THE COHEN INTERVIEWS

SYBIL CLEMENT BROWN -- **Interview no 7**.

Edited by Tim Cook and Harry Marsh

Annotation research by Diana Wray

Transcription by Margaret Martin for WISEArchive

Each interview is presented as a free-standing publication with its own set of notes. However, readers interested in the Cohen Interviews as a whole and the period discussed are referred to:

(a) the other 25 interviews

(b) the Editors' Introduction,

(c) the select Bibliography.

All of these can be found at
http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/services/library/mrc/explorefurther/subject_guides/social_work

---

Sybil Clement Brown (1899--1993) is one of Alan Cohen's very well known interviewees and there is ready access to many of her own writings and to others commenting on her life and work. For example, ten years before the Cohen interview she published (in the final 1970 commemorative issue of the *BJPSW*) her *Looking Backwards: Reminiscences 1922 -1946. S*he mentions her chapter on social casework in the 1939 book edited by F. C. Bartlett, *The Study of Society* and there is an impressive list of published articles and books in the 1930's and 40's, followed by *Social Services and Mental Health* with Margaret Ashdown in 1953. Much more can be found about her in R.G. Walton's Women in Social Work (1975) and Margaret Yelloly's *Social Work Theory and Psychoanalysis* (1980).

Walton gives two illuminating SCB quotations: she wishes to emphasise the *social* rather than the *psychiatric* in the PSW job title and stresses that the essence of social work is "that its function shifts with social change and its disciplines must be constantly developing". Having been a leader of the APSW for many years she was well placed to make that observation. Her summary of the greatest gain made by the profession in the 1930's was "perhaps the realisation that the process of bringing about any sort of growth in individuals, and harmonising of human relationships is the highest sort of art, learned only through disciplined experience, through a constant stirring of the imagination, and not just through the simple application of knowledge".

The Editors examined all of the papers contained in Alan Cohen's five boxes deposited at the Modern Records Centre and were pleased to find that she had given Alan some historically important documents including a handwritten notebook on work she undertook at the Children's Department in the Home Office and accounts of her American experiences. She was clearly of considerable intellect and imagination - and a pioneer par excellence - and our guess is that not many in the period would have had the courage to correct the revered and formidable Gordon Hamilton. Perhaps the last word should go to one of SCB's students, Clare Winnicott, who told Bob Holman that she was "...an eminent, imposing yet kindly social work leader who was later to become a member of the Curtis Committee."

A.C. When did you first come into social work?

C.B. I suppose that when I was quite young I was interested in people and we lived in a small village.

When I left school I was interested in getting groups of people together for playing hockey, country dancing and various things and was concerned about children and their families in the village. I suppose really the roots of my interest in people may have been there. Then the first year after the war (*1919*) I went up to Bedford College **[1]** I had a year first, as we all did then, an intermediate examination, and was offered the chance of taking either English or Philosophy as an honours degree course, and chose Philosophy which at that date was the name of the department in which psychology was taught, and so this degree course included the same lectures and reading that was done by honours psychology students so I became very much interested in psychology as well as philosophy. Sociology was my subsidiary subject. I remember being immensely impressed by the works of L.T. Hobhouse **[2]** – an influence which continued, as I shall show later, to give me perspective in thinking and teaching about individual problems in society.

At college also came my first introduction to social conditions in Bermondsey, through visits to the Women's University Settlement in Nelson Square **[3]**. I was horrified by the sordid inequalities in standards of living and the kind of efforts which had to be made to provide the barest necessities of life to families. The moral issues involved led us to start a study group under the auspices of the Student Christian Movement. Our text was Clement Attlee's **[4]** book *The Social Worker* in which the traditional methods of the Charity Organisation Society (COS) **[5]** were cogently attacked. And at the end of the degree course there was a chance of a minor scholarship for going into some kind of social research and it seemed to me that if one was concerned, as I had then become, with the applications of both philosophy and psychology to human problems, this would lead me into training for social work. And I was successful then at getting what was called the Lady Huggins Scholarship **[6]** which paid my way for a year of training for social work.

I think when we were last talking I told you about the interest that was aroused in me by the early psychoanalytic publications. I look back with interest that the staff of the philosophy and psychology department were sufficiently up to date to introduce me, not only to the early first translations I suppose, really, of the Freudian *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* **[7]** and so on, but also to certain studies that were emerging from America, notably Healey's work in Boston **[8]** in which I was actually given some of the case

studies. So when I applied for this Fellowship I expressed a special interest in delinquency. The question was where I should carry out this study because I'd got rather involved in all sorts of social activities in London. Partly for that reason I was encouraged to get to Birmingham, and partly because in Birmingham the magistrate Mrs. Barrow Cadbury **[9]** had already been making a name for herself in articles and speeches about a better individual treatment of the youngsters who came before the juvenile court. So to Birmingham I went, and took the year's study for the Social Science Certificate really entering also at that stage for what they called a "Higher Diploma" which I never really went on to, because at the end of the year in Birmingham I applied for, and got, one of the first of the American Fellowships. The Laura Spellman Rockefeller Foundation **[10]**, offered for students to go to the United States for anything up to 3 years.

During the course in Birmingham I was expected, by the conditions of the fellowship, to do research, and I had very little knowledge or experience of what this meant. I had gone to interview Margery Fry **[11]** before I went up and she expressed great interest in the fact that I was proposing to go into the study of delinquency. But she was rather sceptical, I think, that I was then really equipped to do any serious study of this subject before getting further knowledge and experience. But I did offer for the Higher Diploma in Birmingham the subject, which was concerned with why the juvenile court magistrates chose to put certain children on probation and send others to approved schools. So while I was taking the ordinary subjects of the social science certificate, I went every week and sat in the juvenile court and made very full notes, of the decisions that were reached by the Magistrates and the apparent reasons for reaching those decisions. I think Birmingham Juvenile Court was the first court to ask for the opinion of a psychiatrist on certain cases. And these of course made an impression on me as did some of the extraordinary statements that were made by the Clerk of the Court on what the magistrates ought or ought not to do. I remember the case of a child of about 11 who had attempted suicide, and the magistrate wanted, I think, to put her on probation with some special form of care and treatment and the clerk turned to them and said, "In the case of an adult this is a criminal offence and she could be sent to an approved school."

I also then went to the probation department and made rather full notes of all the children at that stage who were placed on probation and spent time in Shustoke **[12]**, then an approved school, (I don't know whether it's still in existence), and I think that I was probably the first person to take the records of the approved school and go back to the Education Department to see what had been said about these children when they were at school, and so to trace the whole record with a view to seeing whether the Magistrates had considered the relevance of this when they reached their final decision. At the same time I was fortunate to see a good deal of Mrs. Barrow-Cadbury who later published her book on juvenile courts. She, I think, was one of the first magistrates to keep in personal touch with the children about whom they had reached decisions in court and to correspond with them on their birthdays and so on, and she gave me access to these records, which she'd kept in her own house. It was Mrs. Barrow-Cadbury who lent me Healey's mammoth work, *The Individual Delinquent* , which I absorbed with great interest and decided that if opportunity came to me I would like to go to America to make a special study of their methods in the juvenile court. So I applied for this Laura Spellman Rockefeller Fellowship and was successful in getting this and went

to America in 1924. In America I spent the first term at the New York School of Social Work **[13]**, in a probation department of New York City, and lived and did club work in a settlement on the Lower East Side.

I followed this up by travelling right across the USA visiting juvenile courts and spending time in institutions for delinquent children in the main cities, finally finishing up in California where I spent 18 months, partly doing research again on delinquent girls, adolescent delinquent girls, who were blamed by the neighbours for leading their youngsters into difficulties. It was really a study of leadership, which I finally submitted for a masters degree at the University of Southern California. And on the way back home spent 3 months at Harvard Law School taking part in a study of the administration of criminal justice in which I was given the opportunity of an area study in Roxbury, just outside Boston, and submitted a report to them on not only the treatment of the juvenile delinquents in that area, but also the reasons that some of the prosecuting agencies took, or did not take, action against children which meant more of a sociological study at that stage really than just an administrative one.

During my time in California Professor Carr-Saunders **[14]** who was in charge of the Liverpool University social science department came out to visit, and it was his letter to me about the prospect of the development of child guidance clinics in this country which led me to apply when I returned to become the secretary of the newly formed Child Guidance Council **[15]**

Returning to the 3 months I spent at the New York School of Social Work, I experienced an extreme contrast between the training of social workers in that country and at home. It seemed to me that at the New York School they were, with young post graduate students, concentrating entirely on what you could do wisely about individuals and families, whereas in England we'd had practically no teaching on this subject at all but did feel that we'd exercised our minds about broad social problems and the kind of vicissitudes into which social conditions led people and families. This, on one occasion raised the question of the treatment of unemployment, in which the British were referred to, as I thought, with some disdain as merely offering 'dole' to those who were unemployed when they should be seeking out special individual difficulties. I remember being very perturbed about this and pointing out in class that this was a new scheme of social insurance, and people who benefit from the insurance didn't necessarily have any personal difficulties at all. I raised this in a class with Gordon Hamilton **[16]** and when I met her many years afterwards at an international conference of social workers, I reminded her of my difficulties as a young British student in an American class and told her that I had been troubled by their lack of understanding of our new insurance policies, at which she was rather taken aback and said that she herself had been greatly interested in social insurance and had, in fact, studied these in Germany.

