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Abstract

Purpose

This paper aims to tell something of the story of the ‘Hawkspur Experiment’ (1936 -1941), a therapeutic camp organised early in the modern history of therapeutic community as an intervention into the lives of young men who were viewed to be at risk of delinquency (Wills 1967). Although it was to have remarkable influence on group and therapeutic community practice and theory, we argue that its influence is not as well remembered nor incorporated into contemporary therapeutic understanding and discussion as it should be.

Design/methodology/approach

This paper is a historical reflection based on systematic examination of the clinical and administrative records of Hawkspur Camp for Men, and supporting documents held in the Planned Environment Therapy Archive. In addition, we use published primary and secondary sources.

Findings

Hawkspur Camp was a cross-disciplinary enterprise which brought together psychoanalytic thinking, social work, an interest in groups, political activism, a concern with the dynamics and working of democracy, and the application of emergent social science methods. It was overtly an intervention into the criminal justice system, but was also an intentional exploration of the therapeutic benefits of community living and of a ‘pioneering’ lifestyle; a rigorous experiment in how psychoanalytic ideas might be employed in group residential settings; and a politically grounded exploration of participative democracy as a fundamental therapeutic principle.

Originality
This paper presents the first findings from a systematic study of the records of Hawkspur Camp.
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Introduction

This paper aims to tell something of the story of what David Wills called the ‘Hawkspur Experiment’, 1936 -1941 (Wills 1967). We argue that it was to have remarkable influence on group and therapeutic community practice and theory, but is not as well remembered as it should be. Although it influenced the famous Northfield initiatives (Harrison 2000) and, as Kennard suggests, ‘laid the foundation for Planned Environment Therapy’ (2004: 297), the story and lessons of Hawkspur have been obscured by the subsequent work of the ‘big guns of Bion, Foulkes and Main’, now better known and associated with the birth of group analysis and therapeutic community work (Nicholson 2014: 78). This paper suggests that something of importance is lost by not remembering some of the detail of Hawkspur; in particular the cross-disciplinary nature of the enterprise.

Hawkspur Camp was based in the Essex countryside around 40 miles outside London as the initial project of the ‘Q Camps Committee’. It was a progressive intervention into the lives of troubled young men already in danger of falling into lives of delinquency. The originators of the scheme came from diverse backgrounds, but shared the belief that there was much wrong with the established forms of remedial institutional life provided by schools, borstals and prisons. Underpinned by a range of theories and fuelled by the group’s various enthusiasms and experiences, it was transdisciplinary; a factor that both reinforced its strengths and influence, and aided its being ‘forgotten’.
To tease out some of those influences and interactions we focus on four key individuals; then Hawkspur’s beginnings; and finally its methods.

1. Four key individuals

Eleven people signed the 1936 Memorandum which launched Hawkspur (Franklin et al 1936). Each brought their own specialist areas of influence – probation, education, law - but we will give snapshots of four: Marjorie Franklin, David Wills, Norman Glaister, and Denis Carroll. They formed the vital Selection and Treatment Committee; were essential to the project from beginning to end; and help illustrate something of the diversity and range of influences which shaped Hawkspur.

Marjorie Franklin (1887-1975)

Marjorie Franklin was, in many ways, Hawkspur’s originator and driving force. By 1935 she was qualified in medicine, psychiatry, and psychoanalysis, with practice rooms in Harley Street. Franklin came from a wealthy and influential family, and used her connections quite ruthlessly in support of the project: while they ‘had tremendous support from others’, Wills reflected, ‘Franklin was nearly always the channel through which they came to us’ (Wills 1967:9).

Her background was of considerable privilege – a family of banking, business, and diplomacy – but also included social, religious, and political activism. Her aunt Lily Montagu is remembered for social work and co-founding the Liberal Jewish Movement (Liberal Judaism 2022). Her mother, the Hon. Henrietta Franklin was prominent in the suffragette movement, and worked alongside her sister in the campaign for Liberal Judaism (Kuzmack 1990; Kuzmack and Wilson 2021). She was also active in the progressive education movement, through which Marjorie trained in progressive education and child-care methods under Charlotte Mason in Ambleside (Coombes 2015), before choosing to study medicine.

