of such rumours is not at issue: the point is that they can be traced to certain elements in the societal reaction and they serve both to validate a mood and course of action, and to solidify a diverse

crowd into a homogeneous mob.¹⁴ The rapidly fluctuating content of the rumours also illustrates a significant aspect of the Mods and Rockers phenomenon: the way in which the targets chosen for hostile action changed under the impact of the belief system. In the first place, if, during any one event, an object of hostility became inaccessible, or rumours were spread of new targets, a satisfactory substitute would be accepted.¹⁵ If there were no Rockers in sight, the Mods would quite happily turn on the Beatniks; in the course of one morning, the target could rapidly change from Rockers, to Beatniks, to Police, depending on the mood of the crowd, rumours of victimization or actual police interference. In the second place, the dominant target throughout the whole sequence changed: in Clacton, the enemy was Clacton (the shopkeepers, the weather, the lack of facilities); in Margate and Brighton, at Whitsun, (under the impact of the warring gangs image), the enemy was the Rockers; later on (under the impact of the control culture), the enemy became the police.

Implicit in the analysis so far is a recognition of the importance of symbolization. This process provided a short-circuited definition of the situation whereby deviants and control agents used culturally sanctioned signs and symbols to justify or validate perceptions or actions. The inventory symbols prepared the crowd for action because shared images and objects contribute to uniform action: if a dance hall becomes defined as "The Top Mod Spot of the South", then the defence of it against invading Rockers takes on a symbolic significance. Symbols also create a sense of group cohesion. Wilkins suggests that the easy identification of the dress symbols adopted by the post-1955 "delinquent generation" made it easier for persons outside the minority group to apply negative sanctions and increased

14. The solidification process will be discussed in detail later; see Yablonsky (1962), op.cit., for numerous examples of how gang fantasies unwittingly reinforced by control agents and the public, become real and structured in the process of interaction.

15. See Turner and Killian, op.cit., pp. 132 - 142, for a discussion of the phenomenon of "crowd change".

identification and solidarity within the group.¹⁶ In the rapidly shifting crowd situation and the heightened emotional atmosphere, the slightest cue or sign could become a symbol. The following are examples of symbolization and sensitization during the impact period:-

A young journalist, who was trying to get into the Margate courtroom, was shown to the cells instead of the Press Bench because he had fairly long hair and was wearing jeans. "You look just like them", he was told.

(Interview with P.B. 19/11/64)

Wearing a white shirt and tie with a conventional sportscoat I was walking with a group of Mods down the promenade which had temporarily been made a "one-way". After we were moved along by the police, I turned round and together with a number of others started walking back the wrong way. Although I was pushed once, the police were not as abusive to me as to the others; the boys on either side of me were bodily turned around and pushed in the other direction.

(Notes, Brighton, Easter 1965)

Wearing a pair of old jeans and an army-type anorak, I had a hamburger and a cup of tea in a cafe. Not having any change, I gave the waitress a £5 note and being in a hurry started walking towards the cash desk. I heard the manager angrily say, "Hasn't he got anything else?" but as soon as he saw me approaching he smiled nervously and said, "Oh, I was going to argue until I saw you."

(Notes, Brighton^{ew}, Easter 1966)

A boy accidentally fell to his death over the cliffs at Saltdean (Brighton) during the night. When his friends woke up and missed him, one went across to the houses on the other side of the road to phone the police, "But", he told a reporter, "they wouldn't open their doors at first. They thought we were out for trouble; you know what it is."

(Evening Argus 18/5/64)

The present account of crowd behaviour fits in well with Smelser's analysis of the development of hostile beliefs and hostile outbursts.¹⁷

No form of collective behaviour can take place without a belief system preparing the participants for action. The hostile belief is a necessary precondition for outbursts of rioting or scapegoating; the participants could be seen as being in an ambiguous situation in which the circulation of hostile rumours and negative stereotypes led one group

16. Wilkins, (1964), op.cit. See also Cohen and Rock, op.cit.

17. Smelser, op.cit., pp. 101 - 109; 247 - 260. See Turner and Surace, op.cit., for an account of a similar type of hostile outburst in which the spread of negative symbolization was particularly significant.

to attribute generalized evil to another. These culturally derived beliefs are, of course, not causative without the other preconditions being present; structural conduciveness, strain, etc.. To the extent, though, that the beliefs following Event A can be shown to contribute to the course taken by Event B, one link in the amplification model is established.

The Audience

A more direct influence on the behaviour than the belief system was the presence of spectators during the impact period. If the mass media can be said to have created a metaphorical audience, one may also talk of a literal audience: the adults who lined the beaches and promenades to watch the battle being enacted before them. As early as Whitsun 1964, one local paper (Brighton and Hove Herald 23/5/64) carried a photo of a man in a crowd of boys swinging deckchairs, holding his child above his head to get a better view of the proceedings. Crowds of adults were always conspicuous at each stage of an event; milling around any sign of potential excitement, watching fights, making a path through which arrested boys could be bundled into the police van, crowding the public benches of the courts. If it cannot be said that they came down deliberately to watch the Mods and Rockers, they certainly - at least when the phenomenon reached its peak - regarded the troubles as part of the scene, and were subject to the same hope and expectancy as the boys and girls themselves, that something would happen. The happenings were eagerly sought after and followed. When the events tailed off in 1966 and there was little of a show to be seen, the gaping spectators were even more noticeable. Old hands could be seen pointing out the scene of previous campaigns ("You should have seen it last year, love", "Remember they were throwing all those deck chairs from up there?")

It is difficult to generalize about the motives which brought the spectators to the scene. The simplest explanation is that they came because there was nothing else to do or else - when the young people were

present in such great numbers that they occupied much of the available space - because they were forced to watch. One did not get the impression, though, that there were many unwilling spectators. Sheer curiosity accounted for a large element of the motivation. This is analagous to the phenomenon of "mass convergence" observed in disaster studies: the public flock to the scene of the disaster not so much to help but to stare compulsively at the damage and rescue work. One might, in addition, speculate along conventional psychoanalytical lines, that the adults watching in fascinated horror were gaining some vicarious satisfaction from the sight of aggressive or sexually suggestive behaviour. This type of psychological reductionism, although plausible, is difficult to prove.

A more convincing sociological explanation might be that the Mods and Rockers events were viewed as a ceremony. This was a modern morality play,¹⁸ in which good (the police and the courts) met evil (the aggressive delinquent). Like all morality plays - or bull fights, which the atmosphere often resembled - there was little doubt about which side would win. This type of morality image was sedulously cultivated by the mass media in the interest of consensus, and the audience reaction showed that the image was absorbed. The passive fascination (which might correspond to the psychoanalytical "vicarious satisfaction" and the aficionado's admiration for the brave bull) was livened only when the forces of good triumphed. On a number of occasions spectators were observed cheering the police when they made an arrest and when boys were bundled into a police van, the type of remark one heard was, "that'll teach them a lesson", or "put them in Lewes for a few nights, that'll show them". In the courts there was applause from the public benches when the Chairman praised the police.

18. The Birmingham Research Group use a similar metaphor to describe police confrontations with football hooligans: "... spectators seemed to adopt the attitude that the scenes were comparable to those shown at old fashioned music halls where villains and heroes were booed and cheered in a ritualised manner" (op.cit., p. 37). The situations, though, had one central difference: at football matches it was often the police who were the villains, at the resorts, it was always the Mods and Rockers.

Whatever the reason for the spectators' presence and involvement, it is more important in terms of our model to observe their effect on the behaviour during the impact, remembering that just about everyone present - including the Mods and Rockers - played the spectator role at one time or another. One direct effect of the numbers of spectators was, in fact, to hinder the police in performing their duties of crowd control. The more important effect of the audience, though, was more subtle in that its very presence provided an encouragement to deviance. The audience is part of the crowd, and even if it may disapprove, it makes the crowd larger numerically and increases the expression of strength and support for what is being done. Turner and Killian quote the Southern Commission on the Study of Lynchings to show that the spectators often constituted a source of protection for the very elements of which they might disapprove.¹⁹ In the presence of an audience, the more active members of the crowd become committed to a line of action, because to back down would be to lose face. A passive audience may also have unwittingly contributed to creating what F.H. Allport originally termed "the impression of universality" whereby the mob member loses some responsibility through assuming that "everybody is doing it". Exaggeration of the numbers involved, only heightens this effect.

In the case of violence, as Westley suggests,²⁰ the presence of others leads to a direct escalation. In each type of violence he analyses - by mob members, concentration camp guards, the police - the violators have a symbiotic relationship to a supportive audience. The police, because of public support for the use of violence against criminals and other non-persons such as the insane, can use an audience to legitimate illegal forms

19. Turner and Killian, op.cit., p. 118. For a more extended discussion of the audience as a form of collective behaviour see R. Brown, "Mass Phenomena," in G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, (Cambridge, Mass: Addison Wesley, 1954).

20. W. Westley, "The Escalation of Violence Through Legitimation", Annals, 364 (March 1966), pp. 120 - 126.

of violence.²¹ Escalation occurs when there is a combination of a group willing to use violence and an audience to which it plays and will encourage it and give it moral support. For the young people, the presence of crowds and cameras might have decreased inhibitions about provoking the police. They were "one-up" in a situation which called for some restraint on the part of the police and they knew that the police image would suffer if unnecessary violence was observed by the audience.

The Mass Media

We are now in the position to analyse the more explicit role of the mass media, which, as we have seen, operated from the outset in reinforcing and giving shape to the crowds' sense of expectancy and in providing the content of rumours and shared definitions with which ambiguous situations were restructured. Although popular commentators on the Mods and Rockers often blamed "publicity" for what happened (and newspapers responded with indignant editorials about their "duty" to publish the "facts"), the term "publicity" was used in a somewhat restricted sense. It either referred to the publicity immediately before the event (during the warning phase), which advertised the disturbances and pinpointed the resorts where they would take place, or to the supposed gratification young people derived from the exposure to publicity during the event.

The first of these factors presumably operated in the gross sense of publicizing the event in such a way that it might look attractive, but it is unlikely to have directly influenced the choice of target: asked where they got the idea from (of going to Margate), 82.3% of the Barker-Little sample mentioned friends as their source, only 2.9% mentioned newspapers and 2.9% television. The media more likely reinforced rather than initiated rumours already current. There were certain exceptions, though, where during the weekend a sensational report or T.V. interview might have directly attracted new crowds. One notorious B.B.C. interview in which

21. Ibid., p. 125.

two Rockers said that reinforcements would be arriving, was followed by a sudden influx of both Mods and Rockers, large numbers of whom might have been attracted by the excitement the interview promised.

There were also signs of direct publicity-seeking behaviour in the sense that on-the-spot attention from journalists, reporters and photographers was a stimulus to action. The following account is by one of the boys in the Barker-Little sample:-

By the railway station a cameraman asked, "Give us a wave". So me and a group ran about and waved some flags we bought. My picture was in the paper. We were pleased; anybody would be.

If one is in a group of twenty, being stared at by hundreds of adults and being pointed at by two or three cameras, the temptation to do something - even if only to shout an obscenity, make a rude gesture or throw a stone - is very great and made greater by the knowledge that one's actions will be recorded for others to see.²² Observation at a newspaper kiosk in Brighton showed young people buying up every edition of the evening papers as they appeared and scanning them for news of the disturbances.

The cumulative effects of the mass media, though, were at the same time more subtle and more potent than simply giving the events pre-publicity or gratifying the participants' psychological needs for attention. Through a complex process that is not yet fully understood by students of mass communication, the mere reporting of one event has, under certain circumstances, the effect of triggering off events of a similar order. This effect is much easier to understand and is better documented in regard to the spread of crazes, fashions, fads and other forms of collective behaviour, such as mass delusion or hysteria, than in the case

22. As noted when discussing the sources of inventory distortion, there is also a tendency for the participant in such situations to exaggerate the extent of his involvement. Yablonsky notes that during a conversation with gang boys "My presence, rather than inhibiting them, seemed to expand their discussion, as I felt they were observing my reaction." op.cit., (1962), p. 48.

of deviance. Yet there are forms of deviant behaviour where this triggering-off effect is visible and might be a plausible causative factor, and a vital strand in the deviance amplification sequence. A particularly vivid example is the spread in the use of self-immolation as a form of suicide following the report in 1963 of a Vietnamese monk burning himself to death as an act of political protest. This is a form of suicide almost completely unknown in the West; in the period 1960 - 1963, there was only one such case in England, yet in 1963, there were 3 and in 1964, 9. A similar progression in numbers occurred in America.²³ In this case, the contagious or imitative effect was in the technique rather than the motivation behind the act. Cases where the motive as well as the technique is stimulated by mass communication, might be the spread of prison riots, prison escapes and racial and political riots. A particularly well documented example is the Swastika Epidemic of 1959 - 1960. The contagion effect could be clearly shown in plotting the curve of the epidemic.²⁴

An example closer to the Mods and Rockers is the spread during the Fifties of the Teddy Boy riots and similar phenomena elsewhere in Europe. Most commentators on these events acknowledged the role of publicity in stimulating imitative or competitive forms of behaviour²⁵ and some studies have been made on the mass media coverage of such events.²⁶ Again, though, blame was put on "publicity" in the restricted sense and there was little

23. I am indebted to Arthur Chisnell for drawing my attention to this example.

24. See Caplowitz and Rogers, op.cit. An interesting feature of this epidemic was that initial reporting indicated other avenues for expressing grievances: at the peak of the epidemic, targets for hostility other than anti-Semitic ones were chosen and in fact these general incidents outnumbered the specifically anti-Semitic. Smelser (op.cit., p. 259) describes this as the "drawing-in effect" and it is similar to the widening of the net process in regard to the Mods and Rockers and the ways in which targets changed during the impact. Such processes depend heavily on mass communication.

25. See, for example, Fyvel, op.cit., and C. Bondy et al, Jugendliche Stören die Ordnung, (München: Juventa Verlag, 1957).

26. Cohen and Rock, op.cit., and B-M. P. Blegvad, "Newspapers and Rock and Roll Riots in Copenhagen," Acta. Sociol. 7, 3 (1963), pp. 151 - 178.

awareness of the complex ways in which mass communication operates before, during and after each "impact". The causative nature of mass communication - in the whole context of the societal reaction to such phenomena - is usually misunderstood.²⁷

The common element in all these diverse examples of the amplification of violence is that an adequate medium of communication must be present for spreading the hostile belief and mobilising potential participants for attack. The mass communication of the news of one outbreak is a condition of structural conduciveness for the development of a hostile belief which, in turn, has to sensitize the "new" crowd (or individual deviant) to incipient or actual action and lower the threshold of readiness by providing readily identifiable symbols. The fact that the mere reporting of one event has a triggering off (and eventually an amplificatory) effect, is indicated by the conclusion reached in numerous studies of crowd violence, that voluntary silence by the media is a major technique of control:

... one of the most important features in preventing the spread of anti-Negro rioting at certain public housing projects in Chicago during 1946 and 1947 to city wide race riots, was undoubtedly the co-operation of major newspapers in not reporting the events and thus helping to confine crowd behaviour.²⁸

The triggering-off, sensitization and other such effects of mass communication described so far, deal with the way in which the likelihood of deviant behaviour during the impact was increased: one almost had to attempt to see or take part in trouble. The inventory and subsequent

-
27. T.C.N. Gibbens, for example ("Teenage Riots Around the World," New Society, 2 August, 1964, p.9) uses Bondy's category of the "follow-up riot" (developed in regard to the German Halbstarken Krawalle) to explain the Whitsun 1964 Mods and Rockers disturbances. These took place, according to him "... to avenge the injustice or slights of the first riot." The Whitsun events, however, were not at all follow-up riots in this sense: to attribute such a motivation and structure to the events is to distort the nature of the crowd behaviour.
28. Turner and Killian, op.cit., p. 195. Official reports on the Watts riots and other subsequent racial disturbances in American cities all mention the role of media in the amplification process.

opinion themes, though, also effected the form and content of the behaviour. The societal reaction not only increases the deviant's chance of acting at all, it also provides him with the lines and stage directions to use in his act.

The crucial effect here is the way in which deviant behaviour is shaped by the normative expectations of how people in that particular deviant role should act. Much of the Mods and Rockers behaviour can be conceptualized in terms of a role-playing model. Posing for photos, chanting slogans, making warlike gestures, fantasizing about super-gangs, wearing distinctive insignia, making a mock raid on an ice-cream van, whistling at girls, jeering at the "other side"; all these acts of "hooliganism" may be seen as analogous to the impersonation of mental illness resorted to by those defined as mentally ill. The actor incorporates aspects of the type cast role into his self concept and when the deviant role is public - as hooliganism is by definition - and the deviant is in a state of high suggestibility, then this incorporation is often more conscious and deliberate than in the case of the types of private deviance analysed by Becker and Schur. With an audience and T.V. cameras watching the deviance, the analogy implicit in the concept of role playing becomes no longer an analogy, but the real thing. A journalist at the live T.V. coverage of the Mod Ball at Wembley (a week after the initial Clacton event) notes how a girl in front of the cameras worshipping a hair salvaged off Mick Jagger's trousers, is like a man acting drunk when he is hardly tipsy, "...acting out this adoration. She sees she is being watched, grins sheepishly and then laughs outright."²⁹

In the present context, the importance of the role playing perspective is that the content of the type cast role was present in the inventory and crystallized more explicitly in the process of spurious attribution or labelling. This is not to say that there is a one to one

29. Laurie, op.cit., p. 105.

link between the labelling and the behaviour; for one thing, the type cast hooligan role was known to the potential actors before the deviance even began; like the labellers themselves, they could draw upon an existent folklore and mythology. The point, however, was that the normative element in the role was reinforced by the societal reaction; although the actors might already have been familiar with the lines and the stage direction, they were now confirmed in their roles. In the same way as the "chronic" schizophrenic begins to approximate closer to the schizophrenic role, so did the Mods and Rockers phenomenon take on every time an increasing ritualistic and stereotypical character.

Although the hooligan role was ready made and had only to be confirmed by the labelling process, there were other elements in the behaviour which could be directly traced to the societal reaction. The first of these was the way in which the gap between the Mods and Rockers became increasingly wider and obvious. Although the Mods and Rockers represent two very different consumer styles - the Mods the more glossy fashion-conscious teenager, the Rockers the tougher, reactionary tradition, the lumpen of the Teds - the antagonism between the two groups was not initially very marked. Despite their very real differences in life styles - visible in symbols such as the Mods' scooters and the Rockers' motor bikes - the groups had a great deal in common, particularly their working class membership.³⁰ There was, initially at least, nothing like the gang rivalry that is supposed to characterize the type of violent conflict gang enshrined in folklore by the "Sharks" and "Jets" of West Side Story. Indeed - as has been pointed out - one could not justifiably talk of "gangs" at all in any meaningful sociological sense. The only structured grouping one could find in the early crowds was based on slight territorial loyalty and it was tenuous enough to be broken up in the crowd

30. For a good - if slightly overdrawn - account of the dichotomy between Mods and Rockers, see A. MacGuire, "Emancipated and Reactionaries," New Society, 28th May, 1964, pp. 5 - 6.

situation.

Constant repetition of the warring gangs image, however, had the effect of giving these loose collectivities a structure they never possessed and a mythology with which to justify the structure. This image was disseminated in the inventory, reinforced through the symbolization process, repeated in the "Divide and Rule" and "Cabalism" themes, used to advantage in the form of commercial exploitation and repeated during the warning phase. Even if these images were not directly absorbed by the actors, they were used to justify control tactics, which, as we shall see, still further structured the groups and hardened the barriers between them.