When I got back to this country in 1927 it was difficult to know where there would be opportunities of doing the kind of work for which I now had some experience. I had applied, as Professor Carr-Saunders had advised me, for the post of secretary of the newly formed Child Guidance Council but was not successful in getting this post, and when I discussed this with the much older person who was appointed, she told me that she thought it was because I was too young and had not had enough experience. Later this same person in conversation said to me one day, "I wonder whether you could help me?

Could you tell me what is 'a complex'?" I also applied to become a probation officer and had interviews with Doctor Norris who was then Chief Inspector of the Children's Department of the Home Office **[17]** He arranged for me to spend some time in various approved schools because I thought that perhaps it might be a good plan to apply for a post in residence with our delinquents for a time. I was not successful in getting into the London probation service and I was not prepared at that stage to take a probation post in other parts of the country. (The London area probation officers being appointed directly by the Home Office had already a waiting list.) Just about that time the first social worker in a psychiatric department, Sinclair Townsend, who worked at Guy's Hospital, in what was called the Neurological Department, was resigning to become a member of the staff at the Child Guidance Council, and asked me to apply for this half-time post at Guy's Hospital at a salary of £120 a year. Which I did and was appointed. Shortly afterwards the East London Child Guidance Clinic **[18]** was started by the Jewish Health Organisation**[19]**, and they applied to the Child Guidance Council for a grant which would enable them to pay the salary of a half-time psychiatric social worker in their clinic in Fryingpan Alley, off Petticoat Lane, in the Jews' Free School. The psychiatrist was Dr. Emanuel Miller **[20]** who was assisted by Dr. Noel Burke **[21]** whose main experience, I think, had been with mental defectives. And very shortly Meyer Fortes **[22]** (now [in 1980] Cambridge Professor of Anthropology) from South Africa was appointed as psychologist, and that was our team. Our sessions were all held in the evening and as I was working at Guy's Hospital during the day, it meant a pretty well a fifteen hour day. We had no secretarial help at either end so that I was typing all the records at Guy's Hospital and also both the letters and the records at the East London Child Guidance Clinic. I can remember Dr. Emmanuel Miller waiting patiently far into the evening for me to finish typing some rather complicated medical letter that he was sending to one of his colleagues. From Emanuel Miller, a Master of Arts as well as of medical sciences, and a person of rare perception, I gained more insight into the pressures and problems of social heritage, circumstance and ritual.

The East London Child Guidance Clinic served a very wide area stretching right down from Stepney to Poplar. We were a good deal dependent on the co-operation of the School Care Committee Organisers **[23]** who referred children, and for the first period we were really very unselective in the type of cases that came. We had, on the one hand, quite severely retarded children and on the other, extremely difficult adolescent girls, some of whom had physical as well as psychological complications. I was particularly interested in the immigrant influences in that part of London, and of course on the particular relationships and emotional involvements of Jewish families, as compared with non-Jewish ones. Particularly, I was interested in the tremendous concentration on the intellectual success of the sons of the families and the over-protective attitude towards the daughters of families. Often the boys of the family spending, with their fathers' insistence, long hours on Hebrew classes in *cheder* (traditional classes in religious instruction) were to my mind involved in social and emotional difficulties which their parents failed to understand. These were, I think, some of the typical problems of the area.

After 2 years in the East London Child Guidance Clinic, the new so called "demonstration clinic" financed by the Commonwealth Fund of America **[24]**, and initially under the guidance of the Child Guidance Council, was set up in

Canonbury **[25]** in Islington. They were anxious, I think, to have social workers in the demonstration clinic who had had particular experience and training, and so I was appointed full-time to that staff along with experienced social workers in the field of probation, medical social work etc., who had been sent out to New York to spend a year in training for child guidance work. I worked in the Canonbury Clinic for 2 years and there we had, during my second year, students from the London School of Economics (LSE) **[25a]**, who were being offered a year's training for psychiatric social work. For the first year this course was under the direction of Dr. Evelyn Lawrence **[26]** who spent half-time at the School of Economics and half-time acting as chief social worker at the Canonbury Clinic.

A.C. She was a Ph.D. type Doctor. Not a Medical Doctor?

C.B. No. She was a Ph.D. who had earlier been on the staff with Dr. Susan Isaacs **[27]** of the Malting House School in Cambridge **[28]**. It was decided that the time had come, after this first year, to appoint a full-time tutor to the School of Economics and I was successful in getting this appointment and went to the school in 1932.

It cannot really be said that the Mental Health Course **[29]** was received as an important departure of the School of Economics. The whole of the cost of the course was covered by the Commonwealth Fund, and while I think the staff of the Social Science Department, C.M. Lloyd **[30]** and the senior tutor, Edith Eckhard,**[31]** were genuinely interested, it came as a sort of rather separate departure for the school as a whole.

I was completely inexperienced in teaching, and already during its first year the course had collected to itself a variety of teachers well known for their contributions to what could broadly be called the field of mental health. There seemed lacking a general appreciation of what could be fitted into a year's course, with considerable emphasis on the clinical experience which was started early in the year and took up about 3/5th of the time of the students. So that during the early years one was feeling one's way literally towards something which could be better coordinated. The work of the tutor was largely in helping students to get something more coordinated and comprehensive out of the varied courses of lectures they were having and their practical experience, which from the start was planned to include both psychiatric work for adults and case work in child guidance clinics. It was natural then that different people had different views as to where the emphasis should lie, and the time given to different courses. There was for example one whole course given on mental deficiency as a separate subject. This was given by Dr. Tredgold **[32]** who had written of course the main text on mental deficiency. There was a difference of view as to how far students should be expected to grasp the physiological facts relating to mental disturbance, the extent to which they should attend and have systematic lectures on the main psychosis, and the time that ought to be given to the normal development of children.

The course which by degrees I planned myself, and called "Introduction to the Mental Health Course" without commitment to any particular subject or point of view, came to be designed so that it gave students some awareness of the history of attitudes toward unusual personality and behaviour, and the legislation which was related to these attitudes and the gradual development of social services which lay at the back of what they were experiencing in the

out-patient department of a large general hospital and in the newly formed child guidance clinic. I suppose that really one attempted to get more sense into the inter-relatedness of all these approaches in tutorial work with the students which they had every two weeks, and by degrees the students were also expected to write some extended essay on some chosen subject which one hoped would enable them to reach more depth of understanding in relation to their own particular background and interests. The school appointed a Consultative Committee and part of the work of the tutor, and really a considerable proportion of the time, was given to maintaining the interest of representative people on that committee, and reporting developments to them. Reports were also sent to the Commonwealth Fund of America, responsible for the whole of the finance as well as for giving grant aid to a number of students.

A great deal of the work of the course was naturally undertaken by those who supervised the student's practical training and outstanding amongst the supervisors was Margaret Ashdown **[33]** who was, throughout, stationed at the Maudsley Hospital where Professor Aubrey Lewis **[34]** was responsible for teaching and demonstrating in psychiatry. And Margaret Ashdown stayed throughout the whole length of the training, including the later war years in Cambridge to which I'll refer later. The supervision in the child guidance clinic was at first entirely undertaken in the Tudor Lodge Clinic. But later both in the adult field and in the child guidance, students were scattered into different clinics as it became possible to give them trained supervision.

There were differences of view, naturally, about the emphasis that should be placed on the teaching of students, in terms of individual psychology and social history and relationships. In particular I suppose the issue turned a good deal on the extent to which Freudian psychoanalysis should be regarded as one of the most important approaches to the understanding of human behaviour, and some of the child guidance clinic staff felt that there was not in the mental health course sufficient emphasis on this aspect of emotional development. From the outset Professor Cyril Burt **[35]** had been the main teacher on child study. Dr. J. A. Hadfield **[36]** introduced his own clinical experience and interpretation, much influenced by psychoanalysis, in lectures on the mental health of childhood a course which was called "Individual Differences", followed at a later stage by Susan Isaacs who was introduced to the course and was for some years teaching the students with her inimitable combination of understanding of child development from the social and intellectual stand point; and also her experience and knowledge of psychoanalytic interpretation and techniques.

From time to time I was aware of criticism of my own emphasis as being too much concerned with the relationship between social circumstances and individual problems, this being sometimes described as "too sociological" in outlook. It was interesting that in these pre-war years there was an influential movement towards what later became referred to as the "inter-disciplinary" approach to social research and its application. Professor F.C. Bartlett, Cambridge Professor of Psychology **[37]** was responsible for starting a study group of about twenty, consisting of psychologists in various fields, anthropologists, and sociologists. I was invited to become a member. We met every six months or so in different parts of the country, struggling to discover the common and special facts and practices of our studies and professions. I remember giving a paper to this group on *The Case-Study as a Method of Social Research.* The book which emerged as a result of these meetings was

published just before the outbreak of war. These informal and exciting discussions were a continuing influence in my approach to social work and teaching.