---

1 The original Q Camp Memorandum was signed by June Buck, Denis Carroll, Marjorie E. Franklin, J. Norman Glaister, D. F. Minton, C. K. Rutter, O. L. Shaw, Walter Smith, J.J.Sowerby, W. Percy Thomson, W. David Wills. (Members of Q Camps Committee June, 1936)
Dr. Franklin qualified as a psychoanalyst in 1926, in a training which consisted primarily of an analysis with the Hungarian psychoanalyst Sándor Ferenczi. Ferenczi was one of the most renowned and influential analysts at that time, but through the 1930s became marginalised within the psychoanalytic establishment, principally because – against the orthodox Freudian position – he regarded trauma in childhood as actual rather than unconscious fantasy, and responded accordingly. He took the view that classical free association and interpretation were not sufficient for many patients, including those who had experienced trauma, who needed a more supportive therapeutic approach (Clarke 2014). Franklin’s explicit goal to create services for ‘those others’ (Franklin 1971) who were not being reached by contemporary services (who were neither suffering from psychosis and be treated in the asylums or simply neurosis who might be treated with conventional psychotherapy) is a very significant issue and is explored elsewhere (Jones 2023).

Franklin sat on the research committee of the Royal Medical Psychological Society (now the Royal College of Psychiatrists) from 1928, and hosted its ‘Psychopathological and Psychotherapeutic Discussion Group’. Meetings took place monthly in her consulting room in Harley Street and, significantly for our purposes, the first was attended by Denis Carroll, who Franklin already knew well as a colleague in the ISTD, and Norman Glaister, a new ‘find’. Carroll helped Franklin establish a second group in 1933, the ‘Social and Psychological Discussion Group’, to which non-medical social workers were invited - particularly from the Howard League for Penal Reform (of which Franklin was a member from its beginning in 1921 (Wills 1975)), and the ISTD (the Institute for the Scientific (later, Study and) Treatment of Delinquency, which ‘began life in 1931 as an association of social reformers and enthusiasts of a psychodynamic persuasion’ (Cordess 1992:519)). Franklin’s co-hosts and co-organisers – and this indicates the nature and reach of her associations - were fellow psychoanalysts Melitta Schmideberg (daughter of Melanie Klein), and Kate Friedlander. Schmideberg, like Franklin, was a founding staff member of the ISTD and Friedlander an early staff member who later founded the Hampstead Child Therapy Training with Anna Freud (Lush 1999). All shared Franklin’s interest in the environmental and psychosocial factors of delinquency, and, like Ferenczi, in therapeutic approaches outside those of the conventional consulting room (Friedlander 1947; Shapira 2013; Shapira 2017; Cassulio 2016:fn4).

For David Wills, who worked closely with her over many years, Franklin was intellectually ‘brilliant and accomplished’, ‘warm, good natured and generous’, a socialist, libertarian, and peace-lover, with a ‘kind heart and excellent intentions’. But she was also ‘the plague of his life’, someone who ‘longed for friendship’ whilst never having ‘the slightest conception of the amount of trouble she caused to other people’ and ‘quarrelled, sometimes violently, with everyone’ (Wills A Sense of Vocation: 144).
David Wills (1903-1980)

David Wills was the Camp Chief at Hawkspur, the centre of gravity and core to its realisation. He came from a very different world. Born in Swansea in 1903, he was brought up near Sheffield as one of eight children in what he described as ‘white-collar poverty’ - his parents striving to maintain the appearance of a middle-class lifestyle, without the income. In his unpublished autobiography (called *A Sense of Vocation*), on which we draw extensively, Wills says he felt close and affectionate towards his mother, but distant and combative towards his father, a relationship echoed at school (in which he was not particularly successful). Through canings by a male teacher for poor handwriting, and the contrasting kindness of a female teacher,

```
two seeds were sown, in my heart and mind, which as they took root were to struggle for living space and nutriment. One was called love, respect, gentleness, humility, the other hate, contempt, violence, pride. (Wills, *A sense of Vocation*: 10)
```