The mass media - and the ideological exploitation of deviance - also reinforced another type of polarization: between the Mods and Rockers on the one hand, and the whole adult community on the other. If one is seen as the "enemy" in the "war against crime" it is not difficult to respond in similar spirit; one "rejects the rejectors" and "condemns the condemners". The specialized effect of the "Lunatic Fringe" theme, is to segregate the label those involved by emphasizing their difference from the majority. A striking parallel from a similar form of deviance is the labelling by the motor cycling "establishment" of riders identified with the Hells Angels image as the "one per cent who cause all the trouble": the term "one percenter" is then used by the groups as an honorific epithet, reinforcing their commitment.³¹

The Control Agents

The police - the main control agents operating during the impact period - had two types of effect on the behaviour; the one immediate and the other more sustained. The immediate effect of police policy and action was to create deviance - not only in the sense of provoking the more labile members of the crowd into losing their tempers, but in Becker's sense of

31. Shellow and Roemer, op.cit., p. 223 and Thompson, op.cit., p. 9.

making the rules whose infraction constituted deviance. The type of control tactics adopted by the police under the impact of sensitization and symbolization involved a certain arbitrary element. The practice, for example, of designating certain areas in advance as "trouble spots" meant that youths with the appropriate symbols could be moved along even if they were causing no apparent harm. In one case in the Brighton court, a constable from Eastbourne who had been helping the local force, gave evidence that he had seen a number of youths standing under a bus shelter; they were not doing anything, but he "had heard that this was a trouble spot" and had told them to move away. Not all moved away quickly enough and one was arrested. "If you allow him to get away with what he did", the Constable told the court, "and not move when the police told him to, then others would be free to come down. It was necessary in the public's interest that these youths should not shelter from the rain in this particular shelter."

The police (and the courts) acted on the assumption that certain forms of behaviour, although not criminal in themselves, were, under the particular circumstances, so situationally improper³² as to call for official action. It must be emphasized that the majority of arrests throughout were for offences which are both potentially provokable and involve considerable police discretion. This means that the sheer number of charges could give a distorted picture of the disturbances. In Brighton, Whitsun 1965, for example, there was little serious trouble: the weather (there was hail and sleet) had sent people home early and the Chief Constable even issued an official statement that most young people had been well behaved and the police were in control. But "in control" meant making a

32. The notion of situational impropriety is derived from Goffman. See especially, Behaviour in Public Places (op.cit.). Goffman's examples of the public attitude to "lolling" and "loitering" (pp. 56 - 57) are particularly appropriate to the Mods and Rockers situation. The police are allowed to move people in the streets who are doing nothing; one must appear purposeful.

large number of discretionary arrests: from late Saturday to Monday there were over 110 arrests. These were not clear cut offences such as possessing an offensive weapon or assault, but charges which required highly subjective definitions of what constituted "obstruction", "abusive", "threatening", "insulting", "disorderly" or "unruly". These terms could only acquire an objective and reified status through the acceptance of situational logic, which, in turn, was based on the belief system. The following are examples of this situational logic; the first two are from statements by the Inspector prosecuting in the Brighton court, the second two are from Hastings:

In a case of wilful obstruction: "In the circumstances which operated in Brighton at the time, it can be seen that what the boys did was likely to provoke a breach of the peace."

In a case of using threatening behaviour: "We will allege that he was one of nine or ten Rockers chanting 'We want blood' and we would also allege that in these particular circumstances in Brighton at the time he should be classified as unruly and we will oppose bail on these grounds."

An 18 year old girl was at the back of a crowd which was being moved. She refused to move quickly and turned round to her side where the constable was walking and said, "Don't push me, you copper; I will report you". The prosecutor commented: "This is a case where in ordinary circumstances the police would shrug the thing off but in an inflammable situation of this nature, silly little girls like this could cause a great deal of trouble."

In one of the few cases that were actually dismissed in Hastings (August 1964) on the grounds of insufficient evidence, a boy, P.G., was charged with abusive behaviour. According to the evidence, a constable had seen a large group of "unruly youths" walking along obstructing the road. Along with other officers, the constable moved one part of the group along the promenade. P.G. was one of the group and the constable heard him jeer at another officer and make personal observations, including the remark "Look at freckles". This sort of remark "might not have been taken much notice of in normal circumstances, but because of the inflammatory nature of the occasion, it assumed much greater proportions. Things could snowball very rapidly."

The last two cases, together with personal observation of similar incidents, bear out Becker's point that a great deal of enforcement activity is devoted not to the enforcement of the rules, but getting respect from the people the enforcer deals with: "This means that one may be labelled as a deviant not because he has actually broken a rule, but because he has shown

disrespect to the enforcer of the rule."³³ This factor assumed a particular significance at the seaside resorts, where police were hypersensitive to being exposed to public ridicule. In view of the audience watching their actions, this feeling was understandable. No matador wants to be laughed at.

The more sustained effects of police action were less visible, but, in terms of the amplification model, as important. These effects were to increase the deviance by unwittingly solidifying the amorphous crowd forces into more viable groups for engaging in violence and by further polarising the deviants against the community.

These sort of effects are well known to students of gang behaviour. The early Chicago sociologists - particularly Thrasher and Tannenbaum - documented the ways in which attack, opposition or attempted suppression increase the group's cohesion. According to Thrasher, such attack was virtually a necessary pre-requisite for any embryonic street group to become a gang. More recently, Yablonsky has shown the same effects and they have also been documented in the general literature on crowd control in political, racial and other types of disturbances. The crowd situation offers, par excellence, the opportunity for police intervention to have the unintended effect of solidifying the opposition. Such solidification and polarization takes place not simply in the face of attack, but attack that is perceived as harsh, indiscriminate and unfair. Even if these elements were not present in the police action, the type of ambiguous crowd situation described earlier, offered the maximum possible opportunity for rumours of such police action to spread. In the same way that the Mods and Rockers were perceived symbolically and stereotypically by the police, the police too were perceived by the crowd as the "enemy". Conceiving of the crowd on one hand and the police on the other as being two "partners" in a dyadic relationship, each being involved in a partly false perspective of the

33. Becker, (1963), op.cit., p. 158.

other, one can see how each side acted to justify the perspective.

It was not just a question, though, of a nexus of mutual misunderstandings; the police did objectively act in such a way as to increase solidification and polarization. In the first place, their control tactics were based on the assumption that the young people present were either divided into two homogenous groups, Mods and Rockers (the Divide and Rule theme) or constituted a single homogenous mass. Both these assumptions were false. By emphasizing the Mods and Rockers' difference, (e.g. by preventing the two groups from coming into proximity) police might have widened the gulf between the groups. In one particular case (not in a seaside resort) the police under full publicity, attempted to call two groups together for a peace treaty.³⁴ By seeing the crowd as a homogenous mass, to be controlled on the basis of the visible stigmata of dress, a greater sense of cohesion develops. If subject to indiscriminate harassment or even if only witnessing the innovatory use of violence by the police, the more marginal and passive sections of the crowd could quite easily develop a sense of resentment and grievance. This could be the first step towards a sense of identity and common purpose with the real or imagined hard core of the crowd: "police brutality" is always a convenient rallying point.

One might compare the Mods and Rockers incidents with a similar situation where riots and disturbances were, in fact, prevented: in the case described by Shellow and Roemer, one of the most crucial and consciously applied aims of the police was to avoid polarization of relationships between the authorities and the crowds of motorcyclists arriving in a resort for Labour Day weekend motorcycle races.³⁵

34. Yablonsky comments on a similar peace treaty: "The meeting gave a degree of official recognition to the illegal activity of a disorganized connection of neighbourhood youth. Moreover the treaty may have structured a loosely developed conflict. The meeting confirmed the fact that there was trouble brewing between rival groups. Now two 'gangs' had a war truce." Yablonsky, (1962), op.cit. p. 67.

35. Shellow and Roemer, op.cit., p. 225.

The authors (who acted as consultants to the police in trying to prevent a rumoured and threatened "Hells Angels" disturbance) suggest that there are three conditions under which exuberance and rowdiness explode into rioting:-

- 1) Recreational, service and control facilities "flooded" by overwhelming numbers of visitors, who were then left at loose ends, ready for any kind of 'action'.
- 2) Ineffectual, often provocative, attempts at control and expression of authority by police or officials.
- 3) Development of a sense of group solidarity among members of the crowd.³⁶

All these three conditions were present during a typical impact period: in the American resort, polarization was partly, at least, prevented by an educational programme aimed at impressing three facts on the police:

- 1) that motorcyclists are not essentially different from other citizens and need not be treated as a breed apart;
- 2) that motorcyclists are not a homogenous class but come in a variety of shapes and sizes; some innocuous, some potentially troublesome;
- 3) that indiscriminate, harsh treatment of all motorcyclists would confirm the latter's sense of persecution, increase group solidarity among them, and go far toward creating the very polarization we wished to avoid.³⁷

It should be noted that feelings of persecution were particularly acute among the Rockers, who were observably discriminated against by the police. This group was more visible than the amorphous Mod crowds and also occupy in the public mind the traditional "yobbo" status. Their existent minority group status vis-a-vis the Mods and their sense of fighting a rear guard battle against the new emancipated teenagers, was reinforced by the police who naturally enough found it easier to identify a minority group. The literature on crowd control points to this type of partiality as being particularly provocative and police are usually impressed with the necessity

36. Ibid., p. 222.

37. Ibid., p. 225. Shellow and Roemer also make recommendations which might well apply to British seaside resorts about improving the recreational facilities in order to prevent the milling that precedes crowd disturbances. The Brighton Weekenders Project might be viewed as an attempt in this direction.

to avoid entering into issues that move the crowd.

A second source of solidification stemmed from the fact that the opposition was largely ineffectual. From the initial incident at Clacton, the police were faced with a new situation, for which there had been little precedent. Unlike the Metropolitan Police, the police forces of small seaside resorts have little or no experience in handling potentially violent crowd situations such as political demonstrations. The tactics of crowd control emerged on an ad hoc basis and were necessarily overinfluenced by false perceptions of the situation and the highly charged emotional atmosphere. This meant that hallowed strategies such as "the show of force", which most manuals on crowd control advocate in such situations, were not properly implemented - either because the "force" was not strong enough or had a comic opera aspect (e.g. the use of converted public health vehicles as patrol vans) or because police action was often hesitant instead of quick and decisive, or because action went beyond the show of force to the actual use of force. In the face of control that was manifestly inadequate to deal with the crowd if it did, in fact, become a viable violent mob, the crowd could easily develop a sense of its potential power. If one hundred Mods are chasing a handful of Rockers across the beach, the sight of a handful of policemen in turn pursuing the Mods, can only appear somewhat ludicrous and undignified. It only needed one unfortunate policeman's helmet to fall off for the situation to move very far from a successful show of force.

The third source of solidification and polarization was the effect of dramatization. Although, by definition, a show of force has to be publicly demonstrated if it is to have a deterrent effect, it need not be overdramatized. The dramatic techniques described earlier, such as frog-marching two youths to the police station or marching a group through the streets, could only have the effect that Tannenbaum intended in his phrase "the dramatization of evil". These techniques effectively polarize the forces of good and evil and solidify by creating the sense of resentment,

which is a natural reaction to being exposed to public ridicule. If such effects are combined with a sense of persecution, the whole situation could take on a mythical, chimerical meaning. The activist Mod or Rocker (real or imaginary) could, like Shellow and Roemer's "Hells Angels" function not only as vicarious exemplars of behaviour that some young people might fantasy, but also act as legendary champions who will rescue the persecuted; they quote one motorcyclist witnessing police harassment: "Just wait till the Hells Angels hear about this when they come in tomorrow. They'll come down and tear this place apart."³⁸

That this type of polarization did, in fact, occur, can be seen in the changing attitudes toward the police. In the first series of events, the crowd, with the exception of a hard core, maintained fairly good humoured relations with the police. "Attacks" on the police were usually disrespectful gestures such as knocking off helmets. As the phenomenon developed, though, the lines hardened and relationships between the crowd and the police deteriorated. In Brighton, August 1965, a policeman attempting to arrest the apparent leader of a group of one hundred Mods charging across the beach was immediately stoned and when he lost his helmet in a scuffle, it was pounced upon and used as a football. In Great Yarmouth at Easter 1966, four policemen were assaulted and one of them kicked about the head. The following incidents illustrate the strained atmosphere and the way in which hostility to authority became generalized:-

A policeman walked quite peacefully between two rows of boys near the aquarium. Some of them started whistling the Z-car theme and one shouted out "Sprachen the Deutsch constable?"

A boy was throwing stones outside a shop under the archway. The owner came out and shouted at him: "If you come down here you must behave." The boy retorted (not quite loud enough for the man to hear): "Or else you'll get your fuckin' army onto us."

(Notes: Brighton, Easter 1966.)

The role of the courts in the control culture can be seen as reinforcing the tendency towards solidification and polarization. The sentences

38. Shellow and Roemer, op.cit., p. 226.

were seen as not only sanctioning police action, but as being intrinsically harsh and unfair: this was the overwhelming response among the boys in the Barker-Little sample. The use of the remand in custody as a punitive measure was a particularly widely felt grievance. The dramatization effect achieved by the magistrates' pronouncements left little doubt - certainly among the offenders' friends and relatives waiting in the foyer of the Brighton court - that the magistrates were using their powers for ritual reasons: they were denouncing deviance by making an example of the offender. Such denunciations - combined with the widely held view that the police had been arresting on a "quota" system - lead readily enough to feelings of resentment and martyrdom.

There are two general points which need to be made about the amplificatory effects of the control culture. In the first place, these effects were fed back into the mass media, which further exaggerated them, thus producing another circulatory link in the amplification system. If the policemen did not see themselves as "the brave men in blue" fighting the evil mob, nor the magistrates themselves as society's chosen mouth-pieces for denouncing evil, these polarizations were made on their behalf by others.

The second point is that - for purposes of illustrating the amplification process - the above analysis has dealt only with the negative or unintended consequences of law enforcement and social control. This is not to say that police and court action had no deterrent effect or that a certain amount of violence and vandalism was not contained or prevented. The problem, though, - as in evaluating all types of social control - is that it is by no means clear what constitutes successful law enforcement, either in its deterrent or preventive aspects. Many claims for such success are difficult to evaluate. For an example of "deterrence" one may take the fact that some 65% of the boys in the Barker-Little sample said that they would not get mixed up in that sort of thing again and most gave

the punishment, and fear of worse, as the reason. Most also believed, though, that they would be the only ones deterred, and even individual deterrence was limited by the fact that each event tended to attract crowds from specific geographical areas; only four of the Margate group had been at Clacton. Their own friends certainly weren't deterred by the punishment: they either thought of it as a joke or, at worst, thought that the mistake had been to get caught.

For an example of "prevention" we may look at Clacton, Easter 1965, where, in response to local pressure to avoid a repetition of the previous year's incidents, the police took elaborate precautions, including the use of walkie-talkies and the deliberate policy of making things miserable for all scooter-riders entering the town. There were virtually no arrests and it was claimed that the show of force had worked. In fact, though, the 1964 incident was quite isolated as far as Clacton was concerned, Margate and the South Coast resorts always being more popular with the Mods. The very few Mods who might have set out for Clacton in Easter 1965, were possibly stopped by the weather which, if anything, was worse than the previous year. The best one can say, then, for these two claims of successful "deterrence" and "prevention" respectively, is that the evidence is ambiguous.

Summary

I would like to conclude this section by summarizing the main ways in which the societal reaction may have effected the nature, extent and development of the deviant behaviour during the impact period. These effects are suggested rather than proved by the data, but they do indicate lines along which further theory could be generated about such phenomena.

1. The societal reaction in general and the inventory in particular:-
 - (a) reinforced and magnified a predisposition to expect trouble: "something's going to happen;"
 - (b) provided the content for rumours and the milling process, thereby

structuring the "something" into potential or actual deviance; such rumours and images facilitated deviance by solidifying the crowd and validating its moods and actions;

(c) created a set of culturally identifiable symbols which further structured the situation and legitimized action.

2. The presence of an audience gave encouragement to deviance and helped escalate violence.

3. The mass media in general:-

(a) operated to publicize the events;

(b) led to direct publicity-seeking behaviour;

(c) created a triggering-off or contagion effect, whereby the hostile belief was spread and the participants mobilized for action;

(d) provided the content for deviant role-playing behaviour by transmitting the stereotypical expectations of how persons in the particular deviant roles should act;

(e) together with the commercial exploitation, magnified the Mods-Rockers dichotomy and gave the groups a greater structure and common ethos than they originally possessed;

(f) together with the ideological exploitation, polarized the deviants further against the community.

4. The agents of control:-

(a) "created" deviance by applying situational logic to law enforcement;

(b) because control was unfair, indiscriminate, ineffectual, based on spurious attribution and overdramatized - or perceived in these terms - the effects of 3 (e) and (f) were repeated, thus solidifying an amorphous crowd into a more unified, hostile and polarized collectivity.

CHAPTER 17DIFFERENCES, CONTEXTS AND REASONS

So far, by talking about images, attitudes and opinion themes and their absorption by the actors and certain key spectators, we have drawn a picture of a homogeneous societal reaction. We have more or less assumed that the inventory images diffused outwards to be absorbed symmetrically by all of society. Clearly, such an assumption cannot be made and the distribution of attitudes is much more complicated and uneven. Basic questions need to be asked about the representativeness of the reactions identified, and the manifestation of any significant differences according to such groupings as age, sex, social class and political affiliation. In addition to charting the reactions and their possible effects, there is also a need to locate the reasons for the reactions in a broader cultural context.

The first part of this concluding chapter will deal with the question of differential reaction, and the second part will look - more speculatively - at some of the reasons behind the reaction to the Mods and Rockers.

Differential Reaction

The standard sociological questions about differential reaction cannot be answered satisfactorily within the present research design; a full-scale representative public opinion survey is needed. These questions are important enough, however, to attempt to indicate at least the more striking differences that emerge from the various sources, and also to point out where expected differences did not materialize. The major sources for comparing the mainstream of data analysed in the previous chapters will be the Brighton Sample and the Northview Survey.

1. Mass Media and Public Opinion: The first, and perhaps most striking difference is that between the mass media and the various types of public opinion. For most dimensions of this comparison, the mass media responses

to the Mods and Rockers were more extreme and stereotypical than any of the samples of public opinion surveyed. This is not to say that the mass media images were not absorbed and were not the dominant ones to shape the reaction, but rather that the public coded these images in such a way as to tone down their more extreme implications. In this sense, the public could be said to be better informed about the phenomenon than the media or the moral entrepreneurs whom the media quoted.¹

While the initial orientation of the media to the Mods and Rockers was in terms of the threat and disaster theme, just less than 50% of the Northview sample responded in these terms. The others either saw the behaviour as a limited problem, or else, in the case of about 15%, immediately reacted by blaming the press for exaggerating the phenomenon. Similarly, in the Brighton Sample 53.8% saw what was happening in purely negative terms, although only half of these used threatening adjectives ("disgusting", "horrible", "terrible") and the rest, terms like "annoying". The remaining 46.2% were indifferent or puzzled.