The war led to very important changes and a quite new phase inevitably in the development of the training. At first we were told at LSE that we were going to be evacuated to Glasgow and my heart failed when I began to think of how we should manage to continue psychiatric training in Glasgow, although there was a flourishing Roman Catholic child guidance clinic in that city **[38]** one of the earliest. However, we then learned that we were allowed to go to Cambridge, and the whole of the School of Economics and later the main members of the staff of the child guidance clinic transferred themselves to Cambridge where the school was based around Peterhouse College. The war meant a scattering of PSW's all over the country, first taking part in the whole exercise of evacuation and later acting often in the capacity of special advisors in different areas where hostels were set up dealing with children's difficulties. Some of us were most troubled by the fact that people with so slight an understanding of psychiatric difficulties were called upon sometimes for instance in the case of adult psychosis, to advise about the care of individuals who were disturbed in unfamiliar surroundings. It became apparent that social workers with even this degree of experience were very much in demand in very varied settings which undoubtedly also helped them gain experience of all sorts of practical vicissitudes. In Cambridge for a period we were all pretty much distracted by trying to find lodgings for the students and ourselves, not to speak of the concern about children arriving in this area in large numbers. My own experience of finding lodgings was somewhat influenced by the fact that the School of Economics had gained some reputation as being a centre of left wing views, and prospective landladies would sometimes shake their heads and say, "Not the Economics!"

Gradually we settled down to as much systematic teaching as we could manage under difficult circumstances with insufficient books and papers, and limited accommodation, typing undertaken on soap boxes and so on. Very shortly we decided that the enormous amount of publicity that was given to the problems of evacuated children and their foster parents, was doing damage, and that if we could contribute somehow to the facts of the situation, this would be a public service. It was at this stage that we planned, with the help of the senior teachers responsible for children from two London Boroughs, to make a study of what was happening to this group of children. The Mental Health Course students were not much involved in this study, which was supervised by a committee of which Margery Fry was chairman and Susan Isaacs the leading spirit. Within a comparatively short time, because of Susan Isaacs' editorship of a series of books published by Methuen, we were able to get the outcome of this survey published under the name *Cambridge Evacuation Survey* **[39]**, and this received considerable publicity.

One of the difficulties in Cambridge was getting suitable practical work for students. The mental hospital at Fulbourne **[40]** was not used to social work staff or to demonstrations of social casework with mental patients and the child guidance clinic of the education department was only able to offer limited experience with teaching which was not always consistent with the approach of the course as a whole. After a period then it was decided to transfer the practical work of the students to the Oxford child guidance clinic. In the meantime it had become possible for the Mill Hill Emergency Hospital

with staff from the Maudsley **[41]** to open a social work department, again under the supervision of Margaret Ashdown. The job of the tutor then became an extremely difficult triangle of travelling and tutorial timetables. To the best of my recollection, we spent the first term, or most of the first term, in introductory theoretical teaching and then transferred the students to these two centres of practical training to which I travelled every week, returning to Cambridge as a base.

Towards the end of the war The Commonwealth Fund announced that they would now be gradually withdrawing the grant to the course. So at a very difficult time, when it was even hard to get together members of the consultative committee of the School of Economics, plans had to be made for means by which the course could be continued at all. During the first two years of withdrawal, it was necessary to find the balance of costs since the School of Economics itself had not taken over financial responsibility for the training and this meant that as tutor and as secretary of the consultative committee, I was responsible for finding funds, or rather the balance of funds. This was done by asking various organisations concerned with the continuance of training, to give, (and I think this sum was suggested to them), £25 each, towards the continuance of the training. The organisations involved would be, I think, the Child Guidance Council, the Central Association for Mental Welfare **[42]**, the then Committee for Mental Hygiene **[43]**, and I think the Mental After Care Association **[44]**, though I'm not sure about this. During the last year of the war, because of the difficulties of coordination of all these different centres of training, we were allowed, (we being the Mental Health Course) to return to the building of the LSE which had been occupied by the Ministry of Works. The only part of the accommodation available to us was the Library and one or two offices connected with the then Library. There came a time for examinations at a point when the V2 bombs were falling on London, and the question arose as to whether it was safe for students to be sitting for an examination when at any time there could be bombing in the area. And I remember communicating with the Director in Cambridge and asking whether he felt we should continue with examinations, and if so under what conditions. He suggested to me that I should look around London finding whether there was a safer place than the School of Economics for students to sit! And I did trail round. I remember going to Kings College to find out if they had a basement that would be available. Finally the porter at LSE, the indomitable Wilson, whom many people will remember, suggested that we should go in between the book stacks in the basement under the building, and the porters spent the weekend fixing the lights so that this would be possible. Our arrangement was that we should start each exam sitting in the library upstairs, that copies of papers would be available in the basement; that we should not move for the first siren, but if the "overhead" siren followed, we should all get up and silently trail down to the basement and continue the exams. This happened in each of the three-hour sessions. There was one point at which there was sound of flooding water after an explosion, and I thought, 'Now there must be a water main burst and we shall have to get out of the basement'. This turned out to be a thunderstorm!

During this period in the Library in LSE the tutor was very much occupied with the whole question of the future financing of the course, and this was discussed one evening with Professor Laski **[45]** who happened to come into the Library. He had not, I think, before fully realised that the course was in jeopardy. I think he had a genuine interest in this kind of approach to people

in difficulty and he undertook to speak about it at the meeting of governors which was shortly to be held at the School. It was after this meeting that I was informed that the School of Economics would take financial responsibility for the course, and I always had the impression that he had been influential at this meeting. I don't really know what line would have been taken by the then Director Professor Carr-Saunders, who interestingly enough, had been the first person to tell me about the new developments in the early 20's. I didn't get the impression that he was, during the term of my employment, particularly interested, but the concerns of the LSE were so wide and complicated that one could hardly expect a small course to be attracting much attention on the part of the Director.

During my last 3 years at the LSE, from I suppose 1943 to '46, I served as a member of 3 government committees. First of all the Curtis Committee on the Care of Children deprived of normal home life **[46]**, secondly, the Underwood Committee on handicapped children **[47]**, and thirdly the Mackintosh Committee on the mental health services **[48]**. The Curtis Committee was appointed to look into the care of children "deprived of normal home life" and involved three government departments to the Ministers of which members of the committee were personally introduced: The Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Health and the Home Office. We met under the Chairmanship of Myra Curtis **[49]** who was Principal of Newnham College. I remember at first thinking how would this academic woman (who however had also been a civil servant in the Treasury, I think, before she was appointed Principal of Newnham), would adapt herself to the consideration of the problems of children, of whom, admittedly, she really had very little experience. As time went on however, I became rather convinced of the merits of somebody who was sufficiently detached from the problem to look at it in a very fresh way, and she was a very capable chairman who was anxious to attract different points of view and who welcomed even different methods of reporting. At an early stage we were reporting on the different areas of visits assigned to us, whether of the care of children in residential establishments, or in foster homes, and I remember developing the plan in these sectional reports, of describing as fully as possible some of the institutions and some of the homes as illustrative of the more general facts. I recall that Myra Curtis receiving one of these said, "Oh you've given me an idea as to how this report might be made". At a later stage, I understand that some people, for example the Director of the Children's Department of the Home Office, John Ross, under whom I worked, was rather critical of this and felt that the report had gone into far too much detail. But Mary Rosling, who was a joint secretary of the Curtis Committee, and really responsible for a large part of the writing, remained convinced that this was a significant way of presenting the facts to the public. We spent a great deal of time on this committee in the field. I was visiting with the principal of the National Children's Home and Orphanage **[50]**, as it was then called, The Rev. John Litten. **[51]** Together with his wife in his little car, we travelled all around the West Country spending time in many different kinds of institutions in Cornwall, Devon, Somerset, Hampshire. Different areas were assigned to different members of the committee. I also did a special study with Mary Rosling of foster home care in Wiltshire in which we visited, I think, most of the children who were placed either by voluntary organisations, or by the county in foster care, and we reported in detail on this.

On my own, though this material was never used, I visited a number of mental hospitals in Kent, trying to find out how many adolescents were being sent to mental hospitals possibly unnecessarily because of there not being other suitable accommodation for them. But I remember that Miss Fildes the psychologist **[52]**, who was also on the committee, thinking that this information was not sufficiently well established to be used by the committee

The Underwood Committee was concerned with the treatment of handicapped children and what became rather evident to me in the course of the discussions of this committee, was the relatively little attention that had been paid by Education Authorities to the social care of the children who were in residential establishments. I frequently asked about the appointment of the residential staff with whom we had been so much concerned on the Curtis Committee and it was clear that they had no systematic knowledge of the way in which these staff were appointed. And indeed it appeared that they hadn't regarded this as a question of great importance relative to what went on in the process of education. This I think, really, is my outstanding memory of the discussions of the Underwood Committee. The Underwood Committee Report, I think, was very well thought of by the child guidance staff of various professional qualifications. I think the psychologists were particularly impressed with it, and I think it served to establish the need for recognised qualifications, anyway as far as clinical staff were concerned. I kept on urging the idea that the residential staff of the establishments for which the education authorities were responsible should share, with what was then the responsibility of the Home Office vis-à-vis the local authorities, the responsibility for training residential staff. But I don't think that this view was a very acceptable one on the whole.