The autobiography records his long journey towards the former, and ultimately to Hawkspur. In childhood, his local Scout group gave an early positive experience of a structured institution. One young Scout leader boosted his self-esteem by telling Wills how much he was looked up to and appreciated within the group. Looking back, Wills did not know whether these were simply the ‘casual conversational remarks’ of an ‘earnest and unsophisticated young man’ or the ‘skilfully calculated reflections of a clever man who knew exactly what he was doing’; but it resonated and was to become something of a feature of Wills’ own therapeutic interventions. The death of his older brother at the Somme in 1918 cemented a life-long commitment to pacifism; and helped Wills discover that his strong Christian beliefs could survive a grave scepticism to the Established Church which, for him, had promoted, rather than sought to curb, the cruelties of war. This, in turn, led him ultimately to the Religious Society of Friends/Quakers, directly impacting his life and shaping his vision of Hawkspur.

The employment he found on leaving school at 14 was largely unsatisfactory and unremarkable; but an employer’s encouragement of night classes led him back to study, and he filled his weeks during a long period of unemployment with night classes, wide reading, and leading a local scout troop. The latter led to a successful application to become Assistant General Secretary, ‘with special charge of boys’ work’ at the YMCA in Norwich. Here as he later recalled he discovered Freud (*A Sense of Vocation*). This led to social work, and then to a life-changing three-year placement as a “brother” at
Wallingford Farm Training Colony in the Chilterns. Later known as Turner’s Court, the Colony had been founded to train ‘tramps and down and outs’ for emigration and work in the British Empire’s ‘white Dominions’, such as Canada and Australia (Johns 2002: 1), but by Wills’ time was filled mainly with boys and young men who had grown up in children’s homes. Wills describes a brutal environment, fashioned by physical violence, routinely used by staff and boys alike to establish identity and hierarchies. From fear he became a violent authoritarian, meting out physical punishments to protect himself and establish order. His transformation came through friendship with another young “brother”, Stuart Payne - gentle, idealistic and thoughtful - who did not use violence, and revealed what Wills came to see as essential truths which underpinned his later practice: On the one hand, most of the colonists could be fairly described as ‘unfeeling, foul-mouthed, insensitive, and generally difficult to live with’, who would ‘steal without hesitation’ and ‘take cruel advantage of the weak’. On the other, they had rarely, if ever, known ‘the ordinary affection of loving parents’. Payne and Wills agreed that these points were connected; and that perhaps the one thing they could do for the colonists was to ‘provide at least some of the affection that had hitherto been denied’. In many ways Wills’ later career aimed to put that simple idea into practice, as he and Stuart:

... dreamed of an institution or home of some kind in the future which would care for such people as we had at the colony, where love should cast out fear and all the ideals and principles we discussed and argued about should be put into operation. (A Sense of Vocation :80)

With this vision he left Wallingford for university, to take a Social Study Diploma at Woodbrooke, a Quaker college linked to the University of Birmingham. Here he encountered a different kind of culture; one frankly more ‘middle-class’, but also one that respected ideas and creativity and was in tune with the values Stuart Payne had championed. Graduating, he applied and won a place at the New York School of Social Work, enabling him later to claim the ‘mild distinction of being the first Englishman to train as a psychiatric social worker’ (A Sense of Vocation: 109). Arriving in New York in 1929, he was exposed to the onset of the Great Depression, an all-new culture, and the challenge of social work in Brooklyn; and to the practical application of the ideas of Sigmund Freud as they were taking hold in the US.