In regard to the prediction factor in the inventory, while the media were sure that the Mods and Rockers would continue, both the Northview and Brighton samples were less certain. 42.5% of the Northview sample thought that the phenomenon would die out and that it was just a passing phase or fashion; 15% thought it would continue unless it was dealt with severely and 22.5% thought that it would inevitably continue:

It's part of our present day set up. (D)

It won't die out as long as there are enough yobs with money who thrive on publicity. (S)

You can expect it every weekend now - it will go on just like the marchers. (C)

-
1. Research on mental health education shows a similar situation. One content analysis of the mass media indicates that they present ideas about mental health further removed from the opinions of experts than the opinions held by the average man: J. Nunnally, "The Communication of Mental Health Information: A Comparison of the Opinions of Experts and Public with Mass Media Presentations," Behavioural Science, 2 (1957), pp. 222 - 230. Comparative research of this kind is very much needed in regard to information and opinions about crime, delinquency and other forms of deviance.

The rest of the sample did not know whether the Mods and Rockers would continue. The Brighton sample was evenly divided: 38.4% thought that the behaviour would continue unless something was done; 33.8% thought that it was just a passing phase, and 29.8% didn't know. Some of this uncertainty in the two samples reflects the fact that the questions were asked at a fairly late stage in the development of the phenomenon, when there already were objective signs of its decrease in significance. Nevertheless, even at this stage, the media were ritualistically using the images of prediction and inevitable disaster.

Asked to describe what sort of young person was involved in the Mods and Rockers events, both samples used somewhat slightly less clear-cut images and stereotypes than the mass media. Leaving aside the special images (for example, from the "Sawdust Caesars" speech) the spurious attribution in the mass media centred around a similar stereotype to: that applied to vandals: the affluent yob. The dominant picture was of adolescents drawn from the traditional "delinquent classes", but with plenty of money to spend, riding expensive motor-cycles and, more than ever, predisposed to senseless violence. In the Brighton sample, 47.7% thought that these were "ordinary kids", just out for fun, 33.9% thought they were just typical delinquents. An almost identical proportion - 32.3% - of the Northview sample thought that the Mods and Rockers were just the same as any other delinquents; the added elements were the gang, the uniform, the motor bikes: all the components of the Hells Angel type of image. 12.8% thought that only the ring leaders were the hard-core delinquent types; the rest just tagged along for kicks. 43.6% did not think that the Mods and Rockers were of the delinquent type: either because they came from a broader cross section of the population or because they had no real criminal intent and were just out for kicks. A further 11.3% were undecided about the composition of the Mods and Rockers.

Another way of looking at the image, is to see in what ways - if any -

the Mods and Rockers were thought to constitute an entirely new phenomenon. A new type of deviance is usually seen as more threatening than something which has been coped with in the past, and the media tended to stress the supposedly new elements in the situation: more violence, more mass hysteria and a higher level of organized gang warfare. Very few of the Brighton sample saw these as new features: only 4 (6.1%) thought that there was more violence. About 30% thought that what was happening was simply the old events (spivs, Teddy Boys) under a new name, while the largest group (56.9%) thought that the new feature was the evidence of greater affluence and mobility. Slightly more of the Northview sample (33.1%) thought that the behaviour itself was quite new:

... there used to be hooliganism before, sheer devilment, just to annoy others ... but there was nothing vicious: this is the new element, this pure thuggery. (H)

15.1% thought that the only new elements were greater affluence and mobility and a further 37.6% thought that there was nothing new in the behaviour: what had happened was that the old actors had moved on to a new stage, the Teddy Boys had come out of the Elephant and Castle and were getting more publicity than ever:

In Poplar now, life is probably peaceful and quiet over the Bank Holidays. (H)

Instead of half a dozen louts in one place, you have them all together in Clacton. (L)

Instead of fighting it out on Clapham Common or a bomb site, they go down to the resorts. (L)

Such stereotypes might be just as misleading as the stereotype of greater violence, hysteria and organization,² but they are not as threatening or extreme.

It appeared also that the type of stigmatization used by the press - the branding of the Mods and Rockers as new folk devils - was not always

2. Or even more misleading as, for example, in the type of image often used of a "pool of deviants" who keep re-appearing in new guises. As one Northview Youth Leader put it: "... now that the Aldermaston marches are finished, you have all these kids running about with nothing to do."

agreed to by the public. Asked about their feelings if their own son or brother went down to one of the resorts with a group of Mods or Rockers, most of the Brighton sample (about 70%) thought that they wouldn't mind or that they wouldn't be sure how they would respond. 12% would not let him go down in the first place, and the remaining 18% would have punished him if they found out afterwards. The Northview sample - in roles such as employers, teachers and youth leaders - were somewhat more likely to let their knowledge about a boy's participation in the Mods and Rockers activities to carry over into their other dealings with him. 4 (3%) would not continue to employ him, 11 (8.2%) would be suspicious and watchful about his other activities, and a further 41.4% would talk to him, try to understand his behaviour and dissuade him from further involvement. Only 16.5% said that they wouldn't do anything and that the boy's personal life would not be their concern. These responses obviously varied according to occupational groups: headmasters stressing how the boy's action could harm the reputation of the school, and employers, such as solicitors, tending to say that a boy who was a hooligan couldn't be trusted.

The Northview sample was asked specifically about their opinions on the way the press and television has covered the Mods and Rockers phenomenon. Their responses were overwhelmingly critical, if not hostile, towards the mass media: 40.5% felt that the media had exaggerated and blown the whole thing up, and a further 41.3% actually attributed responsibility to media publicity for part of what had happened. Only 4.5% (six respondents) thought that the media had been accurate and were just carrying out their duty to report the facts. The remaining 13.5% had no opinion about the media coverage. Over 80% then were explicitly critical of the role of the media.

The public awareness of media exaggeration and distortion and the existence of some differences between public and media opinions have been pointed out, only to emphasize the different ways in which images are coded and the operation of some sort of "credibility gap" in the mass communication process. These are standard findings in the field of mass

communication, and should not be thought in any way exceptional. The differences between the public and the media were not always very large and would have been larger if the public samples were more representative: in one case (Northview) the respondents were better - and sometimes professionally - informed about the type of phenomenon in question, and in the other case (Brighton) the respondents were actually observing the situation at first hand, and therefore had evidence before their eyes to contradict some of the more gross mass media distortions. There is little doubt that the mainstream of reaction expressed in the mass media - putative deviance, punitiveness, the creation of new folk devils and so on - entered into the public imagery and formed the basis of control measures.

2. Young and Old: Superficially, one might expect that age differences in the reaction would be very noticeable: older people being more punitive and less able to identify with the deviant group. Neither sample is representative enough - particularly of the younger age group - to fully support this expectation, although the findings are in the predicted direction. Only 23.3% of the younger age group in Northview (20 - 39) saw the behaviour in terms of a threat, compared to about 55% of the older groups. The younger respondents were also more likely than the others to blame the press for exaggeration and distortion. In the Brighton sample, there was a tendency for the oldest respondents (over 60) to be more hostile and punitive than the youngest (under 24) but, on the other hand, the middle aged respondents were less hostile than the youngest.

Other sources suggest that age differences are not as straightforward as might be expected and that young persons were by no means immune from absorbing the mass media imagery or responding punitively. The effect of the "Lunatic Fringe" theme might, in fact, have been to alienate the rest of the young people even more from the Mods and Rockers. Respectable youth organizations were always quick to denounce the deviants as being totally unrepresentative of young people in Britain and to dissociate their members from what had happened. Letters along these lines were frequently

published, and sentiments such as the following from an article in the "Teen and Twenty Page" of the Brighton and Hove Herald (23/5/64) were common:

Just what sort of corkscrew mind finds enjoyments from such a twisted activity as smashing up shop windows, car windows, scotters and such? It's almost unbelievable, isn't it?

A content analysis of essays on the Mods and Rockers written by 25 Third and Fourth Form pupils in a school in the East End of London, shows not only how fully the media images were absorbed, but also how little identification with the Mods and Rockers there was in a group which, by social class, age and geographical position, should have shown some identification. None of the writers saw themselves as potential Mods or Rockers (despite the stereotype which saw all youth as divided along these lines) and the behaviour was quite alien to them: "they" were seen as "absolutely stupid", "a childish crowd", "all a load of idiots". The behaviour was rarely excused:

Some people excuse the Mods and Rockers by saying that they are discontent and bored. I think that this is just a 'front', for an awful lot of other teenagers manage to find something else to do than this senseless fighting.

Although some people think that inadequate recreation facilities are an excuse for vandalism and destruction, I think there is none except stupidity and being unconcerned with the respect that should be given to other people's and the public's property.

About a third of the group did see boredom as a justifiable reason, or mentioned factors such as the desire for publicity, provocation by the police, or adult condemnation of teenagers. Of the solutions suggested for the problem, 7 were "soft" (more youth clubs, cut down press publicity, provide places for young people to let off steam, adults should be more tolerant), 6 were conventional (fines, repayment of damage), and 12 were "hard" innovatory ones (hard labour schemes, using fire hoses on the crowds, tear gas, flogging, long prison sentences, banning the offenders from the town). The following are two examples from the last group:

Instead of giving them a few months in detention centres or fining them, I think it would be better to humiliate them in some way, e.g. invite the public to see them being given six of the best across their backsides with a birch twig and then let the public pelt them with rotten fruit while they are in the stocks set up on the beach. This might teach them a lesson ...

I think the Mods and Rockers should not only pay for the damage, but also fix it. If they get out of hand in these seaside places the fire brigade should be brought in to soak them with water. Then they shouldn't be allowed in trains and buses. They wouldn't like to walk home to London in soaking clothes and I don't think they would do it again.

The fact that these were signed essays, written as part of normal class work, might have led to the expression of views thought to be more acceptable to the teacher, and as this was a grammar school, these were the views of working class college boys rather than corner boys. They do, at least, cast doubt, however, on the simplistic assumption that age differences alone will produce different reactions to such juvenile deviance as the Mods and Rockers. The polarization and segregation effected by the mass media is a stronger basis for attitude formation.

3. Locals and Outsiders: It is not clear what differences one would expect between the attitudes of local residents and those living elsewhere. On the one hand, locals who were directly exposed to the situation might be more resistant to some of the distortions presented in the mass media. On the other hand, they would be more affected by any negative consequences of the behaviour (such as loss of trade, damage to the town's image) and therefore might respond more punitively.

Neither of these effects were observable in a particularly clear-cut fashion and perhaps they balanced each other out. Local people I spoke to did tend to be more realistic than the press, the Northview sample and other outsiders, in their perception of what had actually happened. This difference, however, was not much in evidence in the reaction of local magistrates, press and moral entrepreneurs. The moral entrepreneurs particularly overestimated the amount of support and sympathy they would get from local residents. On the other hand, those local residents who

did see the problem as directly affecting their lives, were very extreme and punitive in their reactions. In the Brighton sample, 62.5% of local residents characterized what was happening as "terrible" or "annoying" compared to 45.5% of outsiders who used these terms. The threat to commercial interests was obviously a more real one to locals. To this must be added the presence in towns such as Hastings, Eastbourne and Margate of a large number of retired and elderly persons to whom the behaviour was especially alien and frightening.

4. Male and Female: A general impression from various sources is that females were more intolerant than males. In the Brighton sample a larger proportion of the females (35.4%) expressed initial disgust than the males (11.8%). They were also more likely to want the police to use tougher measures, and all eight in the sample who were in favour of using corporal punishment were women. The women were twice as likely as the men to name "lack of parental control and discipline" as the cause of the Mods and Rockers phenomenon. There were no great differences on any of the other questions, and the tendency for females to be more punitive in regard to deviance would need to be supported from other sources.

5. Social Class: Some more general remarks will be made later in this chapter on the relevance of social class variables. The survey data alone showed very few significant social class differences, especially in terms of initial reaction and general orientation to the events. There was a slight tendency for working class respondents to explain the behaviour in terms of "lack of parental control", while middle class respondents were more likely to invoke the "looking for kicks" image as a causative explanation.

6. Political Affiliation: There was a tendency in the Brighton sample for the Conservative voters to be more likely to use the "disgusting" or "annoying" categories (64.3%) compared to 38.7% among the Labour voters. Conservatives were also more likely to want the police to be tougher and

to favour the use of Detention Centres.

This section has presented only a sketchy and incomplete account of some differentials in the societal reaction. Future research would have to deal adequately with at least these possible sources of differences, as well as the effect of more complex psychological and sociological variables.

Contexts and Reasons

As we saw in regard to vandalism, it is no less difficult to untangle the reasons for the societal reaction to a form of deviance or social problem than it is to understand why the behaviour or condition is present in the first place. In this concluding section, I would like to suggest some of the reasons for the reaction to the Mods and Rockers, and place these in the cultural context in which the phenomenon developed. The crucial question to ask is not the simple transactional one of why the behaviour was seen as deviant, but why the reaction took the particular form and intensity it did at the particular time. What was it that prompted the control culture's responses, the Margate magistrate's remarks or a Brighton newspaper editor's description of the incidents as "without parallel in English history?" Models such as that of deviation amplification, are incomplete unless set in the context of such questions. They are also specifically defective if they do not allow for the sequence to come to an end: the problem with which I would like to complete this section.

The Mod emerged at the beginning of the Sixties. His immediate predecessor was in the Italianate style of the last years of the Nineteen Fifties: the world of Espresso-bars and sharp dressing captured so accurately in Colin Macinnes' 1959 novel, Absolute Beginners. In 1960, some journalists were beginning to write about the replacement of the Teddy Boys by the "Modernists": the first full-blooded manifestations of the new, slick, emancipated teenager. The Rockers were the ones left

behind, the Teds who hadn't made it, and in 1963 rival groups of Stock Exchange messengers in the City were first referred to as "Mods and Rockers". Even then, though, the symbols had not crystallized and newspapers were still using the term "Teddy Boys" to refer to one, or even both groups. The incident at Clacton in Easter 1964 finally created the Mods and Rockers as cultural types, and led to their elevation into the gallery of folk devils, alongside the Teddy Boys, the Spivs, the Cosh Boys and figures from earlier periods.

The behaviour itself was not particularly new or startling. Disturbances of various sorts - whether called "hooliganism", "rowdyism" or "gang fights" - occurred frequently throughout the Fifties in coastal resorts frequented by working class adolescents. In 1958, for example, Southend police had to appeal for extra support after rival Teddy Boy groups fought battles on the pier. In Whitley Bay, Blackpool and other Northern resorts at the time, there were disturbances and fighting often more severe than any of the early Mods and Rockers episodes. Clearly - as the example of licenced hooliganism in the behaviour of British holidaymakers in Ostend shows from another angle - one has to look for some of the reasons for the reaction outside the intrinsic properties of the deviance itself.

Part of the extreme reaction to the Mods and Rockers is attributable simply to the way the behaviour was initially reported and interpreted. In examining the inventory, we identified some of the sources of exaggeration and distortion. It is worth noting that one reason for the "over-reporting" lay simply in the fact that the weekend of the Clacton incident was particularly dull from a news point of view. Nothing newsworthy happened either nationally or internationally. It is facile, though, to explain the reaction solely in these terms: one must understand that the audience was predisposed to react to the message in a particular way. What must be explained, therefore, are the reasons for assimilating the initial message and for the continuation of this assimilation.

One significant reason lay in the fact that the Sixties began to confirm a new era in adult-youth relationships in Britain. The Teddy Boys in the previous decade - and their equivalents in Europe, the halbstarke, the blouson noirs - had marked the first flickerings of trouble. The partial economic emancipation of the working class adolescent, the emergence of an autonomous commercial leisure market aimed at these adolescents and the elevation of pop heroes to national figures, were only the more tangible signs of new potential lines along which conflict could be drawn. Latent feelings, such as adults' jealousy and resentment over adolescents' increased spending power and sexual freedom - together with uncertain threats that developed later, for example, over drug use - created a situation of ambiguity and strain. This was equivalent to the "boundary crises" which Erikson talks about as preceding certain types of reaction to deviance.³ Although his theory is far too conspiratorial in suggesting that at times of cultural strain and ambiguity, deviants are actually "picked out" to clarify the normative contours of the society, it is not implausible to suggest that the Mods and Rockers fulfilled this sort of function.

Scapegoating and other types of hostility are more likely to occur in situations of maximum strain and ambiguity. The fact that the reports of what had happened were themselves somewhat blurred, might have increased rather than decreased the chances of an extreme reaction. The way in which groups such as the Northview sample had an unclear image of the behaviour, but at the same time supported fairly severe punishments of it, suggests how this type of uncertainty is resolved. There was a chance - if only a remote one - that the threats posed by the Teddy Boys might now be realized. The images the public received from Clacton confirmed their suspicions that little good would come from the new era. The situation was ripe for beliefs such as those expressed in the "It's Not Only This Theme". Again,

3. Erikson, (1964), op.cit.

like the Teddy Boys earlier, the phenomenon had to be named so that the shape of the new devil could be easily identified.

In this context, the way in which the deviance became associated with a fashion style is particularly significant. Changes in fashion are not always perceived - eventually at least - simply as something new, a desire to be different or a fad that will die out. They may also be symbolic of some deeper change, and historically, changes in fashion and style have represented new ideological movements. So, for example, the Sans Coulottes in the French Revolution wore long pants instead of the conventional knee breeches, as a symbol of radicalism. Similarly, the Cuban revolution made beards a symbol of protest, while beatnik styles became identified with certain signs of disaffiliation. So, the Mod fashions were seen to represent some more significant departure than a mere clothing change. The glossiness of the image, the bright colours and the associated artefacts, such as motor scooters, stood for everything resented about the affluent teenager. There were also new anxieties, such as the sexual confusion in clothing and hair styles: the Mod boy with pastel shaded trousers and the legendary make-up on his face, the girls with their short, cropped hair and sexless, flat appearance. The sheer uniformity in dress was a great factor in making the threat more apparent: the cheap mass-produced anoraks with similar colours, and the occasional small group riding their Vespas like a menacing pincer patrol, gave the appearance of greater organization than ever existed and, hence, of a greater threat.

The way in which a single dramatic incident - or, at least, the reporting of this incident - served to confirm the actors' deviant identity is also important. Without pressing the analogy too far, the situation was similar to that in which a natural disaster brings to the surface a condition or conflict that previously was latent. The requirement of visibility - and hooliganism is, by definition, public and visible - so essential for successful problem definition, was met right from the outset. Mass collective action, which before was played out on a more restricted

screen, now was paraded even to audiences previously insulated by geographical, age and social class barriers.

This leads on to another major reason for the form of the reaction. The behaviour was presented and perceived as something more than a delinquent brawl, and the Mods and Rockers could not plausibly be classified as the ordinary slum louts associated with such behaviour in the past. They appeared to be affluent, well clothed and groomed and, above all, highly mobile. They had moved out of the bomb-sites in the East End and the streets of the Elephant and Castle. Oxbridge-type hooliganism and pranks could be tolerated, not only because this was a protected group, but because it was on a relatively small scale and containable. The street gangs in the slums could, if not tolerated, simply be allocated the traditional deviant position. But now, things were literally and metaphorically too close to home. These were not just the slum louts nor the high-spirited undergraduates, but some faintly recognizable creatures who had crawled out from under previously distant rocks.

Such a feeling was even more understandable and marked in places like Brighton. The town had not yet adjusted to the fact that the old type of summer visitors and day-trippers from London were no longer coming to Brighton, but spending their holidays on package trips to Rimini or the Costa Brava. The respectable working class couples in their twenties or thirties were no longer packing out the boarding houses: the old were still there, but there were also the much younger. Not only the Mods and Rockers, but also long-haired French youths in the language schools that had sprung up on the South Coast, and also students from the University of Sussex who, besides their appearance, were partly instrumental in getting Brighton its first Labour M.P. for generations. The Mods and Rockers just represented the epitome of these changes; to many local residents, as a Brighton editor put it, "... they were something frightening and completely alien ... they were visitors from a foreign planet and they should be banished to where they came from." When, in 1965, the new Mayor of Brighton outlined his

vision of the town's future as "a popular holiday resort where the wheelk stalls and the Mods and Rockers will be a thing of the past", a local newspaper's editorial comment was, "Mods and Rockers we would gladly be without - they are a pricey pest. But wheelk stalls? ..." (Brighton and Hove Gazette 4/6/65).