The Mackintosh Committee was of course concerned with the training of PSW's and during part of the period of this committee's meetings, I had left the London School of Economics and become appointed as the Director of Child Care Studies in the Home Office Children's Dept. This meant that I couldn't continue to serve on the Mackintosh Committee as an individual, but my position on it was reconsidered at the Home Office and it was approved that I should continue to serve as an "observer". I remember the chairman of the committee a Dr. Mackintosh **[53]** looking at me with a twinkle in his eye saying, I wonder how long it will take you to learn to be an observer". I don't remember very much of the proceedings of the Mackintosh Committee but I do recall that the Association of Psychiatric Social Workers became rather troubled that their only representative should be someone who was no longer in psychiatric social work but had become, technically, an "inspector" at the Home Office although in charge there of training. I consulted Ruth Darwin **[53a]** about this situation and to the best of my recollection another member who could represent psychiatric social work was appointed.

When I left the London School of Economics in 1946 I went to the United States on a grant from the National Council of Social Service **[54]**. They were concerned with the possibility of exchanges of social workers of various callings, between America and Great Britain. I was to go out and visit the senior staff of a number of different branches of social work to discuss with them these possibilities, both in the USA and Canada. And in the interests of this I travelled right across the USA and back across Canada, visiting a number of organisations and most of the outstanding departments or schools of social work, and wrote a fairly full report about this for the National Council of Social Service. I remember the Head of the Department of Social Services

of Canada, George Davison **[55]**, writing about my report on Canada and saying that he thought in the short time I'd managed to discover the quality of the services in Canada and what their peculiar advantages and difficulties were. I'm not sure that very much came of the plan for an exchange of social workers that was not already being in operation through Fulbright and other schemes of exchange. One of the difficulties was the difference in salary scale, and also I think the general shortage of workers. However, this visit enabled me to meet again many of the friends that I had had on former visits and I was very glad of the opportunity. The social workers in America were obviously very much interested in our war experiences and I gave lectures in very many of the places I visited on the subject of changing views about the care of children, including one of the Smith College series of lectures **[56]**, and a number also in Canada.

When I returned from this visit to America, I was greeted by friends with the announcement of a new department, or rather a new departure, in the interest of training in the Children's Department of the Home Office with a series of appointments of superintending inspectors who were to be placed in key positions in different parts of the country. So I at once applied for one of these posts and I remember very clearly my interview for the post with I think John Ross in the chair, and somebody asking whether I had been interested in reading the Curtis Committee Report and my confessing that I had been a member of it! They were I think rather concerned that I would not have had enough administrative experience. That, and also the fact that, having been occupied in the training of people for mental health services, I would be too inclined to regard the new posts as requiring this kind of special qualification. I remember their asking me about administrative experience and my saying that if you ran a course at the university of a special kind, you were essentially involved in quite a lot of administration, and completely forgetting that at the time of the interview I was being responsible for the programme of the International Conference of Mental Health which involved two thousand people! When the large number of applicants for the new posts of the Inspectorate in the Home Office were sorted out there was a published list of people who were offered the post of Chief Inspector, Superintending Inspector, etc., and I was on the reserve list of, I think there were seven or so, Superintending Inspectors. One of these withdrew and so I could have become a Superintending Inspector, but at that point John Ross who I knew before, because I'd been on the probation training board and he was responsible for that, asked me would I prefer to be responsible for training rather than becoming one of the Superintending Inspectors, and obviously I said yes because this was my line. And then there was some discussion about what this particular Inspector (because technically one was still an Inspector), should be called, and he said he thought the best title was "Director of Child Care Studies". I didn't like that title very much. For one thing it was very long, but I didn't very much like being called "Director" and suggested a university type of title, (quite often isn't it?) Advisor in Studies, Advisor in Child Care Training. Anyway I became the Director of Child Care Studies.

There was always some question at the Home Office about the status of the director. This was a silly sort of question really, but the Superintending Inspectors used to have regular meetings about what was happening in their area and what needed to be developed and I was occasionally invited into this meeting as a rather special thing to tell them what was happening in

training, but I was not part of that meeting because I was not technically a Superintending Inspector. Some people felt that this should really from the start have been the status of the director particularly as I have been offered this job but it never was. To advise the Home Office we had Central Training Council in Child Care **[57]**, which was really a very influential body, I think, and a very good one. Members of such advisory committees in government departments you know are just personally invited and I suppose discussions of individuals and the balance of things goes on behind the scenes.

At first I was both Director of Child Care Studies and also Secretary of the Central Training Council in Child Care, but at a later stage it was considered desirable to separate these two functions and so the secretaryship went to the administrative department of the Home Office and this I think, probably, was inevitable, but it meant a certain division of different types of responsibility. When it came to questions of, say, cutting down on public expenditure, the administrative department would be responsible for that but could not be expected really to be fully aware of what was involved in saying "You'll cut down this course or that course", when it didn't look very promising, but you felt that useful things were going to develop if it was allowed to grow.

The problem of the Central Training Council in Child Care was really to get the whole of the training underway both for the child care officers and also for residential staff, and at first it was considerably centralised in that the selection of the students who received grants was made at the Home Office with representatives from various courses acting with the tutors. I should have said that of course the Curtis Committee had recommended that the child care officers courses should be at the university and should be regarded, as indeed the training of PSW's was regarded, as a post certificate specialising course. And this I think broadly was well accepted, influenced I think to some extent by the fact that the Home Office through their training grant, paid the salary of the people who were to be responsible for the child care courses, and most of the social science departments were always short of funds and were glad, I think, to have someone added to the staff who could help generally to strengthen the academic staff of the department. So the initial stages were really discussing with the various universities the initiation and content of the course. There was always a rather delicate situation as between the government department which was demanding a certain kind of trained person and the universities who, as you know, were safeguarding their liberties of appointment. This always is an issue when there are public funds paying the salary of a person. Do you also call the tune, is the question isn't it? Well I felt rather touched by the fact that when it came to examinations and the qualification which was to be issued by the Central Training Council in Child Care, I was asked by all the five universities, I think it was 4 or 5 universities, to be the external examiner, in order to get the coordination. I think it was really rather an act of faith in my appreciation of the university point of view and the civil service responsibility. In fact I did discuss this with the then Chief Inspector really from the point of view of consumption of time, but in any case with further thought we both agreed, and I think quite rightly, that it would not be a suitable function for anybody who was a civil servant. But from the point of view of the universities of course I was known to them and it was an advantage to have had an academic job and to know not only the people they were appointing, (because in a number of cases, in fact in all cases, they were themselves

PSW's with some sort of special training) but also most of the heads of the social science departments, of course, through the Mental Health Course. It was a very enjoyable thing from my point of view, just going round to the Universities and usually helping with preliminary selection and so on.

After a time, and it was quite a considerable time, I think not many years before I left, I urged that we no longer should do the central selection, even if students did have Home Office grants, but should leave this to the universities and accept their recommendation for selection. The courses I think developed along the right lines. It's certainly true that to start with, and to go on with, some of the posts of Children's Officers and senior staff were not people who had had this kind of training. As you know a number of them from quite big areas were people who had been in the administrative services and had not done what we then regarded as courses qualifying social workers at all. On the other hand I think it must be said that the job of a Children's Officer in the large Boroughs is one that really could be said to require just as much skill in public administration as in casework. There was a good deal of discussion, of course, about this. The Curtis Committee had said that the Children's Officer should have special training, but this was not held to by the letter by any means and I don't think it could have been as far as the local authorities were concerned. The Appointments of Children's Officers had to be approved by the Home Office.

The other aspect of the training which was really more of an innovation was the whole training of residential staff. And there we had to start in a very basic sort of way. Looking back on that since, I think we were in our attitudes somewhat condescending about residential staff. I still remember some of the interviews I had with able people who became directors of residential establishments feeling that they had sometimes been treated as second-class candidates. I remember particularly a couple whom I interviewed when l did a survey of past students, who said "In our last interview you said to us, do you think you'll go on reading?" and they thought that this was most insulting. I remember somebody saying to me, (I think this was not very long ago), "Do you like reading?" And it seemed to me an extraordinary question! But it wasn't an extraordinary question for a lot of the youngsters who came along wanting to do residential work, because many of them had not read books since leaving school. And from asking "What sort of books do you like best?" in selection interviews I came to say, "Which magazines do you like?" This was really true because on the whole we got mostly of course young women who had been in secondary modern schools and they, most of them, had not had books at home. I think the best educated of the ones who applied, with whom I had experience, were the ones who had gone into the so-called "sisterhood" of the National Children's Homes. They tended to be more capable of learning shall we say, in terms of words and ideas than the general run of other staff. But just every now and then one got people whom you thought would get into senior positions in residential establishments, and who indeed did.

There was a great deal of discussion about the length of training for residential staff, and 14 months seemed to be about the limit of length one could expect to be paid for, because, mind you, all these staff were receiving grants at the time for training, so really the budget was a very considerable one. A year's leave from the Home Office, spent at Nuffield College, Oxford, as a holder of the Gwilym Gibbon Fellowship enabled me to follow the careers of a sample of students who had trained in ten courses for residential

staff, and to compare my findings with a similar study made in the Netherlands. During my last ten years or so at the Home Office I was able to make practical use of what I had learned.