Returning to Britain in 1930, he worked briefly at Lingfield Epileptic Colony with Stuart Payne and at a spin-off from Kingsley Hall for children in the East End of London; then he and his wife and partner Ruth took a joint wardenship of Oxford House in Risca, a small town on the Eastern edge of the South Wales coalfields. Oxford House was a project of the Educational Settlement Association (ESA),
an organisation funded by the Quaker-based Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust, which saw education as fundamental, not simply to economic development, but to the construction of a healthy democratic society (Davies and Freeman 2003). The Welsh valleys were being devastated by gruelling industrial disputes fought by mining communities for better working conditions, with mine-owners cutting costs throughout the economic recession of the 1920s and 30s (Francis 1998). ESA’s work encouraged community action as well as promoting education. They arranged premises and loans so that local people could organise self-help shops and repair services, as well as training and education. The Wills’ work included recreational camping for the community, and drama groups, and the Wills themselves were popular. But some within ESA took the view that the work should be limited to helping the community to be more ‘contented with their lot’ (Wills A Sense of Vocation:138), a view diametrically opposed by David and Ruth, who believed they ought to be ensuring that people acquired the means to convert their discontent into positive action to change the world around them. They began looking beyond Risca.

Through his support for the campaign to abolish capital punishment Wills met the Secretary of the Howard League, Cicely Craven, who encouraged him to write an article for The Friend (the weekly Quaker newsletter) setting out the vision for the institutional intervention into the lives of young men he’d dreamed with Stuart Payne. Marjorie Franklin responded as a member of the Executive Committee of the Howard League, and shared the converging idea that she and others had for an alternative to a Borstal institution (Wills, A Sense of Vocation: 142).

Wills and Franklin were essential components of the Hawkspur picture. But it required a larger committed group, bringing diverse personal histories, widening networks, and professional visions and skills. Wills was invited to meet with the forerunner of the Q Camps Committee, which would go on to establish Hawkspur. Norman Glaister was there.

Norman Glaister (1883-1961)

Norman Glaister, according to Franklin was ‘a man of adventurous and original ideas with special interest in communities’ and she had ‘no doubt at all that but for his unexpected arrival’ at the first meeting of the Psychopathological and Psychotherapeutic Discussion Group, ‘I would never have [...] implemented Q Camps or in what it led to’ (Franklin 1971).

Glaister like Wills had turned towards pacifism through his own experience of the horror of the 1914-18 war, as a doctor in the Royal Army Medical Corps (RAMC). The subsequent tumult of grief
that followed the loss of his wife in 1919 to the flu pandemic spurred his interest in psychiatry.

Wilfred Trotter’s *The Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War* inspired him to look for social solutions that emphasised the benefits of human collectivity (Faithfull 1991), and he became involved in the ‘Order of Woodcraft Chivalry’, a pacifist, pioneering movement inspired by Ernest Seton’s Woodcraft Folk (a movement that emerged in opposition to the militarist and patriotic Baden-Powell Scout movement in 1916 as a ‘pacifist coeducational breakaway’ (Pollen 2019:32)). He involved his young children, and met Dorothy Revel, an Oxford educated, Jungian-influenced progressive educationalist (Revel 1928, Revel 1934), who became his second wife. Through Woodcraft Chivalry – whose philosophy included a more liberal approach to sexuality, distinctions between the sexes being questioned, and a freer attitude to homosexuality - Glaister became Treasurer and ‘chief initiator’ of Grith Fyrd, or Grith Pioneers (‘grith’ being Old English for ‘peace’, ‘fyrd’ for ‘militia’), the organisation from which Hawkspur emerged (Franklin 1966b; Field 2012). Grith Fyrd was a response to the psychosocial impact of mass unemployment during the Great Depression. It was described in a letter to the *British Medical Journal* in May 1933 (co-signed by Glaister as Hon Sec. of Grith Fyrd, along with a range of individuals which included Lascelles Abercrombie, John Macmurray, Laurence Housman, Arnold Rowntree, and Aubrey Westlake as Chairman) as ‘a chain of permanent camps’ aiming to help ‘young men of all classes’ to ‘live a worth-while life’; ‘a community closely resembling that of a university, where young men of varied experience and outlook compare views and work together’. Those with means (from public schools and universities) would pay their own full maintenance, and the purpose of the letter was to raise money to support places for those without such means (Glaister et al 1933). Camping at the time had some associations with what might be called socialist utopianism, emphasising collective endeavour and mutuality (Pollen 2019: 32), but the idea that camps might help shape young people for the broader social good had broader established approval. The Ministry of Labour directly supported around 30 camps across Britain aimed explicitly at making unemployed young men more employable, serving around 200,000 men by 1937.