Allied to the threat posed by the new mobility and the wider stage on which the behaviour was now played out, was the image of class barriers breaking down in the emergence of the teenage culture. Traditionally, the deviant role has been assigned to the lower class urban male, but the Mods and Rockers appeared to be less class tied: here were a group of imposters, reading the lines which everyone knows belong to some other group. Even their clothes were out of place: without leather jackets they could hardly be distinguished from bank clerks. The uneasiness felt about actors who are not quite in their places can lead to greater hostility. Something done by an out-group is simply condemned and fitted into the scheme of things, but in-group deviance is embarrassing, it threatens the norms of the group and tends to blur its boundaries with the out-group.

These seem to be some of the contexts in which the responses to the Mods and Rockers might be placed. Spelling out the contingencies affecting the reaction shows what, paradoxically, is the main defect of the amplification type of model: namely, that it is a-historical and not genuinely sociological. This defect is paradoxical because such sequential models were put forward to counteract the static positivist view of deviance. In fact, by using, for example, cybernetic language, the new models are every bit as mechanistic and automatic as the old. Although some of the amplification mechanisms have been shown to be useful in understanding the Mods and Rockers, the "machine" must be placed in historical contexts (for example, changes in the youth culture, or intergenerational relationships) before the onset of the phenomenon, and contemporary contexts (for example, simultaneous developments such as the growth of a drug-taking culture and a student-based radical movement).

This leads on to a consideration of why both the behaviour and the reaction - in different ways - tailed off. In the first place, on the side of the public and the mass media there was simply a lack of interest. Other things were happening that were both new and newsworthy. The behaviour itself carried on in either the identical form or only with slight modifications. In Northern resorts, less accessible places like the Isle of Shippey, or near certain cafes and roundabouts on inland roads, the same behaviour that took place in Clacton, Brighton or Margate was repeated. But the behaviour was too regular and familiar to be of note, it was not as visible as the original incidents and some of the original actors, particularly the Rockers, were leaving the stage. There were also the sorts of processes which occur in cases of mass delusion: a counter-suggestibility produced by the absurdity of some of the initial beliefs and a tailing off of interest when it was felt that "something is being done about it."⁴

Like the last spurts of a craze or fashion style, the behaviour was often manifested with an exaggerated formalism. There was a conscious attempt to repeat what had been done two or three years before by actors who almost belonged to another generation. The media and the control agents sometimes seized on to this behaviour, gave it new names and attempted to elevate it to the Mods and Rockers position. In places like Skegness, Blackpool and Great Yarmouth the new hooligans were called by the press or control agents, "Greasers", "Troggs" or "Thunderbirds". But such casting was not successful, even when there was an attempt to make the actors look even worse than the Mods and Rockers, (as they, in turn, had been made to look worse than the Teddy Boys). At the end of 1966, for example, a Police Inspector told the Great Yarmouth court that the offenders were from "... the roughneck types who have come hell bent causing trouble to everybody including the police, but also the innocent youths who are trying to

4. See Medalia and Larsen, op.cit., and Johnson, op.cit.

enjoy themselves ... They are not the usual Mod and Rocker." Already, the social types were assigned to the realms of folklore.

On the side of the young people themselves, there were similar factors making for a tailing off of the behaviour in its exact form. In the same way as crazes go through a cycle of latency, then a rapid spread, a slackening off, a resistance, or lack of enthusiasm, and finally to stagnation, so did the Mods and Rockers as symbolic styles fade away. The power of the symbols to differentiate its users was deflated. The sheer increase in what was familiar, standardized and routine - instead, as it sometimes was, potentially exciting - accounted for much of this deflation. Becker's account of the decline of the Alliance Youth (the Wandervogel) in Germany in the Twenties is very similar; what was esoteric became well-known:

... the ways in which social objects, expected responses and reflected selves were defined had become relatively standard ... it is a little hard to feel elation at its fullest intensity when thousands of others have undergone the same experience and have told all about it to anyone willing to lend an ear.⁵

These phenomena almost have an inner logic whereby they burn themselves out, to remain in the folklore and language as exemplars to follow or avoid: the Angry Young Men, the Teddy Boys, the Beatniks, the Flower Children all met very similar fates.

One must also note that social control might have its intended consequence. In the eagerness of transactional theorists to point out the evil effects of social control in leading to further deviance, they have ignored that potential deviants might be frightened off or deterred by actual or threatened control measures. In mass phenomena such as the Mods and Rockers, there might also be a type of de-amplification: the amplification stops because the social distance from the deviants is made so great, that new recruits are put off from joining. The only joiners are the very young or the "lumpen" who have access to few other alternatives. These are the

5. Howard Becker, German Youth: Bond or Free?, (London: Kegan Paul, 1946), p. 147.

ones who might fight with the ferocity of a group who knows it is being left behind. In the meantime, the original hard-core might mature and grow out of deviance.

The possibilities of such de-amplification suggests some positive implications for social policy. If one accepts the difficulty - or even impossibility - of preventing the initial manifestations of such mass phenomena such as the Mods and Rockers, certain subcultural forms of drug-taking and various types of vandalism, then one might attempt secondary prevention - for example, by restraining the mass media - in order to stop the first stages of amplification.

PART IV

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER 18CREDIBILITY AND APPLICABILITY

Research of an exploratory nature cannot, in a sense, reach any conclusions. What, I hope, the thesis has shown is that the transactional perspective, or more loosely, the sceptical position, has a certain credibility and can be used to some advantage in the traditional areas of concern to the criminologist and the sociologist of deviance. I will not attempt to summarize the findings or implications of the research; already by taking different slices of data from the same areas, a certain measure of repetition has been necessary. I will rather conclude with some brief general remarks about the theoretical and practical value of this sort of research.

The three studies reported in the body of the thesis have indicated, together or separately, that there is some justification in concentrating on reactions to deviance, as well as the contexts and sources of deviant behaviour itself. These studies have been conducted at different levels and on different types of phenomena. The Northview survey dealt with reactions to everyday, conventional delinquency, the type of routine behaviour which is processed daily by agencies of social control and rarely achieves the status of a headline social problem unless its extent becomes perceived as noteworthy, or it manifests itself in new or disturbing ways. The Mods and Rockers were at the other extreme: a headline social problem which suddenly erupted in the spotlight of public attention and was associated with other fashionable and newsworthy items such as the pop culture and teenage fashion styles. Vandalism is in some respects in between these two extremes. Much vandalism is such routine, everyday behaviour, and is so highly prevalent, that it is virtually a residual form of rule-breaking. Other forms of vandalism, though, can acquire headline social problem status of the same dimensions as the Mods and Rockers.

Each of these studies has, in separate ways, illuminated the nature of the societal reaction to deviance and suggested the reasons and possible effects of this reaction. By concentrating, in the first part of the vandalism study, on the definitional problem, we were able to show how useful the sceptical position might be in the earliest stages of research and theory. From some points of view, though, the exercise of sorting out different definitions might appear to be a piece of scholasticism; there is a clear danger in dealing with the wider phenomenon than vandalism - say, violence as a whole - that such an exercise can be self-defeating. The remainder of the vandalism section, but more explicitly the Mods and Rockers study, lends credibility to the position that an understanding of the processes of problem definition and the nature of the control culture with its accompanying conceptions of deviation or problem, is not only of intrinsic interest, but in fact helps understand the development and shapes of the behaviour itself. From a theoretical point of view, the sociology of moral enterprise, problem-creation and deviance-conceptualization opens up new ways of understanding the normal processes of society.

From a narrower criminological perspective, the Northview survey raises equally interesting theoretical issues. It was in itself limited, in that it stopped short at the point of charting reactions and opinions, without going on to the next crucial stage of noting their effects. Although it is intrinsically interesting to know what control agents think, this information is preliminary to knowing how they act and how their actions effect the deviant.

To put the case in its most negative and modest form, one can say that, looking at reactions to deviance, gives one an understanding of the phenomenon that would otherwise have been impossible to achieve. Slightly more positively, one might use Glaser and Strauss's criterion for judging the credibility of grounded theory: the researcher's knowledge "in his bones", that the analysis he has employed has made sense of the data and that

it will be able to be used by others studying similar areas.¹

In the body of the thesis, particularly in regard to the Northview survey, I have already indicated some of the possible practical implications of studying societal reactions. I would like to comment here on the criticism sometimes levelled at the transactional approach of being remote, abstract and irrelevant to the more practical questions criminologists have to answer. Although it was argued in the opening chapter that the sceptical approach arose partly as a reaction to research and theory being shaped entirely by such questions, I think that the demand for the applicability of a theory is a relevant one. The first point to be asserted is that, to deal with reactions is by no means a diversion from studying what is usually judged to be the more important question of causation. As Wheeler notes in defending his collection of papers on the attitudes of control agents:

... by moving away from the initial emphasis on causation, we are not sidestepping the important problems. On the contrary, a crucial assumption underlying all the chapters in this book is that the later fate of youths labelled as delinquents is not merely a function of their prior delinquent histories; instead, it is intimately tied up with the actions taken towards them by conventional society.²

There is not only Wheeler's argument about the knowledge of causation being incomplete without a knowledge of the nature and consequences of the reactions of society, but also the more obvious practical issues raised in introducing the Northview survey: the importance of community definitions in considering preventive programmes, inter-agency communication and control decisions. Indeed, one might argue, as Wheeler does to some extent, that because the initial prevention of delinquency is so complex a matter, it defies a realistic policy programme. The control culture on the other hand is relatively easy to observe and its procedures are "rational" and subject to manipulation that is both imaginable and realistic: for example, in training programmes and administrative changes. It is thus strategically sound to look at control processes as well as initial prevention.

1. Glaser and Strauss, op.cit., Chap. 9.

2. Wheeler, op.cit., pp. 1 - 2.

Moving away from the organizational to the societal level, one might develop a similar argument in regard to the emergence of large-scale deviant behaviour such as the Mods and Rockers or certain types of vandalism. While the initial deviance is difficult to prevent, the reactions to it - which set into motion processes such as secondary deviation, amplification and social problem formation - are potentially more modifiable. It was suggested, for example, that the mass media be examined in terms of their relevance in de-amplifying deviance. Such suggestions have not yet found their way into many practical programmes; one line along which they might do so has been indicated by some current applied research in Puerto Rico.³

With the background of a clear increase in juvenile delinquency in Puerto Rico following rapid industrialization and urbanization, the programme concentrates on three processes:- (i) normative diversity: in the context of rapid social change, conflicting expectations and reference groups develop, which make not just delinquency but diversity in, say, communication and clothing styles, open to the punitive sanction; (ii) differential vulnerability: the poor, the ignorant and other subgroups are not only more frustrated, but more vulnerable to official sanctions and (iii) bipolarization: a reciprocal tension between the community and its deviants is set up by the punitive sanction to deviance and diversity; this segregates groups and crystalizes their identity around a deviant role. This bipolarization separates the community into the respectable people and the hoodlums and is a necessary, but not, of course, sufficient antecedent to serious group delinquency.

The project is geared towards reducing bipolarization and breaking the cycle of tension. Various social work and community organization techniques are used to help the community to find ways of clarifying its norms other

3. My main sources of information on this research have been officials in the Puerto Rican Department of Public Health, to whom I am grateful for sending me various documents. See, particularly, A.P. de Lopez, "Exploratory Projects Regarding the Problem of Juvenile Delinquency" (Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Research Programme in Social Welfare, July 1965), and H.R. Stanton, "Non-Institutional Control of Juvenile Delinquency," (Mimeograph, no date).

than by attacking the less powerful, to find other ways for the delinquents to challenge these norms and in general to cushion the attacks by each group on each other. The initial stages of the project have concentrated on discovering the attitudes of the community towards delinquency and the criteria of judgment used by control agents. These studies are meant to provide a baseline for changing such attitudes. At the time of writing, only preliminary reports on the project are available, but even these are suggestive at least of the potential in studying the punitive community as well as the delinquent groups.

In dealing with the practical applications for grounded theory, Glaser and Strauss advance four interrelated requirements:- (i) the theory must closely fit the substantive area in which it will be used; (ii) it must be readily understandable by laymen in this area; (iii) it must be sufficiently general to be applicable to other situations within the area, not just to a specific type of situation, and (iv) it must allow the user potential control over the situation.⁴ The three studies reported in the thesis, and the concepts that have emerged from the research, go some way at least to meeting such criteria. The criterion of "fit" is difficult to demonstrate except in the superficial sense that the transactional approach and its elaborations appear to do justice to the data. This criterion would be more fully satisfied by further research on the effects of the societal reaction. The criterion of intelligibility to the layman is again difficult to establish. On the one hand, my experience with extra-mural classes and courses for control agents has shown that, say, illustrations of the amplifying effects of publicity on the Mods and Rockers or the flow chart analogy of the control system are readily understandable. On the other hand, terminology such as that from cybernetics, systems theory and symbolic interactionism can be unnecessarily unintelligible. That the theory can

4. Glaser and Strauss, op.cit., Chap. 10.

be generalized, has partly been shown by this research on three different areas, together with the rapidly increasing body of studies on other forms of deviance. Whether the user is given potential control is, as I have indicated, a largely untapped aspect of the theory. I suspect that this potential has been underplayed and that the future might see more, rather than less, emphasis on the practicality of concentrating on the societal reactions to deviance.

A P P E N D I X AList of Victim Organizations contacted for
Information about Vandalism

- I = Personal Interview
 Q = Mailed Questionnaire
 L = Letter
 D = Documents obtained (Reports, Statistics, etc.)
 N - No Response, refusals

Advertising Association. (N)
 Ancient Monuments Society (L, I)
 Brewers Society (N)
 British Railways (I, D)
 British Poster Advertising Association (L)
 British Insurance Association (D)
 City of Birmingham Tree Lovers League (L, D)
 Church Information Office (L)
 Commonwealth War Graves Commission (I)
 Coal Industry Housing Association (L)
 Construction Companies:
 George Wimpey & Co. (Q)
 Trollope & Collis Ltd. (Q)
 Richard Costain Ltd. (Q)
 Tower Construction Co. (N)
 Council of British Ceramic Sanitary Ware Manufacturers (L, D)
 Ecclesiastical Insurance Office Ltd. (I, D)
 Entertainment Organizations (Cinemas, etc.):
 Associated British Cinemas Ltd. (L)
 Rank Organization (Theatre Division) (I)
 Mecca Limited (N)
 Forestry Commission (L, D)
 General Post Office (I's, D)
 Guernsey Police (L)
 Incorporated Brewers Guild (N)
 Licenced Victuallers Protection Society (N)
 Local Government Information Office (I's, D)
 Local Authorities:
 Greater London Council (D)
 Borough of Watford (L, D)
 Harrow Council (I)
 Urban District of Teignmouth (L)
 Derbyshire Education Committee (D)
 City of Birmingham (I, D)
 County Borough of Gateshead (L)
 Edinburgh Corporation (L)
 Harlow Development Corporation (I)
 London Borough of Bromley (Q)
 Chertsey Urban District Council (L, D)
 Corporation of Glasgow (L)

L.P.E. Public Relations Ltd. (I)
Ministry of Aviation (Gatwick Airport) (L)
National Association of Parish Councils (L, D)
National Farmers Union (I)
National Trust (I)
North Thames Gas Board (Q)
Sheriff of Norfolk (L)
Universities:

- (1) "Redbridge" (I's)
- (2) "St. Edwin's College" Cambridge (I's)

Plus various schools (23) and youth organizations and clubs
(18) in Northview (I's)

A P P E N D I X BSpecimen List of Questions given to
Vandalism Victim Organizations

NOTE: The questions in this exact form were given to only a few of the organizations; this was not a questionnaire designed to yield strictly comparative data. The questions had to be varied according to the type of organization and the aspect of vandalism of particular interest: for some, this was the role of publicity; for some, the question of when the police were called in to deal with vandalism in the organization (such as a youth club); for others, the problem of estimating the cost of the damage. The term "organization" could refer to anything from an individual school, to a whole local authority and from a youth club to British Railways; the wording therefore had to be altered accordingly.

1. Do you consider vandalism to be a problem?
 - (a) in general yes / no
 - (b) in your organization/firm yes / no
2. Do you consider that vandalism is increasing?
 - (a) in general yes / no
 - (b) in your organization/firm yes / no
(give figures supporting this if possible)
3. What is your estimation of the number of individual incidents of vandalism during the past year, 1965?
4. How many incidents (a) were reported to the police
(b) resulted in a prosecution.
5. What is your estimate of the cost of this damage?
6. What are the main types of damage? i.e. What targets are most often chosen and how are they damaged?
7. When is the damage usually done?
 - (a) night / day / no difference
 - (b) during school holidays / during term / no difference
 - (c) weekdays / weekends / no difference
 - (d) summer / winter / no difference
8. By whom is the damage done?
 - (a) youths / adults / no difference / don't know
 - (b) individuals / gangs / no difference / don't know
 - (c) own employees / outsiders / no difference / don't know

9. Are there any other patterns, e.g. difference between areas of the town, or regions?
10. How is the damage reported?
 - (a) Who is responsible for reporting the damage?
 - (b) Is there a special procedure for reporting damage? If so, what?
 - (c) Is there any under-reporting, i.e. incidents not being reported? Why?
11. How are cases handled? At what point, for example, do you call in the police?
12. Public reaction
 - (a) Have you any evidence of public reaction to vandalism
 - (b) Do the public co-operate in any preventive measures you take?
13. What effect does publicity have on the problem?
14. What measures does your organization take to deal with this problem? (e.g. guards, warning signs, patrol dogs, etc.). Please specify in detail.
15. What, in your personal opinion, are the main causes of vandalism in general?
16. What, in your personal opinion, could be done by the community to prevent vandalism in general?
17. Any other comments.

A P P E N D I X CExtracts from Sermon on Vandalism
Distributed by
Local Government Information Office

"The following sermon is to be delivered by Councillor Rev. Edward CALLAND, URMSTON, Manchester, Congregational Minister, at his church on March 15th, on the occasion of a special service which will herald an organised drive against vandalism sponsored by the Urban District Council of Urmston.

"The service will be attended by members of the council, as well as representatives of other denominations and organisations in the town.

"For further details telephone Mr. Calland at 061/URM/2096."

VANDALISM

Vandalism is an affront to God and to man. Unless we do something about it soon, this nation is in danger of rotting at its roots.

In a letter to me Lord Derby described it as "the curse of the second half of the 20th century".

It offends God because He has made us in his own image - to be creative, but vandalism reduces everything to ruin, waste, devastation.

It offends man because it breaks the commandment; "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself".

It is a social cancer of to-day, prevalent mainly amongst a generation that is living for kicks.

Who are these addle-heads kicking? Who are these wreckers harming? They are kicking old people. They are kicking the sick, the dying, the injured. They are kicking tiny tots. They are kicking families hopefully longing for new houses to live in. They are harming Railway passengers, the Sports lover, The Football fan.

Forgive me if my language sounds extravagant, but this is an alarming problem. The gravity of its nature cannot be over-emphasised.

When I tell you vandalism caused the death of a little child you will appreciate my great concern.