The other main development which took a great deal of time of the training inspectors, was the running of short refresher courses and we had these on almost continuously. I was trying to remember the number we did in a year, but I know we very seldom had a gap of more than a week between courses and we were planning these, 6 months ahead, and the finding of suitable residential accommodation, the getting out of a programme which would enable voluntary organisation, the local authorities, to choose which course was suitable for their staff, and then selecting from amongst these, and getting the whole programme going was a tremendously absorbing job. As the full time courses got more established so one was able more and more to leave those to the local authorities, and the tutors, and the universities to run on their own.

Looking back I wonder whether we spent almost too much time on short courses, but on the other hand it seemed to us to be crucial to the acceptance of the newly trained staff, that the rest of the staff should at least be given the opportunity of hearing what it was all about and getting what they could out of short courses, so I think they were important. As time went on we had special ones for groups such as approved school staff, and even Children's Officers themselves. I remember being very apprehensive about having a short course for Children's Officers, but we did manage to pull that one off. And then we also had courses - (in fact the very last one I ran when I left the Home Office) for members of local authority committees. Not a very successful course I may say. At these courses there would naturally be a lot of discussion about the criteria for foster home or residential placement and I suppose taking up the theme of the Curtis Committee, we did feel certainly in the early years, that there were very great advantages in foster home placement if only the right choice could be made. One thing, looking back, which I feel impressed with is the fact that we not only in the Curtis Committee we stressed the advantages, indeed the superior advantages, of foster home placement, but we also laid great stress on the family-sized residential group. Now I think this arose partly from the fact that we didn't give anything like enough attention to the welfare of residential staff. That may seem a funny thing to say at this point. We were, I think, aware that you would have to have a home of a certain size in order to justify at least two people looking after a group of children, but I think it was just as important really for us to spend as much time on the kind of life that residential staff could lead, as it was to spend time on the kind of life that the children could lead, because obviously the most important thing was the children's relationship with the staff. And increasingly I think, as I got either direct or indirect experience of what was happening in the small homes, I felt that we had been much too optimistic about the rather isolated small home with just two people running a small group of children of mixed ages. Because if something went wrong, it went very seriously wrong and there was no sort of balance of personalities to ventilate things and get a readjustment made.

So that if you were to ask, well what were the mistakes of the Curtis Committee I think that would be one of them. That if I were to have a new Curtis Committee now, I would say the first, almost the first thing, is to find out what kind of people are likely to go in for residential work, and to deploy them in such a way that their relationships with the children will be as beneficial as

possible. Now that means something that I've always come up against, and that I suppose everybody in social work comes up against this. That is the variety of persons in social work. There are some people who will flourish in large, and some in quite small communities. For example if one considers schools. I'm quite sure that comprehensive schools can be run very successfully, large comprehensive schools, by certain kinds of people, but if other kinds of people get into it there is chaos. Other kinds of schools can be run very successfully by people who could never begin to run a comprehensive school. But how do we know about the provision of these different kinds of people? So I would be very much against going all comprehensive. In fact this would be influential in making me not vote as I used to for the Labour Party. Because I think it doesn't make sense in terms of staff. And in the same way if one were to think again of Curtis I would think of a great variety of establishments rather that 'Let's have all or even mostly this kind', or 'Let's have mostly that kind'.

Looking back on a life's professional experience of social work, I think what impresses me is the kind of dilemma that there is always between concentration on the very subtle difficult business of understanding individual variation and individual ways of meeting the needs of individuals, with the very obvious knowledge that social conditions are constantly creating the kind of difficulties with which we are dealing. But at the same time one must be aware of the fact that some individuals will always emerge as problems in spite of what one would regard as very favourable social conditions. This is a continuing dilemma which is reflected all the way through the development of social services and the development of training. I think it will always be so.

If one is thinking about the people who enter social services I believe that, broadly speaking, one might say that some people, temperamentally, are much better fitted to deal with the individual problems, and other people, by and large, are more fitted to deal with the broad administrative problems. If this sort of division of people entering by different sort of doors into the social service exists, I suppose that continually there may tend to be more and more separation between them, and that one of the problems is bringing these together. Now there are some people who can combine these two different approaches, but these people I think are rare and I think probably the same is true in the teaching profession. If one were to consider the idea of very large schools, there would be some people who can manage this and who would not be very good with individual children, or individual staff, and other people who can't, but then there are rare individuals whom one can probably pick out in each generation, who are extremely good at both, and then they stand out. I don't know whether Lyward **[58]** was any good at organisation, but I imagine he was, in order to have attracted and run a successful school and demonstrated new ideas. As far as the specialisation in social work with which I've been mainly concerned, first in the Mental Health Course and then in the Child Care Services, I suppose time will show the extent to which this sort of specialisation is necessary. I'm not sufficiently in touch with things now to know how much is being added to the departure of generic training. Again I think it's likely that some individuals are more suitable for some branches of work than others. I hear stories, and have very slight experience, of people who now become employed in social services departments who know extremely little about psychiatric problems. Most people know more about children because of their every day living than they do, say, about psychotic illnesses.

But of course this has been, and will continue to be I suppose, one of the continuing issues. Looking back again, I should think there would be some agreement that even if the specialised courses were not desirable as a permanent feature of the training for social work, at the time at which they were established they demonstrated something which could not have been so demonstrated unless there'd been a period of specialisation. Certainly I think this was true in the Child Care Services. Well I think also it was true in the Psychiatric Services. But then there weren't any practically, you see. There were child care workers, but there really were not social workers in the mental health services before, practically speaking. So that the situations were different. But even so whether this is a sort of self-justification or not. I don't know. You see Eileen Younghusband (Interviewee no 26) said in print somewhere "If only at the time of the Curtis Committee, it had been decided that this was something for general training", (I'm not sure it wasn't the Mental Health Committee she said that about) then all the development of training would have been more satisfactory. I don't believe that is so. I think you needed this period of demonstration and accumulation of experience and knowledge which could then be more generally used, and I think that the fact that psychiatric social workers went into all fields of social work and research and publication and everything else, meant that although they concentrated on one area of thinking for a time, they did so in such a way that it could be used in a great many different contexts.

In answer to your question, I don't think that anyone can look back and say what was the most successful thing they did in life. Looking back, you realise the things that you would like to have done differently and ones in which you failed, and the ones that you did perhaps a little better than others, but to talk of the least good and best, I think is always a fallacy. I can, I think, however say, that certain years of one's professional work were more enjoyable than others, and I wouldn't have much doubt in saying that my most enjoyable years were the ones at LSE I find that I'm still very attached to the School of Economics and I'm very proud that I've recently been made an Honorary Fellow of the School and that this will mean that I shall visit it more often than I might otherwise have done. What was it about the LSE that delighted me? Well, I suppose for one thing it was the first really responsible job that I had at an age when one felt more or less capable of doing a responsible job. I think I enjoyed, probably, the fact that I was almost the only person doing that particular kind of job at that particular time, and so one had a sort of pioneer feeling about it. It also provided, in an awfully interesting way, for very close contact with outside people, with outside universities, which I very much enjoyed, with friends in the social services with whom I'd been involved, and with individuals of great interest who served on the consultative committee. And this in a setting of individual members of the School of Economics academic staff, who were themselves quite outstanding. When I first went there Sir William Beveridge was Director **[59]**, and Graham Wallas **[60]** was still there; Laski was there throughout my time. Malinowski **[61]** had the next door room, Hugh Dalton **[62]** was on the other side and I found all this intellectual stimulus and widening of one's experience very exciting. I felt at that stage of my life very much a junior member, and I was awfully shy when I first went there I remember. I suppose that for a long time I didn't feel I mingled easily with the rest of the staff. But by degrees one did, and to have anthropology on one side and the future Chancellor of the Exchequer on the other side, of one's room was something that one couldn't expect to happen in one's life really! And I made very close and good friends at the LSE One of

the impressive people was, I think, Lord Chorley **[63]** who was influential in some of the children's legislation and who was also influential in the independence of India. I remember his coming back when he'd been on the Indian expedition to report on the prospect of Indian independence. All that kind of thing you were exposed to. But one of the distinguished things that happened to me at LSE was being telephoned after the end of the summer term by Sir William Beveridge's secretary to ask would I give him a game at deck tennis at which he soundly beat me!

Not least among the interesting and enjoyable times of my life was a year spent at the National Institute for Social Work Training **[64]**. Here were fresh departures into research and training in an atmosphere of enterprise and friendliness, providing for social work just the kind of opportunities for discovery which were needed. My experience in making a survey of the fieldwork training of social work students seemed a satisfying ending to professional work in London.

EDITORS' NOTES TO THE CLEMENT BROWN INTERVIEW

1 **Bedford College** was founded in London in 1849 as a higher education college exclusively for women. It was the first institution of its type in the United Kingdom and the founders led by Elizabeth Jesser Reid wished to provide a liberal non-sectarian education. In 1900, the college became part of the University of London and continued to play a leading role in the advancement of women in higher education - and in public life in general. The College became fully co-educational in the 1960s and in 1985 merged with another of the University of London's colleges – Royal Holloway.

2 **Leonard Trelawney Hobhouse** (1864-1929). Liberal politician and sociologist and one of the leading proponents of social liberalism. Appointed the first professor of sociology at the University of London in 1907.