Franklin was introduced to the Grith Fyrd Council by Glaister (Franklin 1971). Referrals began to come in for ‘men on probation, for whom Grith Pioneers was not equipped’, men with ‘social problems or who were delinquent’, and her Council colleague Guy Keeling asked Franklin to draw up proposals for a camp for such men. Thus the first Memorandum for what became Hawkspur was born (Franklin 1966/1943).

2 As reported by David Wills, 1st June 1939 Minutes of Executive Committee Gainsborough Mansions Queen’s Club Gardens W14 (SA/Q 20 Minutes/Agendas, Norman Glaister Chaising)
Denis Carroll (1901-1956)

On the face of things Carroll was a more conventional figure than the others. Private school was followed by Cambridge University, where he studied natural sciences and maths before turning to medicine, followed by psychiatric training at the Maudsley, and in psychoanalysis. He became an immensely effective post-war influence nationally and internationally in the field of delinquency (Obituary: Denis Carroll (1956); Obituary: Dr. Denis Carroll 1901-1956 (1957)). He was also one of the four ‘leading personalities’ of the ISTD, alongside Edward Glover, Emmanuel Miller and Hermann Mannheim\(^3\) (Shapira 2013). He was Director of the *Psychopathy Clinic* that became renowned for the psychoanalytic understanding of what were to become known as the personality disorders and the relationship of such disorders (or states of mind) with offending behaviour; and which in 1948 became part of the National Health Service as the Portman Clinic. It is here that we see most clearly the link between Franklin’s concern to provide a service to ‘those others’ (Franklin 1971) who were not being served by the contemporary facilities but whose needs were to become prominent in the coming decades.

Within Hawkspur, ‘Denis Carroll was the mainstay of our psychiatric team’. It was ‘through his influence that the ISTD gave special facilities at the clinic to Hawkspur members...’ (Franklin 1968:21-22), assessing and monitoring the young men, and raising the profile and *bona fides* of the project. He then took the Hawkspur experience into the war with him, and as Commanding Officer at Northfield at a critical juncture facilitated the developments of the ‘Experiment’ there (Fees 1997a).

The beginning

\(^3\) Mannheim, credited with founding Criminology as an academic discipline in the UK, was himself a member of the Q Camps Committee (Chorley 1979).
In 1935 Franklin typed up the first draft ‘Memorandum’ for a potential Camp. It was discussed in May at a meeting which included a representative of the Home Office, as well as Wills and others who were to be directly involved. For Franklin this was the launch of the project, but its realisation took another year: ‘[for] collecting funds, for propaganda, for getting to know each other better, for further developing our ideas, and in searching for a suitable site’ (Franklin 1966: 11). To gain more experience Wills took a post as a housemaster at Rochester Borstal (Franklin 1968: 21). A revised Manifesto was drawn up, and ten sites searched before settling on Hawkspur Green near the village of Great Bardfield, in Essex, chosen because it was affordable and ‘not too far from London, not too near a town, sufficiently good soil, and possessing natural springs of fresh water. The scenery was attractive and the neighbours kind . . .’ (Franklin 1966b:11).