In August 1960 a three year old boy was drowned in the River Irwell. At the inquest the Deputy Coroner for Salford said; "This child was drowned because an unknown vandal broke a lock on a gate leading to the bank. That vandal will have it on his conscience for the rest of his life. He was responsible for this child's death."

Vandalism is a monstrous injustice against society. Much of it is done by a small minority - bejeaned dandies of destruction out for a giggle.

'de' lassange', a famous French criminologist said in 1888; "every country has the crime it deserves," Psychologists may have their theories as to the cause of vandalism. I have no hesitation in describing it as vulgar and bad behaviour.

Bad behaviour is unfair to old people. A woman I know well, was nursing her sick husband. This couple were both in their seventies and he was very ill. She sat up with him day and night. One evening about 11 o'clock after a day wracked in pain, he finally dropped off to sleep, but a gang of youths were creating a din outside the front door. She opened the door and politely asked them to be quiet explaining the circumstances. She was greeted with a torrent of foul mouthed abuse. The following morning a stone was thrown through her kitchen window. The same afternoon another one was put through her bedroom window.

An elderly widow had her front gate removed and damaged five times. Apart from the shock she cannot afford this, for she only has her old age pension and National Assistance to live on.

This kind of behaviour is definitely unfair to old people. It hits below the belt. Bad behaviour is unfair to the ratepayer and the Council House tenants. It increases rents. A year or two ago, 5,000 Council tenants had their rents increased by 1/2d. a week in Salford, to pay for vandalism. There was £900 of damage at the Ladywell Flats. It puts up the rates. There is a total loss to the ratepayer of more than a million pounds a year - little of which is recoverable by insurance. Because the damage is so widespread and insurance premiums so high most councils prefer to grin and bear the loss themselves.

In this country malicious damage to public and private property now tops £3 million pounds a year. In this district in two years, eight of our schools were ransacked 41 times. Windows were broken, chairs slashed, walls, floors and blackboards daubed with paint. The contents of desks were set on fire. Thefts occurred of tape-recorders, microphones, and tools.

Do you complain because your letters sometimes go astray? Did you know that three pillar boxes were set on fire in Urmston last year? Responsible people all over the place are gravely concerned about this problem.

Sir Philip Dingle, the Town Clerk of Manchester, told me the other day that vandalism in the Manchester Parks in one year cost £1,100. That in addition a case of arson resulted in a bowling pavilion being completely destroyed and an insurance claim for £1,200. 673 litter bins were destroyed or damaged, the repairs of which cost over £800. That in eight months the Manchester Education Department spent over £3,000 because of vandalism, and even the Manchester Reservoirs have been damaged by wreckers.

Did you know that in Bradford 12 buses were put out of service because of seat slashing? Do you realise that new housing estates all over the country have been delayed completion and families kept waiting for houses because of vandalism by rowdies?, that some firms are actually adding additional items to their building estimates to cover the costs of vandalism?

This kind of behaviour is unjust because it makes a big hole in the pockets of the ratepayer and the tax payer. Bad behaviour is unfair because it injures others.

Long ago, Cain asked the question; "Am I my brother's keeper?", If we are not then we are our brother's murderer.

But there are people either through ignorance or stupidity who do not realise this. Consider these facts:-

Near Hope Railway Station at Castleton in Derbyshire vandals threw a seven ton wagon off the rails. Boys laid timber on the lines at Orrell, Nr. Wigan - two trains were held up. Railway points were jammed with stones at Bolton.

Engine Drivers and passengers have been struck with stones. A metal drum was rolled on to the lines at Eccles. Brakes were released on a Parcel Van at Manchester Victoria Station - the van ran into the sidings and hit the buffers.

The Safety factor is ignored every time the communication cord is pulled indiscriminately. The safety factor is violated every time the door of a non-corridor coach is opened when the train is tearing along.

The safety factor is forgotten by those who disrupt electrical gear and place transport in danger, or who remove danger lamps from excavation or building sites.

The Safety barrier is broken by those who break street lamps. Five thousand street lamps were smashed in one town in a year.

The Safety Factor is jeopardised by those who remove street warning signs or cut adrift lifebuoys at the sea-side or put dye into a swimming pool as happened at Southend recently.

Or pause for a moment and consider the injury to animals, birds, and fish as a result of vandalism. In URMSTON hundreds of goldfish were poisoned. At Hawford, Worcestershire, a swan defending her eggs had her leg broken when vandals stoned and smashed her nest on the River Severn. At EALING, Middlesex, 40 birds, including budgerigars and a pair of Australian Lovebirds were lost recently after being released during the night from their cages in the Aviary which is a popular feature in one of the Municipal Parks. At KINDER SCOUT in Derbyshire, two boys were discovered throwing large stones on to the sheep in a field below.

Bad behaviour of any kind which injures man, bird or beast is contemptible beyond words. But what can we do about it? How can we stop this foul rancorous disease which is harming the community? The answer is easy to give but much more difficult to put into effect.

We can do it only by creating a new moral climate. Does this sound like a parson talking? Maybe! but it will only be achieved by the whole-hearted co-operation of every responsible man woman and child in this country.

We need a return to those basic standards of decency which make a community tick.

Here in Urmston we have drawn up a Code for the Citizen. It has been signed by the Councillors and Representatives of the Public Bodies.

This is it:-

It is our duty:-

1. To take an intelligent and lively interest in our town.
2. To respect its life and amenities.
3. To help actively in its improvement.
4. To share in protecting the possessions of the town and all individuals in it from malicious damage and abuse.
5. To be good neighbours.
6. To be honest with ourselves and in our dealings with others.
7. To be fairminded and tolerant, especially towards those who differ from us in any way.
8. To go out of our way to help people whether we know them or not.
9. To stand for justice in all matters.
10. To be sincere in our beliefs and have the courage of our convictions.

But I am not so simple as to believe that a Citizen's Code can effect a moral transformation overnight. Yet I hope it will succeed in impressing some that 'to be with it' is to be a good neighbour. 'To be in gear' is to share in protecting public and private property.

I have sufficient faith in the ingrained common sense of the British character to believe that Public Opinion can help to stamp out this vandalistic dry rot which is attacking the soul of this nation. Somehow or other we must get it across to people that the 'done thing' is to be socially minded..

Vandalism, theft, crime, murder, lust, have different names, but the root cause of them all is SIN. None of us can escape our share of responsibility for these things. Parents, Teachers, Parsons, we have all failed. We have all failed in our responsibilities to the young. We have failed to teach society that the chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy Him for ever.

We have been unwilling to love God with all our heart, mind and soul and to love our neighbour as ourself.

One seldom hears of a young thug coming out of a seriously Christian home. It can happen but hardly ever does. It is rare for a juvenile criminal to be associated with a Sunday School or Church at the time his crime is committed. But, if grown ups take religion so lightly, can we blame the young if they follow our example?

I could speak for hours about vandalism in churches. Only the other day several priceless stained glass windows were broken at York Minster. In one Parish Church 196 panes of glass were smashed overnight, at another, 60 pages were torn out of the Pulpit Bible. But perhaps the most significant piece of damage occurred at a Methodist Church in Stratford. It has a lesson for us all. It followed the usual pattern. Paint daubed on walls, hymn books torn up, blasphemous slogans scrawled on walls. But, and this is the significant thing, the face of CHRIST was obliterated from a religious painting.

They could not crucify Him on Calvary in the 20th Century, so they obliterated His face from a work of art.

Obliterate Christ from society and there is no hope for the world. Destroy Christian influence and example and you remove the anchor from this England of ours.

The Ship of State will founder on the perilous rocks and reefs of disaster.

Men and Women, a revival of true Christianity is the solution of vandalism. It will do more than anything to empty our crowded prisons, purify the prostitute, and reform the thug. It will give a new purpose to life and a new meaning for living.

When everyone of us is prepared to abdicate selfishness, pride, sin and evil, and allow Christ to occupy the Throne of our Hearts, then and only then will the trumpets sound, the chariot wheels of God begin to turn and the armies of the King march on to Victory.

AMEN.

A P P E N D I X D

Leaflet Issued During the Birmingham
"Stop Vandalism Week", 9th - 15th January, 1967

LEND A HAND



STOP
THE
VANDALS

A P P E N D I X EExtracts from Proposals for an Advertising Campaign, Prepared for British Railways by
"Madison" Advertising Agency.Creative recommendations aimed at
discouraging hooliganism and
vandalism on British Railways1. Objective

The Agency's aim is to discourage hooliganism and vandalism on British Railway property through a national, strategically selected, poster campaign using creative methods aimed at these three pre-determined classes of reader.

1. Parents
2. Schoolchildren
3. People already trespassing on British Railway's property

1. PARENTS:

This class prove to be the most straight forward part of the overall problem. They are of course an innocent section of our market and as such must be appealed to by the most reasonable form of argument. We would reach this section by displaying posters on British Railway's stations. Two distinctly different designs and copy stories are presented for your consideration. The first takes the form of an actual press announcement of the rail disaster ... this would have a super-imposed message in red asking a very direct, emotive and leading question. To enable British Railways to gather as many helpers in this campaign as possible, the copy states that "A word from you tonight, could avoid a terrible disaster". This immediately acknowledges the important role that a parent can play in the overall promotion. The second approach uses the damaged hand of an apparently dead child and again in a forceful, emotional way

stuns the parent into the realisation that his children, like all children, could create this sort of disaster, and suggests in a colloquial way the part parents can play.

2. SCHOOLCHILDREN:

Here the Agency presents four poster approaches for your consideration. Bearing in mind the range of age groups covered by this category, we have based one idea on to two visual techniques to accommodate age variance. The basic idea behind those first two posters is that of "chicken", the game of dodging oncoming trains. For the younger children the Agency recommends the use of the tough youngster as featured on the poster with whom children of this age group would easily identify themselves. He is stating quite categorically that it is far, far better to be a live "chicken" than a dead duck, and in simple language goes on to point out the danger and repercussions to themselves and the parents of such children should they, the children, become involved in this sort of stupidity...

Knowing the tremendous impact that the pop scene has made on the minds of young people, we feel that a strong argument could be made to dissuade young people from fooling about with railway property by suggesting, in the third poster in the category, that their favourite pop stars travel thousands of miles on the railways. Therefore it is never, ever worth-while fooling about, because this sort of stupidity could well hurt someone they know and like. Visually there is considerable impact achieved by combining a pop star and a rail disaster ...

3. PEOPLE TRESPASSING ON BRITISH RAILWAYS PROPERTY

Because these people already show criminal intentions, the Agency has no hesitation whatever in applying the toughest arguments possible at this section. As far as can be established in the short time at the Agency's disposal, we feel that there is a hard core of young people who are simply and purely psychopaths. They will not, and indeed cannot, react as normal human

beings to reasonable argument and normal persuasion. These people are the ring-leaders of any dangerous activities on the line. They are a social problem. Creative communication however strong and persuasive to normal human beings can in no way affect the behaviour of these people. It is felt by the Agency that any attempt to communicate directly with this hard core is doomed from the outset, but there is surrounding this psychopath hard core an idiocy fringe of hangers-on. They are rather weak minded, feeble, sheep-like youngsters, who, because of the tremendous control that their ring-leaders have over them, bend to the ring-leaders' influence. They might, being subjected to a more intelligent argument against taking part in such stupidity, be able collectively to resist...

The Agency suggests four poster approaches to this section ... In the first we have, without pulling any punches, clearly told the reader (provided he is not one of the psychopath hard core) that his is a subservient role, and we provide him with hard, forceful reasoned arguments, using his own rather ungrammatical language, to give him ammunition to fight back should he be instructed by his leader ... The Agency is strongly convinced that tough measures of this nature should be taken in any creative communication directed at these layabouts. The second type of poster even uses the argument of "self-styled God" to pay lip service to their ring leaders' status, all in an attempt to make maximum communication with these youngsters.

The third advertisement in this category uses ... the deterrent of jail. The Agency's argument of 20 years and more is based upon a typical maximum manslaughter sentence which we presume could be carried out on those who kill people in deliberate rail accidents. This, as with all posters in this section, is written to appeal at the time of the premeditated

hooliganism. The final poster in this section could be used in strategic positions on or near railway bridges from which hooligans can tamper with the electrification system...

Although this is not part of the Agency's brief, our deliberations have enabled us to consider one aspect of this promotion over and above that of posters. This would be the introduction of a movement amongst school children from five to school-leaving age and would be called the 'Chicken Club'. Its motto would be "Better a live chicken than a dead duck". It would be for boys and girls who take a superior pride in being "chicken", who've never been fools enough to be persuaded into playing last across the line... There would be a badge, possibly a yellow chicken feather or perhaps a cock crowing. It would be a way of turning the natural gang-mindedness of boys and girls to our advantage instead of, as at present, our disadvantage. It would make a negative thing ie. refusing to play running across the line, into a positive thing. It would give a code of action, something to be proud of, to the weaker brethren who now have nothing better to do than follow their more daring or psychopath leaders. The club could no doubt develop other aspects, positive, constructive interest in trains, engine drivers etc., but its primary aim would be to give the fringe majority an answer, "Better a live chicken than a dead duck, and I've got a badge to prove it" to the taunt of "chicken". To make in fact being "chicken" a thing to feel big, instead of small, about...

A P P E N D I X FNorthview Survey: Interview Schedule

(The actual schedule was 22 pages long, spaces
of up to a page being left for recording answers
to open-ended questions)

OPINIONS ABOUT JUVENILE DELINQUENCY
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

O. NO. _____
CODE _____

Name of Respondent
Occupation of Respondent
Date of Interview
Length of Interview

General Comments about Interview:

A ORIENTATION TO YOUTH

1. I would like to start off with a very general sort of
question - in what ways do you think young people today
are different from young people in the previous generation?
.....

2. How do you find "getting through" to young people today -
easy or difficult?
.....
(PROBE FOR COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS IN HOME OR WORK
AS APPLICABLE)
.....

3. Take young people today, say between the ages of 15 to
18 - how much importance do you think they place on each
of the following things? How important are these things
to them?
(HAND RESPONDENT CARD A AND GIVE INSTRUCTIONS)
(RECORD COMMENTS ON EACH ITEM)

- (a) overcoming shyness ()
.....
- (b) getting enough money for clothes and enter- ()
tainment
.....
- (c) choosing the right occupation ()
.....
- (d) becoming independent of parents ()
.....
- (e) finding a satisfactory code of moral ()
standards
.....

- (f) sorting out feelings about sex ()

 (g) getting recognition and status from society ()

 (h) overcoming boredom ()

B GENERAL ORIENTATION TO DELINQUENCY

4. Another rather general question - what do you think is the size of the juvenile delinquency problem in this country today? How much of a problem would you say it is? (PROBES: What reason would you give for saying that? Just how much has juvenile delinquency been increasing?)

 (a) What types of delinquency have increased most?

 5. (a) Can you think of any types of behaviour by young people today which are not usually thought of as delinquent, and would not end up in the court, but should still be causes of concern?

 (b) Are there any types of delinquency which are dealt with by the courts, but you think should be handled some other way? How?

C CAUSATION OF DELINQUENCY AND IMAGE OF THE DELINQUENT

6. What do you think are the most important causes of delinquency in general?
 (PROBE FOR "CATCH AREAS" NOT MENTIONED:
 Home, School, Economic Conditions, Social Climate)
 (IF NOT STATED: What is the one thing you feel is most important?)

 7. In order to get a little more specific information, I'd like to show you a list of things that people have suggested as important in understanding why a boy becomes delinquent. All of these things may be important, but you'll probably find that you think some of them more important than others.
 HAND RESPONDENT SHEET A
 I'd like you to mark in the spaces on the right hand margin of this sheet how much importance you would give to each of the factors on the list. Please read through the whole list first. Choose your answers again from those on this card.
 HAND RESPONDENT CARD A
 WHEN RESPONDENT FINISHES:
 Now would you go through the list again, marking in order on the left hand side the three things you think are the most important. Just write "1" - "2" - "3" next to your choices.

SHEET A (Question 7)

Because his parents had given him very little love and attention _____

Because he was a member of a gang _____

Because he came from a very poor home _____

Because he had been using drugs such as purple hearts _____

Because he was emotionally disturbed _____

Because he was below average in intelligence _____

Because he came from an area where lots of other boys were delinquent _____

Because his parents were mentally ill or emotionally disturbed _____

Because society had not given him the status and recognition he aspired to _____

Because he failed to receive religious training at home _____

Because he had always found school unsatisfactory and boring _____

Because there was a lack of discipline in the home _____

Because his neighbourhood lacked recreational facilities such as clubs or sports grounds _____

Because his family history indicated that his anti-social behaviour had been inherited _____

Because he had been influenced by T.V. and films _____

8. Another question about juvenile delinquents in general - would you say that there are different kinds and types of delinquents or that they are pretty much alike?

alike _____

types _____

don't know _____

IF ALIKE:

Could you briefly describe what you think most delinquents are like? How do you see them?

(PROBE FOR: socio-economic group; education; intelligence; physical appearance; psychological characteristics; attitudes; offence pattern)

IF DIFFERENT TYPES:

What different types are there? Could you describe each one briefly for me?

(PROBES AS ABOVE)

.....

D MODS AND ROCKERS

9. I would now like to turn to something more specific - the type of behaviour that took place at Clacton, Margate and other seaside resorts over Bank Holiday weekends last year and at Brighton this year.

(a) How do you feel about this sort of thing?
(PROBES: Do you think that it is a big problem?
In what ways? Why do you say that?)

.....

(b) Is this sort of thing something new or has it been going on for a long time?

.....

(c) How do you feel about the way that the press and T.V. handled the events?

.....

(d) Do you think that this sort of thing is likely to happen again in the same form? For how long?

.....

(e) Other comments.

.....

10. We talked earlier about juvenile delinquents in general - now how about the youths that take part in the Mods and Rockers type of thing, how would you describe them? Are they the same as the rest of the delinquent group(s)?

(PROBE FOR IMAGE)

same _____

different _____

don't know _____

11. What do you think are the best methods to deal with this type of behaviour?

How appropriate do you think each of the following methods is? Of course you want to know more about each individual but could you just say in general terms which ones you are in favour of?

Please answer according to the choices on this card.
HAND RESPONDENT CARD B

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|
| 1. Probation | _____ |
| 2. Full repayment of damage | _____ |
| 3. Heavy fines | _____ |
| 4. Punish parents | _____ |
| 5. Confiscate licence if vehicle used | _____ |
| 6. Confiscate vehicle if used | _____ |
| 7. Corporal Punishment | _____ |
| 8. Detention Centre | _____ |
| 9. Borstal | _____ |
| 10. Work Scheme | _____ |
| 11. Army | _____ |

Against "putting in Army" but if National Service,
this would't have happened

Yes _____
No _____

OTHER SUGGESTIONS AND COMMENTS:

.....

12. Suppose that you were dealing with a boy of 17 and you find out that he's been convicted of the type of offence that the "Mods" and "Rockers" were involved in. Do you think that this knowledge will affect the way you deal with the boy?

(PROBE FOR REACTIONS IN RESPONDENT'S OWN SETTING

.....

E REACTION TO TYPES OF DELINQUENCY AND FACTORS
AFFECTING DECISION MAKING

13. A problem I'm interested in is how people feel about other different kinds of delinquent acts. I'm going to read out a series of activities that different boys might take part in and I'd like you to give me some opinions about these boys and their actions.

Assume that in each case the boy is 15 years old and that he has no previous record of delinquency. Assume also that this is the first time the boy has committed the particular act, and that unless I state otherwise, the act was committed alone.