3 **Women's University Settlement** (the 'Settlement') was founded in 1887 by women from Girton and Newnham Colleges at Cambridge University, Lady Margaret and Somerville Colleges at Oxford University and Bedford and Royal Holloway Universities. Its objective was to "promote the welfare of the poorer districts of London, more especially of the women and children, by devising and advancing schemes which tend to elevate them, and by giving them additional opportunities in education and recreation". Women from London colleges were invited to live at the Settlement rent free in exchange for their work in the community. The name was changed to the Blackfriars Settlement in 1961.

4 **Clement Attlee** (1883-1967) Taught at the LSE 1913-23 and became mayor of Stepney in 1919. Author of the 1920 book, *The Social Worker*, which took issue with the prevailing philosophy of the Charity Organisation Society. Was elected MP for Limehouse in 1922. Leader of the Labour Party 1935-1955 and Prime Minister 1945-51 .

5 **Charity Organisation Society** was founded in London in 1869 and led by Helen Bosanquet (1860–1925), social theorist and social reformer and Octavia Hill ((1838–1912), housing and social reformer. It supported the concept of self help and limited government intervention to deal with the effects of poverty. The

organisation claimed to use "scientific principles to root out scroungers and target relief where it was most needed". It organised charitable grants and pioneered a volunteer home-visiting service that formed the basis for modern social work. The original COS philosophy later attracted much criticism though some branches were much less doctrinaire than others. Gradually volunteer visitors were supplanted by paid staff. In 1938 the COS initiated the first Citizens' Advice Bureau, and continued to run CABx branches until the 1970s. The COS was renamed Family Welfare Association in 1946 and still operates today as Family Action a leading provider of support to disadvantaged families. [For more information, *see* Charles Loch Mowat *The Charity Organisation Society 1869-1913* (1961), Madeline Rooff *A Hundred Years of Family Welfare: A Study of the Family Welfare Association (Formerly Charity Organisation Society) 1869–1969* (Michael Joseph 1972) and Jane Lewis *The Voluntary Sector, the State and Social Work in Britain* (Brookfield 1995). Michael J.D. Roberts, in an article *'Charity Disestablished? The Origins of the Charity Organisation Society Revisited, 1868-1871'* in the Journal of Ecclesiastical History (CUP 2003, vol 54).

6 **Margaret Lindsay Huggins** (1848-1915) Irish scientific investigator and amateur astronomer. She left £100 to Bedford College for scholarships.

7 **Sigmund Freud** wrote the *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* in 1901 which laid the basis for the theory of psychoanalysis.

8 **William Healey** was the author of *The Individual Delinquent* published in 1915 by Little, Brown, Boston, Mass. And reissued in 1929. It was one of 21 studies on juvenile delinquency discussed by Barbara Wootton in chapter III of *Social Science and Social Pathology*.

9 **Geraldine S. Cadbury Southall** set up in 1920 with her husband, Barrow Cadbury, the charitable foundation then known as the Barrow and Geraldine S. Cadbury Trust. She wrote *Young Offenders Yesterday and Today* published in 1938 by Allen and Unwin.

10 **Laura Spellman Rockefeller** (1839-1915) Wife of John D. Rockefeller and a philanthropist in her own right. Founded Spellman College to educate black women in the south. The Laura Spellman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation was established in 1918 by her husband and it had a particular interest in the social sciences.

11 **Margery Fry** (1874-1958). Prison reformer and one of the first women to become a magistrate. Warden of the new women's residence at Birmingham University 1904-13. Director of the Howard league for Penal Reform 1921-6 and Principal of Somerville College, Oxford 1926-30.

12 **Shustoke, Warwickshire** opened in 1868 as an Industrial School for boys. Became Shawbury School in 1926. Closed in 1980.

13 **New York School of Social Work** (now the Columbia University School of Social Work) is the USA's oldest, with roots extending back to 1898 when the New York Charity Organization Society's first summer course was announced in the *New York Times*. The combination of its age, the influence of its staff and its size led to the School becoming a repository for much of the reference literature in the social work field. The Summer School continued as the primary training course until 1904. That year, it expanded the coursework as the first full-time course of graduate study at the newly renamed New York School of

Philanthropy. The name was changed to the New York School of Social Work in 1917 and in 1963 to its current title.

14 **Professor Carr-Saunders.** (1886–1966). Sociologist, demographer and academic administrator. Secretary of the research committee of the Eugenics Education Society, and served as sub-warden of Toynbee Hall. He was elected to Stepney borough council, and in 1914 was called to the bar. *The Population Problem* (1922) did much to establish his reputation and much later it was claimed as having anticipated major developments in ethology. Became first holder of the Charles Booth chair of social science at Liverpool University in 1923. Succeeded Sir William Beveridge as director of the London School of Economics (LSE). In the next nineteen years he held the school together through its exile during the war and presided over its expansion.

15 **Child Guidance Council** was set up in the 1920s funded by the Commonwealth fund. It bankrolled British child guidance until 1939. A full history, *The Dangerous Age of Childhood: child guidance in Britain c.1918-1955,* was written by John Stewart (2012)

16 (Amy) **Gordon Hamilton.** (1892 - 1967). Social work educator at the New York School of Social Work at the Columbia University School of Social Work from 1923 to 1957. She was an admired teacher, thinker and writer with a considerable influence on European social work pioneers as well as in the USA . Her particular concern for the direction and quality of social work education. She was an outstanding contributor to social work literature and her most important work was *The Theory and Practice of Social Casework* first published in 1940. See *Notable American Women: the modern period: a Biographical Dictionary*. Harvard University Press. 1980.

17 **Dr. Charles Norris** was Chief Inspector of the Children's Department at the Home Office for 23 years from 1917 and was regarded as the guiding force in framing the 1933 Children and Young Persons Act.

18 **East London Child Guidance Clinic** was founded in 1927 by the Jewish Health Organisation and was thought to be the first such clinic in Europe. John Bowlby practised there after graduating.

19 **Jewish Health Organisation** was founded in 1923 and was concerned with every aspect of Jewish health.

20 **Emanuel Miller.** (1893-1970) was a founding father of child and adolescent psychiatry in the UK. He is credited with establishing clinics that became the forerunners of freely available child and adolescent mental health services in the UK. He assisted in the establishment of the Association for Child and Adolescent Mental Health and the *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychology and Psychiatry*. And he was also a mover behind the establishment of the Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency and the *British Journal of Criminology*. In his early professional years he practised across the range of activities, with a special interest in children but also working in what was then called mental deficiency, and in neurology. In 1929 he became a member of the Royal College of Physicians. Miller's approach to psychiatry had a strong psychoanalytic and sociological bent. He was the psychiatrist to and director of the first child guidance clinic to open in England, which he founded at the Jewish Hospital in east London, working with the psychologist (as he then was) Meyer Fortes and a leading psychiatric social worker, Sybil Clement Brown. When some of those interested in this type of work with children combined to create the

Child Guidance Council, Miller became a member of its governing body. Miller believed that psychoanalytically informed work would help to prevent delinquency and neurosis spreading from the youthful individual to the adult. He published *Types of Mind and Body* in 1926 and two extremely influential and much cited articles in 1931 on the psychopathology of childhood and illusion and hallucination. He also wrote a moving but professional account of the state of psychotherapy in 1931 and in *The Generations* (1938), the most sociologically inclined of all his writings, his rallying call for mental health to lead social reform for a better future

21 **Dr. Noel Burke** co-authored articles with Emanuel Miller on child guidance clinics. His interest in mental defectives is perhaps by an article in the British Journal of Medical Psychology: *Child Mental Hygiene: Its History, Methods and Problems.*

22 **Meyer Fortes** (1906-83). Originally trained as a psychologist and then as an anthropologist at the LSE.

23 **School Care Committees** The School Care Committee service was set up in 1908 by the London County Council to provide a welfare service to London's school children, using large numbers of volunteers directly employed by the local authority. Published histories include: Willmott, P. *London's School Care Committee Service 1908-1989* in Voluntary Action Journal (6, 2 (Spring 2004, 95-110) and Jennings, H. (1930) *The Private Citizen in Public Social Work*. Allen & Unwin.

24 **The Commonwealth Fund (of America) and Commonwealth Scholarships** had its origins in the philanthropic efforts of the Harkness family. Its original 1918 endowment of $10 million expanded to $53 million by 1959. Child welfare has been a major focus of its grant making. In 1925, the Fund launched its international program of fellowships called The Commonwealth Fund Fellowships (now the Harkness Fellowships). A number of people in the UK (including some of the Cohen interviewees) were invited by the Commonwealth Fund to visit the USA in 1927, and an offer was made to train a group of UK social workers in psychiatric social as a preparation for opening a child guidance clinic in this country. When the visitors returned to the UK, they presented a report to the Child Guidance Council on the development of child guidance clinics in this country. This report stressed the need for making clinics an integral part of the school system and it also advocated co-operation between clinics and hospitals. From 1929 to 1940 the Commonwealth Fund also completely financed the LSE to deliver the first university training course for psychiatric social workers: the Diploma Course in Mental Health. For an informed discussion see: Stewart, J. (2006). *Psychiatric Social Work in inter-war Britain: American ideas, American philanthropy*. In Michael Quarterly. www.dnms.no and Noel Timms (1964). *Psychiatric Social Work in Great Britain: 1939-62.*

25 **Canonbury Child Guidance Clinic** (sometimes referred to as the London CGC) was started in 1929 with financial aid from the American Commonwealth Fund whose officers wished to give support to child guidance and psychiatric social work with children in England and Scotland. Several distinguished staff members worked there, including John Bowlby from 1936 to 40.