David and Ruth Wills left London for Essex on May 9th 1936 in a cruiser car packed with tents, their luggage, and a dog who was a gift from Denis Carroll. Wills’ memories of the place are evocative:

> It is over forty years since that May morning when we first arrived at Hawkspur Green, but never from that day to this have I heard the monotonous chortle of the woodpigeon without a deep feeling of nostalgia. We pitched our tents as far from the road as possible near the copse and the stream, and every morning we were awakened by this sound which continued intermittently until we went to bed at nightfall. It was the accompaniment of all our optimistic hopes in those early days, and although the sound is I suppose intrinsically a melancholy one, when I hear it now I can still experience, beyond the nostalgia, the thrill and excitement of starting at last on the venture for which all my previous life had been the preparation. (A Sense of Vocation: 160)

Four others also arrived: Dan Minton, Wills’ deputy, ‘a tall somewhat willowy young man slightly younger than myself, the product of two very different educational processes – Oxford and Grith Fyrd’; Walter Smith, an older man taken on to look after the cultivation of the land; and two student helpers - Ron Urwin, a product of Grith Fyrd, who would oversee the building work, and ‘Gibson’, the younger brother of George Gibson, with whom Wills had worked in Wales, and who so far as Wills could remember, had ‘no clearly defined function’ (Wills A Sense of Vocation: 160).

According to the surviving Hawkspur case records (for their adventure, see Fees 1997b), the first member arrived on May 20th, less than a fortnight after David and Ruth pitched their tent in the
empty field. There were six by the end of June. In terms fore-echoing Harold Bridger when asked about “The Hospital Club” at Northfield⁴, Wills remembered:

We said, in effect, to the first members “Here we are. We’ve got 26 ½ acres and a few tents, and we’re going to live together. Timber and a skilled carpenter are available if we want to build ourselves more permanent quarters. The ground will grow some of our food if we cultivate it, we can have goats and hens to give us milk and eggs.” And then we anticipated Mr. Morrison’s famous war-time slogan: “Go to it!” (Wills 1967 :25)

Methods

In Franklin’s words the purpose of the Camp was to ‘discover and give scope and encouragement to those assets and talents possessed by the men which make for good citizenship, to stimulate a desire for this and restore self-respect and usefulness’ (Franklin 1971). The emphasis on citizenship reflected political concerns, and the excitement (and perhaps anxiety) about the possibilities for a society that had only fully embraced a democratic system of selecting government via universal suffrage in 1928, less than a decade earlier.

The 1935 Memorandum was short and concise. It included the commitment to work alongside the ISTD, and said the curriculum ‘should include various kinds of open-air work – if possible, elementary farm work, handicrafts, games, drama, music, educational classes, and debates’. The members of the camp (with help of staff) were responsible for the construction of the camp itself, and for the provision of the community’s ‘essential needs and amenities’. There were few operational details, as both Wills and Franklin felt that the scheme would develop organically. Franklin did, however, address the concept of what was to become known as ‘planned environment therapy’ in some detail later (Franklin 1945), and in a ‘Confidential’ letter to the Committee Members in 1941, soon after the original experiment ended, listed what she describes as the seven instruments of treatment at the Camp. The list was not exhaustive, and were not building blocks, but co-essential components of a dynamic system, in which the organisational arrangements were crucial to the therapeutic

⁴ ‘everybody used to come along to me, and say, “when is the club going to start?” And I said, “when you start it”.’ Harold Bridger, ‘War in the Head’, BBC Radio 4. August 17 1994, quoted in Kaur 2008, p. 46.
purposes. For the sake of presentation we divide the instruments into two categories, ‘Therapeutic’ and ‘Organisational’.

### Therapeutic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The instrument</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pioneering (and work)</td>
<td>The whole work and life of Hawkspur was constructed to bring the men in contact with nature and under the influence of the discipline of natural forces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instrument of love</td>
<td>“There was an atmosphere of friendliness and tolerance shown by every member of the staff which diffused itself among the members. There was an absence of authoritarianism and punishment by the staff, restitution was exacted by the members as a whole for damage and community sometimes imposed fines. The Camp Chief had power of expulsion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group approach</td>
<td>Side by side with individual treatment there was cultivation of a vigorous corporate life, group occupation and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual approach</td>
<td>The Camp Chief sought to deal with individual problems from an understanding of the causes, and to discover and cultivate special talents and aptitudes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational

| Shared responsibility between members and staff | The Camp Chief would be a member of the community, consulting with the rest of the staff in staff meeting etc. The Camp Chief, and possibly other members of the resident staff, should be full members of the executive committee together with persons who are not resident or full time. |
| Shared responsibility between staff and committee | There was regular communication between the staff group at the camp, particularly Wills, and the advisory committee.                                                                                                       |
| Participation of co-partners            | Other non-resident staff such as, medical psychologists, should participate by providing psychological, medical and social examination.                                                                           |
We are struck by how clearly the instruments emerge from the interests of the key protagonists.

Wills would have associated himself strongly with the instrument of love and the importance of the individual approach on the one hand, after his experiences at Wallingford, and the importance of self-management and community engagement from his work at Oxford House in South Wales. In the commitment to outdoor and communal existence we can see Glaister. In the selection of individuals for the camp we can see the psychiatric interests of Carroll and Franklin, both heavily involved in bringing the expertise of ISTD to the camp.

Wills balked at what today we would call ‘manualisation’, expressing his impatience with ‘exhaustive enquiries’ into the exact methods used, and questioning how significant it was that Q was ‘a carefully worked out scheme’. Instead:

transcending all method is the question of the spirit and faith (if that is the right word) of those using the methods. If we prepare in the most minute detail a list of every instrument, and a full description of the way it was used; and if that document is then studied in detail for some weeks by a group of intelligent, informed people; and if they are then given the means to start a Q camp and told to run it . . . Would it succeed? I do not think it would unless the persons concerned had a deep “concern” not only for the work and the method, but for the individuals with whom they were working.

He explained, comparing two members of the Q Camps Committee:

I always felt that Cuthbert [Rutter, the Chair] had this sense of concern, but was inclined to doubt its presence in Otto Shaw [founder of Red Hill School]. Cuthbert was primarily a human being who cared for other human beings; Shaw seemed primarily a scientist and educationalist searching for the ‘correct’ or ‘efficient’ way of doing things. Obviously, of course, the right people in this sense will work much more effectively if they have also the ‘right method’. I wonder whether the instruments ought to have some preface to this effect? (Wills to MEF 19/03/42).
Life in the Camp: the dynamic of democracy

The most sustained account of life at Hawkspur is Wills’ *The Hawkspur Experiment* (1967). The “Epitome”, originally published in 1943 and edited by Franklin (1966), has a number of briefer accounts. In the latter, Arthur Barron (1966) describes the building work that took place over the 4-year period, with huts for sleeping, toilet blocks, bathrooms, kitchen, and a reservoir and full drainage system being constructed; and a decorative garden created alongside the more pragmatic vegetable patches. All day-to-day activities were organised in a self-managing manner and carried out by the members of the camp (and staff and volunteers), with the collectively organised Camp Committee being at the community’s organisational heart.

T.C Bodsworth (1966), who joined as Bursar and Quartermaster in June 1937, presents the day’s timetable: It began at 6.30am for the two men taking responsibility for breakfast duty. They woke the rest of the camp at 7.30, for breakfast at 8.00. After eating, there was bedroom tidying followed by a community meeting at 9.00 that included ‘a ten minute sing song’. The various work groups then set about their tasks with a tea-break at 10.45. Lunch at 12.30 was followed by work until 4.30pm, and tea at 5.00pm. Afternoons and evenings might be spent in education or handicrafts, with outdoor activities more likely in summer and indoor activities (the wireless, games and an occasional ‘unofficial fight’) in winter.

The case records indicate that daily life was less regular and orderly than Bodsworth’s timetable suggests; and it was often around the boundaries of engagement with work, and cooperation with others, that a) there was most friction, and b) the most opportunity for therapeutic progress. It was an important point of principle that participation in the activities of the camp was regarded as voluntary, for example, but early in the first year the Camp Committee (made up of members) decided to ‘get tough’ with individuals who were not pulling their weight in terms of work. Camp member D (31.215) was the first to be ‘hauled before’ the Committee, charged with taking little part in camp life. In response he organised a revolt and a vote of no confidence in the Committee itself. ‘These are regarded as very favourable developments in his case’ wrote Wills, ‘as he has hitherto insisted on being quite aloof from camp affairs. The morning after these events he turned out to work with the others, and has been hoeing potatoes.’ Wills (31.21: 3rd monthly report 27/7/37).