Of course you'd want to know much more before making definite judgements, but on first impression, as a snap judgement, I'd like your opinion of these four things:-

- (a) Firstly, how serious for the community do you feel the act is? Is it something small, or something which can't be tolerated?
- (b) Secondly, how likely is it, if the boy did something like this, that he is emotionally disturbed?
- (c) How likely is it that the causes lie in society, rather than the boy? i.e. is he the victim of broader social and economic forces?
- (d) Would you be in favour of sending the boy away from home - say to a place such as a detention centre?

(IF NOT, RECORD ALTERNATIVES)

HAND RESPONDENT CARD C AND EXPLAIN USING ITEM
NUMBER 10 (Mods and Rockers) AS AN EXAMPLE

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
1. He destroys school property worth about £10	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. He takes part in an armed robbery of a petrol station	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. He has sexual relations with a willing 15 year old girl	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. He takes a car for a joy ride	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. He places stones or other such objects on a railway track	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. He takes a cheap article from a chain store or supermarket	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. He gets drunk in the street with a group of his friends	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. He takes part in a gang fight where everyone uses weapons	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. He drives a motor scooter without a licence	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. He joins in the activities of the Mods or Rockers	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. He takes part in homosexual relations with a boy of his own age	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. He takes part in civil disobedience - such as holding up the traffic by sitting in the middle of the road	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. He starts using regularly drugs such as "purple hearts"	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. He steals a book from a public library	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. He defaces the walls of public building such as bus shelters and public conveniences	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. He steals £1 from the open till of a shop	_____	_____	_____	_____

14. As I mentioned before, there's other information you might consider important in coming to the sort of decisions and impressions that you reached in the previous questions. Could you tell me how much importance you attach to each of the following factors in deciding how to deal with a boy?

HAND RESPONDENT CARD A, AND REPEAT INSTRUCTIONS

1. What social class the boy came from _____
2. Whether the act was premeditated or not _____
3. The boy's general appearance and way of dress _____
4. How frequently he had engaged in delinquent behaviour before _____
5. What type of school the boy came from or what type of job he had _____
6. Whether the boy shows respect when the policeman or magistrate talks to him _____
7. Whether the act is one that is strongly disapproved of by the public _____
8. Whether there is any likelihood of the boy being emotionally disturbed _____
9. Whether the act was done alone or in a gang _____
10. Whether the boy thinks that his action was justified and doesn't regret it _____

F CONTROL AND PREVENTION

15. I'd like to ask your opinion about the juvenile court. How do you feel about the way in which juvenile courts should be run?

(PROBE FOR: Ideas about aims and atmosphere of juvenile courts, especially whether it should be run along "welfare" or "traditional" lines.)

.....

- (a) How do you feel about the sort of people who are juvenile court magistrates?

.....

16. What would be the one thing you would like to see done to prevent juvenile delinquency or at least keep it in check?

(PROBE THEN FOR ATTITUDES TO CONTROL OR PREVENTION AGENCIES NOT MENTIONED: CLUBS AND OTHER YOUTH ORGANISATIONS; SCHOOL; PSYCHIATRY.)

.....

17. Do you think that it is possible to predict at a very early age - say at 6 to 8 - which children are likely to become delinquent later?

Yes _____

No _____

Don't know _____

(PROBE FOR REASONS)

.....

Assuming that somebody did claim to have devised an accurate prediction test - do you think it would be a good idea to use it?

Good idea _____

Poor idea _____

Don't know _____

(PROBE FOR REASONS)

.....

IF GOOD IDEA:

How could the test be used, for example, in the schools?

.....

G PERSONAL INFORMATION

18. As I wrote in my letter, these interviews will be kept confidential and your name will not be used anywhere - I wonder though, if you wouldn't mind giving me a few bits of information about yourself. This is just census-type information which I'm asking for in order to check that the survey covers a cross section.

(a) Age _____

(b) Marital Status

married 1

single 2

widowed 3

divorced 4

or separated

IF MARRIED

(c) Children 0

1

2

3

4+

(d) Length of time as

(a) (.....)

FOR: MAGISTRATES,
COUNCILLORS,
VOL. YOUTH WORKERS

(e) Full time occupation
and length of time

.....

(f) Previous occupation

.....

(g) Father's occupation

.....

19. (a) Do you belong to any organizations, national or local, concerned with delinquency or crime?

SPECIFY:

Yes	1
No	2

- (b) Do you belong to any other bodies in the community - committees, boards etc.?

Own professional or organizational:

Welfare:

Educational/Youth:

Religious:

Political:

Other (specify):

- (c) Are you in favour of approaches by the whole community to deal with the sort of problems we've been discussing? (e.g. forums, committees)

(PROBE FOR REASONS AND RESPONDENTS PERSONAL INTEREST)

Yes	1
No	2

.....

- (d) FOR CONTROL AND PREVENTION AGENTS:

Are you satisfied with the amount of contact you have with others working in the field?

(PROBE FOR CONTACTS DESIRED)

Yes	1
No	2

.....

RESPONDENTS CONTACT WITH DELINQUENCY IN HIS OWN SETTING

.....

FURTHER INFORMATION ABOUT RESPONDENT

.....

CARD A
(For Questions 3, 7 and 14)

No Importance at all	-	1
Very Little Importance	-	2
Some Importance	-	3
Much Importance	-	4
Very Great Importance	-	5

CARD B
(For Question 11)

Strongly in Favour of	-	1
In Favour of	-	2
Undecided	-	3
Against	-	4
Strongly Against	-	5

CARD C
(For Question 13)

(a) Seriousness

Not at all serious	-	1
Somewhat Serious	-	2
Quite Serious	-	3
Extremely Serious	-	4

(b) Emotional Disturbance

Not at all likely	-	1
Somewhat likely	-	2
Quite likely	-	3
Extremely likely	-	4

(c) Social Forces

Not at all likely	-	1
Somewhat likely	-	2
Quite likely	-	3
Extremely likely	-	4

(d) Detention

Very much in favour	-	1
In favour	-	2
Against	-	3
Very much Against	-	4

A P P E N D I X GSpecimen Letter Sent to Northview Sample *

Telephone No.

Address

Dear Mr. ,

I am writing to you in connection with a survey that I am carrying out from the London School of Economics, University of London, under the direction of Dr. Terence Morris. I believe that you were informed earlier this year by the Education Committee that I have been authorized to approach you for your assistance in this enquiry. Your name was selected at random from a list of Head Teachers given to me by the Committee.

The survey is about juvenile delinquency and young people in general. It is concerned at this stage to find out the personal opinions on these subjects of members of the community who, like yourself and other Head Teachers deal with young people. It is believed that your knowledge and experience will be most valuable and that any action concerned with this problem needs the interest and support of those active in the field. Other groups being contacted include youth leaders, magistrates and probation officers.

The survey, while initially concentrated in Northview, will eventually include other areas. Any information obtained will be used for research purposes only, and will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous.

I would very much appreciate it if you could spare the time to discuss the questions included in the enquiry. If the date on the enclosed card is convenient, could you please return the card indicating a suitable time to meet. Alternatively, could you suggest another date (evenings and weekends included) which would then be confirmed.

Yours faithfully,

(Mr.) S. Cohen

* Details varied according to each occupational group.

A P P E N D I X HBrighton Sample: Interview ScheduleI PRE-AMBLE

I'm from the University of London, doing a study of what people think about this sort of thing. Do you mind giving me 10 minutes to answer a few questions? There are no right or wrong answers - I just want your personal opinion. If you don't mind talking into this tape-recorder, it'll save time because I won't have to write everything down. I'm not going to ask you for your name, so don't worry about what you say.

II QUESTION GUIDE

1. How do you feel about this sort of thing?
2. What do you think is the main cause of all this?
3. Do you think that this sort of thing is something new?
4. Do you think that we're going to have this sort of thing with us for a long time?
5. Do you agree with the way the police are handling this?
6. How would you like to see the ones who cause trouble handled?
 - (a) on the spot
 - (b) by the courts
7. What would you do if your own child/brother/friend got involved in this?
8. What sort of youngsters do you think these are:
 (PROBE FOR: Local or out of town?
 Type of School?
 Social Class?
 "Ordinary Kids" or "Delinquent Types"?)

III PERSONAL INFORMATION

Would you mind giving me some information about yourself, so that we can check, like Gallup Poll do, that we've got a cross section of opinion? Don't answer any of these questions if you don't want to.

Male..... 1
 Female..... 2

Local Resident..... 5
 Out of town..... 6

16 - 20..... 3
 21 - 24..... 4
 25 - 29..... 5
 30 - 34..... 6
 35 - 44..... 7
 45 - 49..... 8
 50 - 64..... 9
 65+10

Occupation.....

Married..... 1
 Single..... 2
 Widowed..... 3
 Divorced/Separated.... 4

Labour.....1
 Conservative..... 2
 Liberal..... 3
 Other..... 4

R E F E R E N C E S

- Aichhorn, August. Wayward Youth (London: Imago Publishing Co., 1951)
- Akers, Ronald L. "Socio-Economic Status and Delinquent Behaviour: A Retest," Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, 1 (January 1964), 38-46
- _____. "Problems in the Sociology of Deviance: Social Definitions and Behaviour," Social Forces, 46 (June 1968), 455-465
- Allport, Gordon & Postman, L. The Psychology of Rumour (New York: Henry Holt, 1947)
- _____. The Nature of Prejudice (New York: Doubleday Anchor, 1958)
- Baker, George W. & Chapman, Dwight W. Man and Society in Disaster (New York: Basic Books, 1962)
- Barker, Paul & Little, Alan. "The Margate Offenders: A Survey," New Society, 4 (30th July 1964), 6-10
- Barton, A.H. et al. Social Organization Under Stress: A Sociological Review of Disaster Studies (Washington D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, 1963)
- Barton, Arthur. "A Smashing Time: Vandalism in School," The Tablet, 25th June 1966, 725-726
- Bates, William. "Caste, Class and Vandalism," Social Problems, 9 (Spring 1962), 349-353
- _____. & McJunkins, Thomas. "Vandalism and Status Differences," Pacific Sociological Review, 5 (1962), 89-92
- Becker, Howard. German Youth: Bond or Free? (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1946)
- Becker, Howard S. Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance (New York: Free Press, 1963)
- _____. (ed.) The Other Side: Perspectives on Deviance (New York: Free Press, 1964)
- _____. (ed.) Social Problems: A Modern Approach (New York: John Wiley, 1966)
- _____. Introduction to Clifford R. Shaw: The Jack Roller: A Delinquent Boy's Own Story (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1966)
- _____. "Whose Side Are We On?" Social Problems, 14 (Winter 1967), 239-247
- Bend, E. & Vogelfanger, M. "A New Look at Mills' Critique" in B. Rosenberg et al (eds.) Mass Society in Crisis: Social Problems and Social Pathology (New York: Macmillan, 1964)
- Bensman, J. & Gerver, I. "Crime and Punishment in the Factory: A Functional Analysis," in Rosenberg et al (eds.) Mass Society in Crisis.

- Berger, Peter L. & Luckman, Thomas. The Social Construction of Reality (London: Allen Lane, 1968)
- Blegvad, Britt-Mari Persson. "Newspapers and Rock and Roll Riots in Copenhagen," Acta Sociologica, 7 (1963), 151-178
- Boorstin, Daniel J. The Image (London: Penguin, 1963)
- Brown, Roger. "Mass Phenomena," in G. Lindzey (ed.) Handbook of Social Psychology (Cambridge, Mass: Addison Wesley, 1954) 833-876
- Buchanan, B. "Punishment for Disorderly Gangs," Magistrate, 20 (1964), 170-171
- Bucher, Rue. "Blame and Hostility in Disaster," American Journal of Sociology, 62 (March 1957), 467-475
- Burroughs, William. The Naked Lunch (London: John Calder, 1964)
- Caplowitz, David & Rogers, Candace. Swastika 1960: The Epidemic of Anti-Semitic Vandalism in America (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, 1961)
- Casson, F.R.C. "Vandals," Family Doctor, (August 1966), 464-465
- Chambliss, William. "A Sociological Analysis of the Law of Vagrancy," Social Problems, 7 (Summer 1959), 48-57
- _____ & Liell, John T. "The Legal Process in the Community Setting," Crime and Delinquency, 12 (October 1966), 310-317
- Chein, Isidor et al. Narcotics, Delinquency and Social Policy: The Road to H (London: Tavistock, 1964)
- Chilton, Roland J. "Middle Class Delinquency and Specific Offence Analysis," in E.W. Vaz (ed.) Middle Class Juvenile Delinquency (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), 91-101
- Clark, Eric. "Vandalism: 'Phone Wrecking Only Part of the Story," Observer, 9th January, 1966
- Clark, John P. & Wenninger, Eugene P. "Socio-Economic Class and Area as Correlates of Illegal Behaviour among Juveniles," American Sociological Review, 27 (December 1962), 826-834
- Clark, Kenneth B. & Barker, James. "The Zoot Effect in Personality: A Race Riot Participant," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 40 (1945), 143-148
- Clark, W.H. "Sex Differences and Motivation in the Urge to Destroy," Journal of Social Psychology, 36 (November 1952), 167-177
- Clinard, Marshall B. (ed.) Anomie and Deviant Behaviour (New York: Free Press, 1964)
- _____ & Wade, Andrew L. "Toward the Delineation of Vandalism as a Subtype in Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 48 (January, 1958), 493-499
- _____ & Quinney, R. Criminal Behaviour Systems: A Typology (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967)

- Coates, Ken. "Wage Slaves," in Robin Blackburn & Alexander Cockburn (eds.) The Incompatibles: Trade Union Militancy and the Consensus (London: Penguin, 1967)
- Cohen, Albert K. Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang (New York: Free Press, 1955)
- _____. "The Study of Social Disorganization and Deviant Behaviour," in R.K. Merton et al (eds.) Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects (New York: Basic Books, 1959)
- _____. "The Sociology of the Deviant Act: Anomie Theory and Beyond," American Sociological Review, 30 (February 1965), 5-14
- _____. Deviance and Control (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1966)
- _____. & Short, J.F. "Juvenile Delinquency," in R.K. Merton & R.A. Nisbèt (eds.) Contemporary Social Problems (New York: Harcourt Bruce & World Inc., 1966)
- Cohen, Stanley. "Vandalism," New Education, 2 (October 1966), 10-15
- _____. "Mods, Rockers and The Rest: Community Reactions to Juvenile Delinquency," Howard Journal of Penology and Crime Prevention, XII (1967), 121-130
- _____. Review of Kai T. Erikson Wayward Puritans in British Journal of Criminology, 7 (July 1967), 346-348
- _____. & Rock, Paul. "The Teddy Boys: Evolution of a Social Type," in V. Bogdamor & R. Skidelski (eds.) Britain in the Fifties (London: Macmillan, Forthcoming)
- Cooper, David. Psychiatry and Anti-Psychiatry (London: Tavistock, 1967)
- Cormier, Bruno M. et al "Cell Brekage and Gate Fever: A Study of Two Syndromes Found in the Deprivation of Liberty," British Journal of Criminology, 7 (July 1967), 317-324
- Coser, Lewis A. "Some Functions of Deviant Behaviour and Normative Flexibility," American Journal of Sociology, 68 (September 1962), 172-181
- Council of British Ceramic Sanitaryware Manufacturers, "Survey of Washing Facilities in Public Conveniences in Great Britain and also of Vandalism in Public Conveniences," (March 1965, Mimeograph, 43 pp)
- Dearing, E. & Capozzola, T. "A Survey of Professional Opinions on Juvenile Delinquency," (Department of Institutions, State of Colorado, Mimeograph, undated)
- Dentler, Robert A. Major American Social Problems (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1967)
- _____. & Erikson, K. "The Function of Deviance in Groups," Social Problems, 7 (Fall 1959), 98-107
- Deutsch, Martin. "The 1960 Swastika Smearings: Analysis of the Apprehended Youth," Merrill Palmer Quarterly of Behaviour and Development, (April 1962), 1-22

- Deutscher, Irwin. "Some Relevant Directions for Research on Juvenile Delinquency," in Arnold M. Rose (ed.) Human Behaviour and Social Processes (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962)
- Dienstein, William. "Interprofessional Differences in Beliefs about the Etiology of Juvenile Delinquency," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 51 (1960), 79-80
- DiRenzo, Gordon J. Juvenile Delinquency and Public Opinion (Notre Dame: Department of Sociology, University of Notre Dame, January 1962 Mimeograph)
- Docker-Drysdale, P. "Some Aspects of Damage and Restitution," British Journal of Delinquency, 4 (July 1953), 4-13
- Dow, Thomas E. Jnr. "The Role of Identification in Conditioning Public Attitudes Towards the Offender," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 58 (March 1967), 75-79
- Downes, David M. "Clacton and the Dead End," Observer 6th April 1964
- _____. "What to do About the Mods and Rockers?" Family Doctor, (August 1965), 469-471
- _____. The Delinquent Solution: A Study in Sub-cultural Theory (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966)
- Ehrlich, Howard J. "The Swastika Epidemic of 1959 and 1960: Anti-Semitism and Community Characteristics," Social Problems, 9 (Winter 1962), 264-271
- Ellerby, John. "Notes on Vandalism," Anarchy, 61 (March 1966), 65-75
- Elmes, Frank. "Mods and Rockers," Police Review, LXXII (5th June 1964)
- Eppel, E.M. & Eppel, M. Adolescents and Morality (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966)
- Erikson, Eric H. & Erikson, Kai T. "The Confirmation of the Delinquent," The Chicago Review, 10 (Winter 1957), 15-23
- _____. (ed.) Youth: Change and Challenge (New York: Basic Books, 1963)
- Erikson, Kai T. "Notes on the Sociology of Deviance," in Becker (ed.) The Other Side
- _____. Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance (New York: John Wiley, 1966)
- Federal Probation. XXVIII (March 1964) Note on Vandalism p.76
- Freeman, Richard. Graffiti (London: Hutchinson, 1966)
- Friedenberg, Edgar Z. "The Image of the Adolescent Minority," Dissent, 10 (Spring 1963), 149-158
- _____. "Adolescence as a Social Problem," in Becker (ed.) Social Problems
- Fritz, Charles E. "Disaster," in R.K. Merton & R.A. Nisbet (eds.) Contemporary Social Problems (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1963)

- Fuller, Richard C. & Myers, R.R. "Some Aspects of a Theory of Social Problems," American Sociological Review, 6 (February 1941), 24-32
-
- "The Natural History of a Social Problem," American Sociological Review, 6 (June 1941), 320-329
- Fyvel, T.R. The Insecure Offenders: Rebellious Youth in the Welfare State (London: Chatto & Windus, 1961)
- Gans, Herbert J. The Levittowners: Ways of Life and Politics in a New Suburban Community (London: Allen Lane, 1967)
- Garfinkel, Harold. "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies," American Journal of Sociology, LXI (March 1956), 420-424
- Gibbens, T.C.N. "Teenage Riots Around the World," New Society, 4 (6th August 1964), 8-10
- Gibbs, Jack P. "Conceptions of Deviant Behaviour: The Old and the New," Pacific Sociological Review, 9 (Spring 1966), 9 - 14
- Gibson, H.B. "Self-Reported Delinquency: Preliminary Results of an On-going Study," (Unpublished paper read at Third National Conference on Teaching and Research in Criminology, Cambridge, July 1968)
- Gilbert, G.M. "Crime and Punishment: An Exploratory Comparison of Public, Criminal and Penological Attitudes," Mental Hygiene, 42 (October 1958), 550-557
- Glaser, Barney G. & Strauss, Anselm L. The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1968)
- Goffman, Erving. Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1961)
-
- Behaviour in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings (New York: Free Press 1963)
-
- Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Inc., 1963)
-
- Gold, Martin. "Undetected Delinquent Behaviour," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, (January 1966), 27-47
-
- "On Social Status and Delinquency: A Note on Voss's Article," Social Problems, 15 (Summer 1967), 114-116
- Goldman, Nathan. "A Socio-Psychological Study of School Vandalism," Crime and Delinquency, (July 1961), 221-230
- Gorer, Geoffrey. Death, Grief and Mourning in Contemporary Britain (London: Cresset, 1965)
- Gouldner, Alvin W. "The Sociologist as Partisan: Sociology and the Welfare State," American Sociologist, 3 (May 1968), 103-116