25a **The London School of Economics and Political Science** (informally, the London School of Economics or **LSE**) was founded in 1895, the moving Fabian

spirits being Beatrice and Sidney Webb, Graham Wallas and George Bernard Shaw. The initial finance came from a bequest of £20,000 from the estate of Henry Hunt Hutchinson, a lawyer and member of the Fabian Society. He left the money in trust to be put "towards advancing its [The Fabian Society's] objects in any way they [the trustees] deem advisable". The aim of the School was the betterment of society through the study of social science subjects such as poverty and inequality. The important role of the LSE in the development of social work education is referred to in several of the Cohen Interviews. The Charity Organisation Society (COS) sociology department - that had provided some theoretical training for social workers - was absorbed in 1912 into the LSE's new Department of Social Science and Administration. The range of courses later provided by the Department was described by David Donnison in 1975: "The Department was teaching about 300 students at this time (1956): about sixty were taking the Social Administration options in the second and third years of a course leading to an honours degree in sociology, ninety were taking a course leading to a Certificate in Social Science (later renamed the Diploma in Social Administration) and twenty five graduate students were taking the same course in one year. The Department also provided four one-year professional training courses designed in the main for graduates in social sciences: the Personnel Management course for about twenty five students, the Mental Health Course [established in 1929] for about thirty five students training for psychiatric social work, the Child Care Course for about twenty students training to work in local authorities' children's departments and involuntary child care organisations, and the Applied Social Studies Course for about twenty five students entering various branches of social work. A number of graduate students were reading for higher degrees, and various others were temporarily attached to the Department." The School ceased to offer professional social work qualifications in 1998.

26 **Dr. Evelyn Lawrence** did an economics degree at the LSE and then went in 1927 to the Institute of Industrial Psychology but was very soon offered a post as a child psychologist at the Malting House School (see note 28 below) which she took. She noted that the key feature of the children was their evident happiness.

27 **Susan Isaacs** (1885-1948) In !907 she trained as a teacher for 5-7 year olds at Manchester University, then took a degree in philosophy and graduated in 1912. She was an educational psychologist and psychoanalyst. 1924-7 she was Head of Malting House School, Cambridge (see below), 1929-40 she was the agony aunt (as Ursula Wise) on children's problems in child care journals. In 1933 she was appointed as the first head of the Child Development Department at the Institute of Education.

28 **Malting House School** In 1924 Geoffrey Pyke, eccentric and wealthy, opened an infants' school in his own home in Cambridge. He wanted an imaginative education for his son, his own having been very unhappy. The school closed in 1929 due primarily to bankruptcy.

29 **The Mental Health Diploma Course at the LSE**. This one year course was established in 1929 with financial aid from the Commonwealth Fund in the USA and this support continued until the1940's. However, as Professor John Stewart has established by researching the archives of both organisations, the relationship was a complex one and not without difficulties. The senior staff of the Commonwealth Fund had had strong views on how the course should be run – particularly in relation to the course content and the experience and qualifications of admitted students - while the LSE wished to maintain its independence. However, threats to withdraw funding were not carried through

and the course became established. For a considerable period this was the only course of its kind in the UK and hence carried considerable prestige. It formed a focus for the expansion of the profession of psychiatric social work from a very low base: in 1930 the newly formed Association of Psychiatric Social Workers had only 17 members. The curriculum included the different existing strands of psychiatric theory and practice; intra-family relationships; and disorders of childhood. Those qualifying went into, or returned to, a variety of work settings; child guidance, mental hospitals, local authorities and voluntary agencies. Over the years the influence of this course gradually spread. For a fuller discussion see: Stewart, J. (2006). *Psychiatric Social Work in inter-war Britain: American ideas, American philanthropy*. Michael Quarterly. www.dnms.no and Noel Timms (1964). *Psychiatric Social Work in Great Britain: 1939-62***.**

30 **Charles Mostyn Lloyd** a barrister who was Head of the Department of Social Administration at the LSE 1922-44. A prize is awarded in his name for outstanding performance at MSc level.

31 **Miss Edith Verena Eckhard** taught at the LSE from 1919 to 1952, firstly as Assistant Lecturer, then as Senior Tutor (to the Almoner students) and finally as Deputy Head of the Social Science Department. Miss Eckhard was part of a long campaign to encourage the mutual raising of standards in social studies departments in the face of a proliferation of *ad hoc* courses. She was Secretary of the Joint University Council which published *Training for Social Work* in 1926 and I which the training needs of Almoners were recognised. For a period she served on the Executive Council of the Institute of Almoners.

32 **Dr. A. F. Tredgold. (**1870-1952). Physician at University College in London and became a recognised medical authority on mental conditions**.** In 1905 gave a lecture on 'The Problem of the Feeble-minded' at the Guildhall conference on the feeble minded. He was concerned about England's vitality waning. His text book *Mental Deficiency (Amentia)* was in a second edition by 1914.

33 **Margaret Ashdown.** (1892-1962) was an early psychiatric social worker and a leading member of the Association of Psychiatric Social Workers (APSW). She was a tutor at the London School of Economics for several years and edited the *British Journal of Psychiatric Social Work*: a tribute to her by Sybil Clement Brown was printed in that journal in 1962 - Volume 6, no 3.

34 **Sir Aubrey Lewis.** (1900-1975) first Professor of Psychiatry at the Institute of Psychiatry, London – the designation given to the Maudsley Hospital Medical School in 1946. He had a profound influence in the development of psychiatry in the UK, partly through his own work and published papers and lectures, partly through his influence on many of his students. From a Jewish family in Adelaide, he attended a local Catholic school and went on to graduate as a doctor from the Adelaide University Medical School and then practice in the City's Hospital. Awarded a Rockefeller scholarship, he trained in the USA, Germany and England and became thoroughly committed to psychiatry. In 1928 he obtained the membership of the Royal College of Physicians and went to the Maudsley Hospital, London, first as a research fellow, and from 1929 as a member of the clinical staff. He remained there until his retirement. During the thirty years of Lewis's leadership the hospital and institute emerged as a postgraduate research and teaching centre of world rank, with a leading position in the United Kingdom. Around himself Lewis established a group of research workers who transformed British psychiatry from a clinically orientated study to a respected academic discipline with foundations in the empirical sciences, particularly

epidemiology, psychology, neuroendocrinology, neuropathology, and biochemistry. He helped to train a generation of psychiatrists who later occupied many of the principal psychiatric posts in the United Kingdom and elsewhere. Although Lewis wrote no books, he published numerous papers, notably on melancholia, neurosis, history, and biography. He was particularly interested in social and economic influences on mental illness. In 1942, for example, he was honorary secretary to the neurosis subcommittee of the Royal Medico-Psychological Association which examined the relevance to psychiatric disorders (such as neurosis) of poverty, occupation, unemployment, and housing. He is remembered primarily for his creation of an internationally recognized institute for psychiatric research and training. [Further information available from: Royal College of Psychiatrists online Archive No 14.]

35 **Sir Cyril Burt** (1883–1971). Psychometric psychologist and eugenicist. His first teaching job was at Liverpool University at a time when the Eugenics Society was very influential and the 1913 Mental Deficiency Act required children with learning difficulties to be transferred from elementary schools to schools for the "feeble minded". His career was mostly involved with research and debate about the inter-relationship between heredity, intelligence, race and class: highly contentious territory between champions of universal education and its opponents. In the 1920's and 1930's he chaired the Eugenics Society's long-running Pauper Pedigree Project, which was designed to show that the pauper class was a closed, inbreeding group of interrelated families, and that pauperism could be traced to a heritable biological defect s that revealed immorality, feeble-mindedness and criminality. The results of the study were published in 1933. He continued in several influential positions, including with the LCC, and published widely until the 1960's when the tide turned against policies of rigid selection. After his death much of key research findings on twins were shown to be questionable, if not fraudulent, and his reputation suffered severely.

36 **J. A. Hadfield.** (1882 - 1967). Graduated in medicine in 1916 at Edinburgh University and served as a surgeon in the Royal Navy. Practiced as a neurologist in Oxford and lectured at Birmingham University before beginning a long term career in psychological medicine in London. Joined the Tavistock Clinic and became Director of Studies. Played a leading role in training medical staff in psychiatry. Published extensively and reached a non-specialist readership with titles like *Dreams and Nightmares* (1954), *Childhood and Adolescence* and *Psychology and Mental Health.*

37 **Sir Frederic Charles Bartlett** (1886-1969).The first professor of experimental psychology at Cambridge 1931-51. Knighted for his war-time work with the RAF in applied psychology.

38 **Notre Dame Child Guidance Clinic** was opened in Glasgow in 1931 in response to local demand from parents and professionals especially teachers. The first director was Sr. Marie Hilda who had observed work at the Canonbury clinic. Funding was obtained from the Commonwealth Fund, London Child Guidance Council and the National Committee for the Training of Teachers.