- Greater London Council, Hooliganism on Council Estates
(Report by The Director of Housing, Ref. Hg. 821, 1st
May 1967)
- Greeley, Andrew & Casey, James. "An Upper Middle Class Deviant
Gang," American Catholic Sociological Review, 24
(Spring 1963), 33-41
- Greenberg, Bradley S. & Parker, Edwin, B. The Kennedy
Assassination and the American Public: Social Communica-
tion in Crisis (Stanford, California: Stanford University
Press, 1965)
- Grosser, George H. et al (eds.) The Threat of Impending
Disaster: Contributions to the Psychology of Stress
(Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1964)
- Gusfield, Joseph. Symbolic Crusade: Status Politics and the
American Temperance Movement (Urbana: University of
Illinois, 1963)
- Harrington, J.A. "A Preliminary Report on Soccer Hooliganism,"
(Birmingham Research Group, 1968, Mimeograph 50pp.)
- Hartung, Frank E. Crime, Law and Society (Detroit: Wayne
State University Press, 1965)
- Hobsbawn, E.J. "The Machine Breakers" in Labouring Men
(London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1964)
- Hood, Roger. Sentencing in Magistrates Courts (London:
Stevens & Sons, 1962)
- Horowitz, Irving Louis. "Consensus, Conflict and Co-operation:
A Sociological Inventory," Social Forces, 41 (December
1962), 177-188.
- Horton, John. "Order and Conflict Theories of Social Problems
as Competing Ideologies," American Journal of Sociology,
71 (May 1966), 701-713
- Housden, J. "The Relative Frequencies of the Sexual
Paraphilias as Demonstrated by 159 Graffiti," British
Journal of Criminology, 3 (January 1963), 290-293
- Jacobs, Norman. "The Phantom Slasher of Tapei: Mass Hysteria
in a Non-Western Society," Social Problems, 12 (Winter
1965), 318-328
- Johnson, Donald M. "The Phantom Anaesthetist of Mattoon"
Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 40 (1945)
175-186
- Kitsuse, John I. "Societal Reaction to Deviant Behaviour:
Problems of Theory and Method," Social Problems, 9
(Winter 1962), 247-256
- _____ & Cicourel, Aaron V. "A Note on the Use of
Official Statistics," Social Problems, 11 (Fall 1963),
131-139
- Knight, Douglas W. "Punishment Selection as a Function of
Biographical Information," Journal of Criminal Law,
Criminology and Police Science, 56 (September 1965)
325-327

- Laing, R.D. The Divided Self (London: Penguin, 1965)
- _____ et al International Perception (London: Tavistock, 1966)
- _____ The Politics of Experience and the Bird of Paradise (London: Penguin, 1967)
- Lang, Kurt & Lang, Gladys Engel. "The Unique Perspective of Television and Its Effect: A Pilot Study," American Sociological Review, 18 (February 1953), 3-12
- Laurie, Peter. The Teenage Revolution (London: Anthony Blond Ltd., 1965)
- Lemert, Edwin M. "Some Aspects of a Theory of Sociopathic Behaviour," Proceedings of the Pacific Sociological Society, (Research Studies, State College of Washington) 16 (1948), 23-29
- _____ Social Pathology: A Systematic Approach to the Theory of Sociopathic Behaviour (New York: McGraw Hill, 1951)
- _____ "Social Structure, Social Control and Deviation" in Clinard (ed.) Anomie and Deviant Behaviour
- _____ Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1967)
- Lentz, William P. "Social Status and Attitudes Toward Delinquency Control," Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 3 (July 1966), 147-154
- Lindsay, Jack. The Writing on the Wall (London: Muller, 1960)
- Lippman, Hyman S. "Vandalism as an Outlet for Aggression," Federal Probation, XVII (March 1954), 5-6
- Local Government Information Office. "The Cost of Vandalism to Local Authorities: Results and Report of Answers to a Questionnaire," (31st March, Mimeograph 5pp.)
- de Lopez, Awilda Palay. "Exploratory Projects Regarding the Problem of Juvenile Delinquency," (Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Research Programme in Social Welfare, Series on Juvenile Delinquency, Publication No. 1.A., July 1965)
- Lorber, Judith. "Deviance as Performance: The Case of Illness," Social Problems, 14 (Winter 1967), 302-310
- Lumbard, J.E. "The Citizens Role in Law Enforcement," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 56 (March 1965), 69
- McClintock, F.H. & Avison, N. Howard. Crime in England and Wales (London: Heinemann, 1968)
- MacGuire, Alec. "Emancipated and Reactionaries," New Society, 4 (28th May 1964), 5-6
- Mandel, Jerry. "Hashish, Assassins, and the Love of God" Issues in Criminology, 2 (Fall 1966), 149-156
- Mannheim, Herman. "The Problem of Vandalism in Great Britain," Federal Probation, XVII (March 1954), 14-15

- Martin, John. "Some Characteristics of Vandals," American Catholic Sociological Review, 20 (Winter 1959), 318-327
- _____. Juvenile Vandalism: A Study of its Nature and Prevention (Springfield, Illinois: Charles G. Thomas, 1961)
- _____. & Fitzpatrick, Joseph F. Delinquent Behaviour: A Re-definition of the Problem (New York: Random House, 1964)
- Matza, David. Delinquency and Drift (New York: John Wiley, 1964)
- Mays, John Barron. Growing Up in the City (Liverpool: University of Liverpool Press, 1954)
- _____. The Young Pretenders (London: Michael Joseph, 1965)
- Mead, George Herbert. "The Psychology of Punitive Justice," American Journal of Sociology, XXIII (1928), 557-602
- Medalia, Nahum Z. & Larsen, Otto N. "Diffusion and Belief in a Collective Delusion: The Seattle Windshield Pitting Epidemic," American Sociological Review, 23 (1958), 180-186
- Merton, Robert K. "Social Problems and Sociological Theory," in Merton & Nisbet (eds.) Contemporary Social Problems (2nd edit.)
- Miller, Walter B. "Interinstitutional Conflict as a Major Impediment to Delinquency Prevention," Human Organization, 17 (Fall 1958), 20-23
- _____. "Violent Crimes in City Gangs," Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Science, 364 (1966), 96-112
- _____. et al. "Delinquency Prevention and Organizational Relations," in Wheeler, Stanton (eds.) Controlling Delinquents (New York: John Wiley, 1968), 61-100
- Mills, C. Wright. "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists," American Journal of Sociology, 49 (September 1943), 165-180
- Ministry of Transport, "Railway Accident Report on the Derailment that Occured on 29th March, 1965, near Elm Park," (London: H.M.S.O., 23rd June 1965)
- Morris, Terence & Morris, Pauline. Pentonville: A Sociological Study of an English Prison (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963)
- Musgrove, F. Youth and Social Order (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1964)
- Mycroft, David R. "Juvenile Vandalism" (Dissertation, Post Graduate Diploma in Psychology, University of London, Section D, 1964, 77 pp.)
- National Association of Parish Councils. "Against Vandalism," (National Circular, No. 184, 1964)

- Newberg, Paula M. "A Study in Deviance: Shoplifting," Corrective Psychiatry and Journal of Social Therapy, 12 (1966), 43-53
- Nunnally, Jum. "The Communication of Mental Health Information: A Comparison of the Opinions of Experts and Public with Mass Media Presentations," Behavioural Science, 2 (1957), 222-230
- Oppenheim, A.N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement (London: Heinemann, 1966)
- Osborough, Nial. "Police Discretion Not to Prosecute Students: A British Problem," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 56 (June 1965), 241-245
- "Ourselves and Crime - Who's Guilty?" New Society, 29th September 1966, 479
- Parker, Tony. The Plough Boy (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1965)
- Piliavin, Irvin & Briar, Scott. "Police Encounters with Juveniles," American Journal of Sociology, 70 (September 1964), 206-214
- Polisky, Ned. Hustlers, Beats and Others (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967)
- Power, Michael. "Trends in Juvenile Delinquency," The Times, 9th August 1962
- Powers, E. & Witmer, H. An Experiment in the Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951)
- Prover, R.R. "Some Observations on Window Smashing," British Journal of Delinquency, 10 (October 1969), 104-113
- Pritchard, Violet, Medieval English Graffiti (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967)
- Ramsay, R.A. Managers and Men: Adventures in Industry (Sydney: Ure Smith, 1966)
- Ranulf, Sven. Moral Indignation and Middle Class Psychology (New York: Schocken Books, 1964)
- Robins, Lee N. Deviant Children Grown Up: A Sociological and Psychiatric Study of Sociopathic Personality (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins Co., 1966)
- Rooney, Elizabeth A. & Gibbons, Don. C. "Social Reactions to 'Crimes Without Victims'," Social Problems, 13 (Spring 1966), 400-410
- Rose, Arnold M. & Prell, Arthur E. "Does the Punishment Fit the Crime? A Study in Social Valuation," American Journal of Sociology, 61 (November 1955), 247-259
- Rude, George. The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730-1848 (London: John Wiley, 1964)
- Salinger, J.D. The Catcher in the Rye (London: Penguin, 1958)
- Scheff, Thomas J. Being Mentally Ill: A Sociological Theory (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1966)

- Schur, Edwin M. Crimes Without Victims: Deviant Behaviour and Public Policy (Englewood Cliffe, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1965)
- Scott, Chester C. "Vandalism and our Present-Day Pattern of Living," Federal Probation, XVlll (March 1954), 10-12
- Scott, P.D. "Public Opinion and Juvenile Delinquency," British Journal of Delinquency, 1 (July 1950), 56-59
- _____ & Willcox, D.R.C. "Delinquency and the Amphetamines," British Journal of Psychiatry, 111 (September 1965), 865-875
- Shalloo, J.P. "Vandalism: Whose Responsibility?," Federal Probation, XVlll (March 1954), 6-8
- Shellow, Robert & Roemer, Derek V. "The Riot That Didn't Happen," Social Problems, 14 (Fall 1966), 221-233
- Short, J.F. & Nye, F.I. "Extent of Unrecorded Delinquency," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 49 (November 1958), 296-302
- Silvey, Johnathan. "The Criminal Law and Public Opinion," Criminal Law Review, (1961), 349-358
- Simmons, J.L. "Public Stereotypes of Deviants," Social Problems, 13 (Fall 1965), 223-232
- _____ & Winograd, Barry. It's Happening: A Portrait of the Youth Scene Today (Santa Barbara: Marc-laird, 1967)
- Skolnick, Jerome H. Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society (New York: John Wiley, 1966)
- _____ & Woodworth, J.R. "Bureaucracy, Information and Social Control: Study of a Morals Detail," in D.J. Bordua (ed.) The Police: Six Sociological Essays (New York: John Wiley, 1967)
- Smelser, Neil J. Theory of Collective Behaviour (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962)
- Smith, Roger. "Status Politics and the Image of the Addict," Issues in Criminology, 2 (Fall 1966), 157-175
- Spiegel, J.P. "The English Flood of 1953," Human Organisation, 16 (Summer 1957), 3-5
- Spinley, B.M. The Deprived and the Privileged (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953)
- Stanton, Howard R. "Non-Institutional Control of Juvenile Delinquency," (Mimeograph, undated, 13pp.)
- Stein, Herman D. et al. The Swastika Daubings and Related Incidents of Winter, 1960 (Research Centre, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, 1961, Mimeograph)
- _____ & Martin John M. "Swastika Offenders: Variations in Etiology, Behaviour and Psycho-Social Characteristics," Social Problems, 10 (Summer 1962), 56-70

- Stock, C.R. "Vandalism in Parks," Local Government Chronicle, 26th March, 1966, 535-557
- Sudnow, David. "Normal Crimes: Sociological Features of the Penal Code in a Public Defenders Office," Social Problems, 12 (Winter 1965), 255-276
- Sutherland, Edwin H. "The Diffusion of Sexual Psychopath Laws," American Journal of Sociology, 56 (September 1950), 142-148
-
- & Cressey, Donald R. Principles of Criminology (Chicago: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1960)
- Tannenbaum, Frank. Crime and the Community (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1938)
- Thomson, Hunter S. Hell's Angels: A Strange and Terrible Saga (New York: Random House, 1966)
- Thrasher, Frederick M. The Gang (Abridged Edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963)
- Toch, Hans. The Social Psychology of Social Movements (Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill Co., 1965)
- Turner, Ralph H. & Surace, Samuel J. "Zoot Suiters and Mexicans: Symbols in Crowd Behaviour," American Journal of Sociology, 62 (1956), 14-20
-
- & Killian, Lewis M. Collective Behaviour (Englewood Cliffe, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1957)
- Tumin, Melvin. "The Functionalist Approach to Social Problems," Social Problems, 12 (Spring 1965), 379-388
- Turk, Austin T. "Prospects for Theories of Criminal Behaviour," Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 55 (December 1964), 454-461
- Vaz, Edmund W. "Middle-Class Adolescents: Self-Reported Delinquency and Youth Culture Activities," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 2 (1965), 52-70
- Veltfort, Helene Rank & Lee, George E. "The Coconut Grove Fire: A Study in Scapegoating," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 38 (April 1943), 158-154
- Vold, George. Theoretical Criminology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958)
- Voss, Harwin L. "Socio-Economic Status and Reported Delinquent Behaviour," Social Problems, 13 (Winter 1966), 314-324
- Wade, Andrew, L. "Social Processes in the Act of Juvenile Vandalism," in Clinard and Quinney (eds.) Criminal Behaviour Systems: A Typology
- Wallerstein, J.S. & Wyle, C.J. "Our Law-Abiding Law Breakers," Probation, 25 (April 1947), 107-112
- Wardron, M. "Class, Anarchism and The Capitalist Mentality," Anarchy, 68 (October 1966), 301-304

- Westley, William A. "The Escalation of Violence Through Legitimation," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 364 (March 1966), 120-126
- Wheeler, Stanton. Controlling Delinquents (New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1968)
- _____ et al "Agents of Delinquency Control: A Comparative Analysis," in Wheeler (ed.) Controlling Delinquents
- Werthman, C. & Piliavin, I. "Gang Members and the Police," in Bordua (ed.) The Police: Six Sociological Essays
- Wilkins, Leslie T. Social Deviance: Social Policy, Action and Research (London: Tavistock, 1964)
- _____ "Some Sociological Factors in Drug Addiction Control in England and Wales," in Rosenberg et al (eds.) Mass Society in Crisis
- _____ & Chandler, Ann. "Confidence and Competence in Decision Making," British Journal of Criminology, 5 (January 1965), 22-35
- Willmott, Peter. Adolescent Boys of East London (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966)
- Wilson, Bryan R. "The Social Context of the Youth Problem," 15th Charles Russell Memorial Lecture (London, October 1965)
- Winick, Charles. "How People Perceived 'The Mad Bomber'," Public Opinion Quarterly, 25 (Spring 1961), 25-38
- Wise, Nancy Barton. "Juvenile Delinquency Among Middle-Class Girls," in Vaz (ed.) Middle Class Juvenile Delinquency
- Yablonsky, Lewis, The Violent Gang (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1962)
- _____ "Experiences With the Criminal Community," in A.W. Goulder & S.M. Miller (eds.) Applied Sociology: Opportunities and Problems (New York: Free Press, 1965)

MODS, ROCKERS AND THE REST: COMMUNITY REACTIONS TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY*

By STANLEY COHEN

THIS paper deals with one part of a research project being carried out within a certain theoretical framework in criminology and the broader field of the sociology of deviance. To understand why certain aspects of the subject matter—the Mods and Rockers phenomenon—are being considered rather than others, it is necessary to provide a brief statement of this framework.

Theoretical Framework

The main purpose of the research project is to investigate social reaction to deviant behaviour. The rationale behind this approach was first set out in a strangely neglected textbook by Lemert¹ and systematized more recently by Becker². This approach views deviance as a transactional process, the result of interaction between the person who commits an act and those who respond to it. Social reaction to deviance, the crucial variable in this approach, is largely ignored in conventional research in criminology and social deviance. In the field of juvenile delinquency, for example, the bulk of research is directed towards the taxonomic tabulation of the delinquents' traits (or attitudes, or values) in an attempt to see how delinquents differ from non-delinquents.³ On this basis causal theories are constructed. But the deviant act is not, or not only, deviant *per se*, it has to be defined and treated as such by the community. Social problems are what people think they are—there is an objective and verifiable situation, but also a subjective awareness of it and a definition by certain people that the situation is inimical to their interests and that something should be done about it⁴. The damage to art treasures by floods is a 'problem' to those whose commercial or aesthetic values are tied up with the preservation of art treasures. If this group of people didn't exist, there would be no problem. In the same way, the delinquent is a problem, but a problem *for someone*.

So when Becker writes that society creates deviance, he does not mean this in the conventional sense of there being social factors in the individual's situation which prompt his action, but that '... social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infractions constitute deviance, and by applying these rules to particular persons and labelling them as outsiders.' From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an 'offender'.⁵ The audience, not the actor, is the crucial variable.

One effect of community reaction is to confirm the deviant in his self-identity. When the community reacts negatively to a person's deviation from valued norms, he tends to define his situation largely in terms of the reaction. He takes on a

* Lecture given to Howard League, 6th December, 1966.

new self-concept, identifies himself in a new light and even begins to act like the stereotype of him. James Baldwin has vividly described the position of many Negroes in these terms: he notes how his father '... was defeated long before he died because ... he really believed what white people said about him' and warned his nephew: 'You can only be destroyed by believing that you really are what the white world calls a nigger'.⁶

This reaction sequence sets into operation what Wilkins calls a 'deviation-amplifying system'⁷ and the present research is aimed at observing the workings of this sort of system. The sequence would run something like this:

1. Initial deviation from valued norms, leading to:
2. Punitive reaction by the community (which may lead to the segregation of groups and marking them as deviant):
3. Development of a deviant self-identity and behaviour appropriate to this identity:
4. Further punitive reaction, etc.

Although it is not within the scope of this lecture to develop the theme, it should be pointed out that this sort of analysis is not just a manipulation of theoretical models. As Wilkins himself has made very clear, the implications for social policy, in the fields of both treatment and prevention, are considerable. Schur has recently used this type of model to examine the impact of public policy on abortion, homosexuality and drug addiction.⁸ He shows, for example, how policy based often upon vital misconceptions about the nature of the deviant behaviour, may be expressed in legal prescriptions. This 'criminalization' of deviance then forces the individual into reinforcing a criminal self-image that creates problems for himself and society at large. The classic example, of course, is the creation of the addict sub-culture as partly at least a consequence of the public stereotype (the 'dope fiend') and repressive legislation. In the context of compulsory hospitalization, treatment may just reinforce the self-image.

The Present Study

Deviance is not a 'thing' which can be observed and studied. The term is a conceptual category and all we have are types of behaviour that have been classified as deviant. For research purposes we have to choose one of these types and juvenile delinquency is simply one such type that can be studied. Again though, juvenile delinquency is not a concrete enough category for this type of study—the term is a legal definition and not a behavioural syndrome. So, for reasons including its topical importance as a subject in its own right, the unit of study for this section of the project was narrowed down to what is classifiable (for want of a less emotive word) as 'hooliganism'. The Mods and Rockers phenomenon of the last three years, particularly in the form it took of disturbances and so-called riots at English seaside resorts over bank holiday weekends, provides an archetypal example of this behaviour.

Because we are using the transactional framework to explore certain aspects of the community reaction, the study is necessarily self limiting. It does not attempt to provide a comprehensive account of the whole phenomenon e.g. in historical terms or in terms of sub-cultural theory.

Method

In an exploratory study of this nature there are few guidelines on which method to use for collecting data. In the event almost all possible methods were tried. These included:—content analysis of all press cuttings covering the period Easter 1964—August 1966 (national as well as relevant local press); 65 interviews carried out with a quota sample of spectators on the Brighton sea-front during Whitsun 1965; various other interviews with local figures, e.g. newspaper editors, local government officials, hotel proprietors, M.P.'s etc., and personal observation of crowd behaviour, police action and court hearings. (The final research report will also use data from 140 intensive interviews carried out in a London Borough on the more general topic of attitudes to delinquency.)

The Initial Deviation

Clacton is an East Coast resort not particularly well known for the range of amusements it provides for its younger visitors. Easter 1964 was worse than usual—it was cold and wet, in fact the coldest Easter Sunday for eighty years. The shopkeepers and the stall-owners were irritated by the lack of business and the young people milling around had their own irritation fanned by rumours of cafe owners and barmen refusing to serve some of them. A few groups started roughing around and for the first time the Mods and Rockers factions, a division at that time only vaguely in the air, started separating out. Those on bikes and scooters roared up and down, windows were broken, some beach huts were wrecked, one boy fired a starting pistol in the air. The vast number of young people crowding the streets, the noise, everyone's general irritation and the often panicky actions of an unprepared and undermanned police force, made the two days seem rather frightening.

One of the most significant features about Clacton is that there appear to have been present a number of what the police would call 'troublemakers'—mainly Rockers from the East End or small East Anglian villages. Contrasted with the fringe supporters, these are the same hard core who in race riots and other crowd situations are predisposed to take the initiative and to respond violently to what is perceived as police provocation. All the 24 boys charged in the Clacton court claimed that they had been the unlucky ones, that they had been picked out at random. Yet 23 out of the 24 had previous convictions—the police's chances of picking out 23 previous offenders at random out of a crowd of say a thousand, is one in a couple of million.

As we shall show, many aspects of the Mods and Rockers have parallels in the class of phenomena known as mass delusion. These studies⁹ show that the first stage is invariably a real event—the delusion or hysteria is created because the initial event is reported in such a way as to set in motion a cumulative sequence which serves to fulfill the expectations created by the earlier events. In terms of our model this is an amplifying process.

The Process of Amplification

One of the most important elements in the reaction to deviance is the growth of a generalised set of beliefs to explain the behaviour. Once the first stage of reporting is past, the community feels the need to make sense of what has occurred—this is especially the case when the event is perceived as a dislocation of the smooth running of things: the killing of a policeman, a political assassination, a natural disaster. People look for explanations, self-styled experts proclaim favourite theories, stereotypes are confirmed or new ones are created, words acquire a symbolic meaning—‘Aberfan’, ‘Dallas’, ‘Braybrook Street’, ‘Clacton’.

In the case of deviancy, these generalised beliefs invariably involve spurious attribution; all sorts of traits are attributed to the deviant and, on the basis of little or no evidence, a whole set of misconceptions arise. Let us give a few examples of some of these elements.

‘Violence and Damage’—it was widely believed that the Mods and Rockers caused widespread damage and were involved in violent assaults on each other or ‘innocent holidaymakers’. In fact the amount of damage done was not excessive—in the three year period there were less than ten cases of malicious damage—in Hastings, August 1964, for example, one of the ‘big’ events, there were only four charges of malicious damage out of 64 arrests.

During Whitsun 1964, although there were 54 arrests in Bournemouth the damage was £100, in Brighton with 76 arrests the damage was £400, in Margate with 64 arrests the damage was £250. Compare these figures to the *real* cost to the resorts which was in extra police charges: the four successive bank holidays between Easter 1965 and Easter 1966 cost the Brighton Council an extra £13,000. The amount of serious violence similarly was negligible—only one tenth of the original Clacton offenders were charged with offences involving violence. In Margate, Whitsun 1964, supposedly the most violent week-end, where according to the *Daily Express* (19/5/64) ‘The 1964 boys smeared the traditional postcard scene with blood and violence’, there were two not very serious stabbings and one man dropped onto a flower bed. The typical offence was using threatening behaviour or obstructing the police. Leaving aside the obvious inconvenience caused to adults by crowds of youths milling about on the pavements and beach, few innocent holidaymakers were the victims of violence—the targets were members of a rival group or, more often, the police.

'Loss of trade'—it was widely believed that the troubles scared potential visitors away and the resorts suffered financially. The evidence for this is at best dubious. Papers quoted figures from Brighton for Whitsun 1964 showing that the number of deck-chairs hired had dropped by 8,000 on the previous year's week-end. This drop was attributed to the effects of the Mods and Rockers. Analyses of other figures, however, show that the total number of visitors was probably more—the reason why fewer deckchairs were hired was that Whit Monday was one of the coldest for decades—the temperature had dropped overnight by 14° F. and the beaches were virtually deserted. Interviews and observation suggest that if anything, the Mods and Rockers attracted some visitors and by the end of 1965 certainly, the happenings were part of the Brighton scene—the pier, whelks and the Mods and Rockers could all be taken in on a day trip.

'Affluent Youth'—attitudes and opinions are often shaped and bolstered up by legends and myths. One of the most recurrent of the Mods and Rockers myths was the one about the boy who told the Margate magistrates that he would pay his £75 fine with a cheque. This myth was frequently used to justify the image of the Mods and Rockers as classless, affluent, and scooter or motor-bike owners. The story was in itself true enough—what few papers bothered to publish and what they all knew, was that the boy's offer was a pathetic gesture of bravado. He later admitted that not only did he not have the £75 cheque but did not even have a bank account and had never signed a cheque in his life. The affluence image has very little factual basis. The Clacton offenders had on them an average of 15/- for the whole bank holiday week-end. The best off was a window cleaner earning £15 a week, but more typical were a market assistant earning £7 10s. and a 17-year-old clerk earning £5 14s. The average take home pay in a sample of offenders from Margate, Whitsun 1964, was £11 per week. The classless image is also none too accurate—the typical Rocker was an unskilled manual worker, the typical Mod a semi-skilled manual worker¹⁰. In all cases, the majority of young people present hitched or came down by train or coach. The scooter and motor-bike riders were a minority, albeit a noisy and ubiquitous minority.

A detailed analysis of a number of other such images, shows that a large component of the deviation is, in Lemert's term, 'putative': 'The putative deviation is that portion of the societal definition of the deviant which has no foundation in his objective behaviour.'¹¹ Why is this sort of belief system important?

In the first place the stereotypes implied in the putative deviation serve to sensitize the community to any sign of incipient deviance. A previously ambiguous situation which may have been 'written off' as a Saturday night brawl now becomes re-interpreted as a 'Mods and Rockers clash'. In the weeks following the first two or three major happenings, a number of such incidents were reported

from widely scattered localities. Minor scuffles and fights and increased police vigilance were reported by the Press under such headings as 'Mods and Rockers Strike Again'. There were also numerous false alarms—after Whitsun 1964 for example, the police in Stamford Hill after answering a false alarm stated that 'people are a bit jumpy after the trouble on the coast'. This type of sensitization which turns non-events into events, is exactly the same process noted by students of mass delusion. In a state of hypersuggestibility following the reporting of a 'Mad Bomber' or a 'Phantom Anaesthetist' or a 'Sex Fiend On The Loose' ambiguous events are re-interpreted to fit into the belief. This is made easier when there is a composite stereotype available with readily identifiable symbols such as clothes. To the residents of Brighton, any boy between fourteen and twenty wearing a fur-collared anorak was a Mod. At the end of one Bank Holiday the police stood at the station putting back on the trains all 'suspicious looking' arrivals who could not prove that they were local residents.

Another way in which beliefs are important in amplifying deviance is that they serve to legitimate the action of society's agents of control. *If* you are dealing with a group that is vicious, destructive, causing your community a financial loss, and symbolically repudiating your cherished values, then you are justified to respond punitively. *If*, moreover, this is an affluent horde of scooter-riders, then 'fines won't touch them' and you have to propose confiscation of their scooters, forced labour camps, corporal punishment, turning the fire hoses on them. By the logic of their own definitions, the agents of control have to escalate the measures they take and propose to take to deal with the problem. So by Easter 1965 the magistrates in Brighton were employing the highly dubious practice of remanding young people in custody as a form of extra-legal punishment. Bail was refused not on the merits of the individual case but as a matter of principle—the ostensible reason given by the magistrates for remand as being to enable the police to make enquiries, was not in fact the reason given in court when bail was opposed. The police opposed bail on the grounds that if the boys were allowed to go free justice would not be done and that the public would not be protected. On the flimsiest evidence a boy, who by the police's own account had done nothing more than refuse to 'move along', would be certified as an 'unruly person', refused bail and remanded in custody in an adult prison—in some cases for up to three weeks. A test case of this sort when taken before a Judge in Chambers resulted in the immediate release of a 16-year-old boy from prison on bail. Although precise data is difficult to obtain, at least 20 cases have been traced of successful appeals on the grounds of wrongful arrests or disproportionately high sentences. There is no doubt that in certain cases, admittedly under conditions of extreme physical and psychological strain and under direct provocation, arrests were made quite arbitrarily and with unnecessary violence. In one instance, arrested youths were observed being pushed through a gauntlet of police punches before literally being thrown into the van.

Informal agents of social control also took up extreme positions. On the initiative of a group of senior aldermen and councillors, the Brighton Council overwhelmingly passed a resolution calling for the setting up of compulsory labour camps for Mods and Rockers. A group of Great Yarmouth businessmen and hotel-keepers set up a Safeguard Committee which seriously debated a scheme of setting up road blocks outside the town to prevent any invasion.

We have discussed three types of processes indentifiable in the reaction: the growth of generalised beliefs, which contain a putative element, the sensitization to deviance and the escalation of methods of social control. To evaluate the effects of the reaction on the self image we would need a more complicated type of research design than has been used here—a longitudinal study of the impact of community reaction on young people's self concepts. At present we can only use the overt behaviour as the dependent variable and assume that this behaviour is consonant with the actors' self image.

In the first place, as we have seen, the behaviour was often 'created' because of community sensitization. The atmosphere of expectancy present at the seaside resorts resulted in incidents being created out of nothing.

Two boys stopped to watch a very drunk old tramp dancing about on the beach. They started throwing pennies at his feet. Within 45 seconds there were at least a hundred people gathered round and in 60 seconds the police were there. I turned my back on the crowd to watch the spectators gathering on the promenade above and by the time I turned back, two policemen were leading a boy away from the crowd.

(Notes, Brighton, Easter 1965).

Incidents such as these were created by sensitivity on the part of both audience and actors. There was a sense among the young people that they had to play to the gallery; the literal gallery of the adults lining the railing as at a bullfight, and the photographers running around from one event to the other; and the metaphorical gallery of the consumers of the mass media who had read in their morning papers 'Seaside Resorts Prepare for the Hooligans' Invasion'. The control agents, especially the police, created deviance not only in the sense of provoking the more labile members of the crowd into losing their tempers, but in Becker's sense of making the rules whose infraction constituted deviance. So, for example, certain areas were designated in advance as 'trouble spots'. If a number of youths were congregating in one of these trouble spots even for legitimate reasons (such as sheltering from the rain) they could be moved along, because policy was to keep these spots free. If one refused to move along he could be arrested and charged with wilful obstruction. (Under Sec. 51(3) Police Act 1964.)

Another significant effect of the reaction was, in Tannenbaum's phrase, the 'dramatization of evil'. The adult reaction was not only negative—it could hardly have been otherwise—but it was hostile in the melodramatic sense. There was the famous speech by a Margate magistrate about his town being

'... polluted by hordes of hooligans . . . these long-haired mentally unstable petty little hoodlums, these sawdust Caesars who can only find courage like rats hunting in packs'; there were the newspaper headlines about 'vermin'; there was the show of force on the spot—police dogs, horses, walkie talkies, water board vans converted into squad cars; there were scenes like the police ceremoniously marching a group of youths through a street lined with spectators.

One way in which this hostility was reacted to was by returning it in kind. In the first series of events, the crowd, with the exception of the hard core referred to earlier, maintained fairly good humoured relations with the police. Attacks were disrespectful gestures such as knocking off helmets rather than malicious. In the 1966 incidents, the atmosphere was more tense. The lines had hardened:

A policeman walked quite peacefully between two rows of boys near the aquarium. Some of them started whistling the Z-car theme and one shouted out 'Sprachen the Deutsch Constable'?

—(Notes, Brighton, Easter 1966).

Another way in which the conflict was hardened was between the two groups themselves. Although the Mods and Rockers represent two very different consumer styles—the Mods the more glossy fashion-conscious teenager, the Rockers the tougher, reactionary tradition—the antagonism between the two groups is not very deep, they have much more in common, particularly their working class membership. There was initially nothing like the gang rivalry supposed to characterise the American type of conflict gang caricatured in *West Side Story*, in fact there was nothing like a gang. Commercial and media exploitation of the Mod-Rocker difference, and misguided attempts to explain the whole situation of unrest in terms of this difference, hardened the barriers. The groups were merely loose collectivities or crowds within which there was occasionally some more structured grouping based on territorial loyalty. e.g. 'The Walthamstow Boys', 'The Lot From Eltham'. Constant repetition of the gang image made these collectivities see themselves as gangs and behave in a gang fashion. Yablonsky has noted the same process in his study of delinquent gangs as near groups.¹²

The Role of the Mass Media

Without being able to consider here all the mechanisms through which the reaction was amplified, it is necessary to comment on the most important of these, the mass media. One must remember that in mass society one's view of deviance is usually second hand. In the hypothetical village community one might have been able to react to the village idiot in terms of first-hand impressions. In mass society images arrive already processed—policymakers can and do make decisions about say delinquents or drug addicts on the basis of the most crude and misleading images. In the case of the Mods and Rockers the media were responsible to a large extent for the putative deviance. An analysis, for

example, of the House of Commons debate on 'Juvenile Delinquency and Hooliganism' (27th April 1964) shows the extent to which the images and stereotypes provided by the media were the basis for theories and policy proposals.

It is not just that the newspapers exaggerated the amount of behaviour—this is more or less inevitable. Estimates in any crowd situation such as a political rally or sporting event are notoriously inaccurate. What was more important was the manner of presentation—the sensational headlines, the interviews with dramatic characters and subtle techniques well known to war correspondents, such as reporting the same incident twice. Another effective technique was the misleading juxtaposition of headlines—on at least three occasions headlines such as 'Mod Found Dead in Sea', 'Boy Falls to Death from Cliff' were used as sub-headings in Mods and Rockers reports. In every case the deaths had no connection at all with the disturbances and were pure accidents.

The chief rôle of the media seem to have been in transmitting the stereotypes and creating an expectancy before each event that something was going to happen. This last rôle was particularly taken by the local press which highlighted reports about local traders arming themselves with tear gas, citizens forming vigilante patrols, etc.

Differential Reaction

It is, of course, a fallacy to think of the mass media influencing a purely passive audience. Communication is responded to selectively, and the sort of questions we would like to answer are:—To what extent were the stereotypes and images absorbed by the community? How did the reaction crystallize into attitudes and opinions (e.g. about causes and solutions)? How were these attitudes affected by variables such as social class, education, political membership? Why did the reaction take the form it did?

The final research report will attempt to answer these questions. A preliminary analysis of the data from the Brighton sample only, suggest that the following type of generalisations might emerge:—

1. The reaction of the general public is less intense and less stereotypical than the reaction reflected in the mass media.
2. Local residents in the areas affected are more punitive than out of town visitors and the public in general.
3. Little difference between the Labour and Conservative groups were found. Except at the extreme of authoritarianism, political preference does not correlate with attitudes to delinquency.
4. The two most frequent single causes given for the Mods and Rockers events are 'boredom' and 'too much money'.
5. A dimension such as 'punitiveness' is too gross to measure attitudes to deviant behaviour. Certain groups, particularly working class and upper

class, can at the same time be 'tolerant' of the behaviour and also devise the most punitive solutions for dealing with the behaviour when it is perceived as 'going too far'. The middle class less often make this distinction.

Conclusion

It must be emphasised again that as this is an analysis of the ways in which social reaction impinges upon the genesis and amplification of deviance, little has been said about the behaviour itself. This does not mean that one is trying to deny an objective reality or even less trying to present the Mods and Rockers as innocent victims of conspiracy and discrimination. Social forces work in far more subtle ways. Although people *were* inconvenienced or hurt, and there were fights and vandalism, there is at the very least enough evidence to suggest that the development of this behaviour was not independent of the reaction it provoked. Can one go further and say that the transactional theory is proved?

Clearly the present study is not a complete validation. For one thing, the crucial variable of the deviant self identity has not been measured and it might be a defect of the theory that this type of variable is peculiarly difficult to operationalise. There are problems in the model immediately apparent—for example why does the Wilkins-type of amplification sequence ever stop? Theoretically something like the Teddy Boy movement should have carried on growing. We know that this did not happen and there are already signs that the Mods and Rockers are going the same way. There are obviously factors 'outside' the model to account for these changes. Another problem is why not everybody exposed to the same definitions develops the appropriate self-image.

Until such questions are answered, we can only conclude that transactional theory provides a potentially useful framework for studying deviance. In the case of the Mods and Rockers at least, it gives an additional dimension to any other causal explanation.

REFERENCES

- ¹Lemert, E. M.: *Social Pathology*, (London: McGraw Hill 1951).
- ²Becker, H. S.: *Outsiders, Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. (New York: Free Press, 1963).
- ³Deutcher, I.: 'Some Relevant Directions for Research in Juvenile Delinquency', in Rose, A. R. (Ed.). *Human Behaviour and Social Processes*. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962) pp. 468-481.
- ⁴Fuller, R. C., and Meyers, R. R.: 'Some Aspects of a Theory of Social Problems', *Amer. Sociol. Rev.* 6, (February 1941), pp. 24-32.
- ⁵Becker: op. cit. p. 9.
- ⁶Baldwin, J.: *The Fire Next Time*. (Penguin, 1964) p. 13.
- ⁷Wilkins, L.: *Social Deviance*, (London, Tavistock, 1964).
- ⁸Schur, E. M.: *Crimes Without Victims, Deviant Behaviour and Public Policy*, (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965).
- ⁹Johnson, D. M.: 'The Phantom Anaesthetist of Mattoon', *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 40, (1945) pp. 175-186 etc.
- ¹⁰Barker, P. and Little, A.: 'The Margate Offenders: A Survey', *New Society*, Vol. 4, No. 96, (30th July 1964), pp. 6-10.
- ¹¹Lemert: op. cit. p. 56.
- ¹²Yablonsky, L.: *The Violent Gang*, (New York: Collier MacMillan, 1962).