39 **Cambridge Evacuation Survey** was undertaken in 1939 to study the effect of evacuation on children. It was overseen by Susan Isaacs.

40 **Fulbourne** was opened in 1858 as the County Pauper Lunatic Asylum and eventually became a traditional psychiatric hospital.

41 **Maudsley Hospital.** The foundation of the Hospital dates from 1907 when Dr Henry Maudsley offered the London County Council a substantial sum for the creation of a new mental hospital. Because the first world war intervened, the LCC did not assume control until1923. The Hospital gained a high reputation for the training of nurses and for the inter-disciplinary teamwork of its children's department. There was considerable expansion in the1920's and 30's. A Child Guidance Clinic was opened in1928 by Dr William Moodie. The children's inpatient unit followed in 1947. Several of Alan Cohen's interviewees had contact with the adult's and children's departments. The Hospital was also recognised for the quality of its teaching and research. A Medical School was established in1924 and became a pre-eminent postgraduate centre for mental health medicine, eventually evolving into the independent **Institute of Psychiatry,** which shared the south London site with the Hospital.

42 **Central Association for Mental Welfare** was formed in 1913 and was one of three organisations which became NAMH which later became MIND

43 **National Council for Mental Hygiene** was formed in 1922 and was one of the three organisations which became NAMH, now MIND.

44 **Mental After Care Association (MACA)** A very early community based mental health charity which was originally called The After-care Association for Poor and Friendless Female Convalescents on Leaving Asylums for the Insane. Initially, the Association helped find temporary homes and placements in service for women coming out of asylums, working alongside them as they tried to regain a normal life. Soon after, it began preventive work by placing "people at risk of becoming insane" in cottage homes and set up the first residential care home in England for people with mental health problems. The Charity is now known as Working for Well-being.

45 **Harold Laski** (1893-1950) was a political theorist who became professor of social science at the LSE in 1926 until his death in 1950. Had taught history in the USA prior to 1920. Was very popular with the LSE students, his lectures being described as "brilliant and eloquent". Chairman of the Labour Party 1945-6

46 **Curtis Committee report.** Report of the Care of Children committee. September 1946. HMSO, (Cmd: 6922). The modern statutory framework of public provision for deprived children, was created following the recommendations of the Curtis Committee, set up in 1944. It was chaired by Miss (later Dame) Myra Curtis. The Committee's findings focused on three areas: the absence of a single centralised authority responsible for deprived children, who were left to the charge of five different authorities; the lack of properly trained staff; and the insensitive and sometimes excessive discipline of the residential regimes. It insisted on the need to establish personal links in the care of children, and recommended the appointment by local authorities of children's officers: qualified women who would specialize in childcare and take a personal interest in each individual child. This was important in opening and securing the status of a new vocation for educated women. A single central department would have responsibility for maintaining standards in homes run by both local authorities and voluntary organisations. The recommendations were embodied in the Children Act of 1948, which vested in the Home Office responsibility for overseeing the care of homeless or deprived children.

47 **Underwood Committee 1950 - 55.** *The Underwood Report 1955- Report* **of** *the Committee on Maladjusted Children***.** In October 1950 Labour minister of education George Tomlinson appointed a committee to *enquire into and report upon the medical, educational and social problems relating to maladjusted children, with*

reference to their treatment within the educational system. Recommendations included: a comprehensive child guidance service in every local education authority area; all medical students should be given lectures on general and child psychology and should attend a child psychiatric department; a Training Council should be established to oversee training courses for educational psychologists; every effort should be made to ensure that a child has a satisfactory home base before he leaves school, if necessary through the local authority taking him into care under the Children Act ; the fundamental importance of the family as a whole should be borne in mind by those responsible for strengthening and developing the social services, and action designed to keep the family together should be regarded as one of the most important aspects of prevention.

48 **Mackintosh Committee** *Report of the Committee on Social Workers in the Mental Health Services, etc.* [Chairman J. M. Mackintosh.] London, 1951 (Cmd. 8260). The Mackintosh Committee sat from 1948 to 1951, but by the time that the Committee reported and made its recommendations, a working party on health visitors had been set up under Sir William Jameson. That working party took another three years to consider the matter and action had to wait until it was seen how the social workers in the mental health services would fit into the general picture of social work provision.

49 **Myra Curtis.** (1886-1971).Civil servant and college Principal, attended Newnham College, Cambridge. From 1915 onwards she had various positions in the Civil Service and in 1937 she moved to the Treasury as assistant secretary and director of women's establishments. Following her retirement in 1941 Curtis, who had retained her links with Cambridge as a member of the university's Women's Appointments Board, was elected principal of Newnham College from January 1942. In November 1944 she was appointed by Herbert Morrison, the Home Secretary, as a member of a committee chaired by Sir Godfrey Russell Vick to investigate conditions in remand homes administered by the London County Council. This inquiry began her interest in addressing the needs of the nation's distressed children and thus to her appointment to the Committee of Inquiry that bears her name. In recognition of her work on the inquiry, Curtis, who had been made CBE in 1942, was appointed DBE in 1949.

50 **National Children's Home and Orphanage** the work began in 1868 with a Methodist minister who wanted to rescue young boys from the streets The first home was opened in 1869. It was called NCH in 1908 and renamed Action for Children in 2008.

51 **Rev John Litten** (1878-1957) He trained as a teacher then became a minister. Worked at NCH for 33 years, the last 17 as Principal, retiring in 1950.He was a member of the Curtis Committee.

52 **Lucy G. Fildes.** Assisted William Moodie in establishing the Canonbury (London Child Guidance Clinic**.** Wrote some practical articles such as *Suggestions* for a Clinic *Playroom* (1936), co-authored with Susan Isaacs and Gwendolen Chesters. In 1937 wrote *The relation between Difficulties and Behaviour Problems*.

53 **Dr. James Macalister Mackintosh** (1891–1966), public health teacher and administrator. He established himself as an expert on rural housing and his reports on that subject are a permanent contribution to social history. In 1937 Mackintosh was appointed chief medical officer in the Department of Health for Scotland, and he was there for four years. In 1944 he became Professor of Public Health at the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine. From that base his interests and

reputation expanded to the international stage and he made important contributions to the teaching and practice of public health in Europe and in the World Health Organisation.

53a **Ruth Darwin** (1883 -1972). A granddaughter of Charles Darwin. Appointed in 1921 as a Commissioner of the Board of Control for Lunacy and Mental Deficiency.

54 **National Council of Social Service (NCSS)** was launched in 1919 to bring various voluntary bodies together and into closer relationships with government departments. Its foundation was made possible through a legacy from Edward Vivian Birchall (1884–1916) who had played a large part in the evolving voluntary sector before he was killed during the First World War. NCSS became the National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO) in 1980.

55 **George Davison** after the second world war he was the executive director of the Canadian Welfare Council.

56 **Smith College** was a private independent women's liberal arts college in Northampton, Mass. which took its first students in 1975. Its founder was Sophia Smith who was left a fortune by her father.

57 **Central Training Council in Child Care.** In 1948 the Central Training Council in Child Care was set up under the aegis of the Home Office Children's Department. In 1971 the Central Council for Education and Training in Social work was set up as an independent quango, superseding the CTCC. That too was wound up in 2001 and responsibility for training moved on to other organisations

58 **George Lyward** (1894-1973) was an educationalist and psychotherapist who established a school for 50 to 60 'delinquent, disturbed or disturbing boys' in 1930 and moved to Finchenden Manor in 1935. The school closed a year after his death. Michael Burn wrote a book, *Mr Lyward's Answer*, in 1956 (Allen and Unwin).

59 **William Beveridge** (1879-1963) was an economist, writer and academic. Joined the Board of Trade in 1908 and became an authority on unemployment. He had become interested in unemployment and other social issues through working at Toynbee hall in 1903 where he had close contact with Sydney and Beatrice Webb. He was Director of the LSE 1919-37 but resigned in 1937. This was thought to be over his serious interest in eugenics, he was a member of the Eugenics Society. The Beveridge *Report on Social Insurance and Allied Services* (1942) was part of the foundations of the welfare state.

60 **Graham Wallas** (1858-1932) was a social psychologist and educationalist, a leader of the Fabian Society and co-founder of the LSE. He lectured at the LSE from 1895.

61 **Bronislaw Malinowski** (1884-1942) After degrees in Germany he studied at the LSE 1910-14. In 1922 he was appointed lecturer at the LSE and later became professor of Anthropology.

62 **Hugh Dalton** (1887-1962) After Cambridge he studied at the LSE. Was elected MP for Peckham in 1924 and lectured at the LSE and the University of London from 1919. Was Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1945 but had to resign in 1947 for leaking budget details to a journalist.

63 **Lord Chorley** (1895-1978) legal scholar, public servant and labour politician, made a peer in 1945.

64 **National Institute for Social Work Training (NISWT or later NISW)** aimed to raise standards of social work and social work management through research, publications and training courses . It was set up in 1961, following the recommendations proposals in the report of the Ministry of Health Working Party on *Social Workers in the Health and Welfare Services* (the Younghusband Committee) in 1959. The Institute wound down its activities from 2001 onwards and closed in 2003.