---

5 To preserve anonymity members will be referred to by their catalogued case number. For example, D’s is SA/Q/HM/31.21.
The case notes make it clear that - not surprisingly – D’s ongoing progress was not entirely smooth following this “breakthrough”; but as with the Northfield Club (Harris on 2000), it was active and meaningful engagement with the life of the camp which mattered, even if this meant organising a revolt. As Wills himself noted, he subscribed to the philosophy of wanting to ‘make rebels’, by which he meant that he did not want people to be simply ‘agin the government’, but to develop ‘the capacity for personal judgment’, so they were capable of standing aside from the values of the groups around them because:

Criticism is the dynamic of democracy, and if its citizens have lost that capacity, we had much better have a dictatorship, which will at any rate be efficient’. (Wills 1961: 60-61).

Living in the growing presence and shadow of fascism, this concern with authoritarianism was an immediate and realistic one.

Evidence of Wills’ more radical political views, and his tolerance of disagreement as Camp Chief, comes in a chapter of The Hawkspur Experiment devoted to ‘Work and Wages’. In his original philosophy for the camp, work would be part of everyday community life, undertaken as part of the community and for the community and unpaid. The Camp Committee, prompted by concern that too many were not pulling their weight, shifted the Camp towards a wage-assisted system. Although disappointed that the value of work to the community itself was not sufficient motivation, Wills was also aware that the principle of overriding therapeutic importance was that of collective responsibility.

The Individual approach

Franklin included ‘Transference and Identification’ among the important ‘psychic mechanisms’ at work at Hawkspur (Franklin 1943 :21), and despite his professed scepticism of over-theorisation, Wills (1967) devoted an entire chapter of The Hawkspur Experiment to ‘The Transference’. Franklin believed that most camp members had suffered some form of early ‘frustration’ or ‘interference’ in their family relationships, and that the environment at Hawkspur allowed them to transfer their feelings onto members of staff. These were ‘sometimes hostile’ but also might include ‘filial love and respect’.

Wills appears to be thoughtfully putting transference to work in this report:

One night CR (31.17) visited Chief – ‘to express his admiration and affection for the Camp Chief and his despair because the Camp Chief had so much to put up with and ‘liked so many
people’. Wills describes how he allowed CR to believe that he did have a special affection for him (which Wills admitted was true) – but did warn him that it would be better if others did not know this. The next day that Wills had a day off, CR ‘was again hysterical and threatened suicide’. Wills saw him the following day and listened to what he had to say. CR admits that it ‘was because he thought that what had been said to him the day before was insincere and was merely to placate him’. Wills reports that his response was to say ‘that if he ever felt like that during the Camp Chief’s absence he should come down to the Camp Chief’s house for an hour or two, it being understood that this was to be done only as a last resource (sic)’. CR agreed and although Wills then had had several days and a weekend off, CR did not have to fall back on this remedy. (Hawkspur Case notes: Box SA/Q/HM 31.17-31.22)

We do not know how much discussion with Franklin and others may have gone on in the background, and structured Wills’ actions captured in this vignette, but here is what Franklin says a few years later:

‘Not only should the persons in charge understand and accept both transferences and “reality” attachments - it is impossible always to distinguish between them - they should also allow themselves sincerely to respond, though taking care that their reciprocal feelings are kept in hand. Analytical or institutional aloofness is too cold a thing to be suitable in social therapy, which needs warmth and spontaneity. (Franklin 1945:5)

Here Franklin echoes her analyst Ferenczi, who argued that the detached methods of psychoanalysis were not suitable to many people (Ferenczi 1926). She, and her Hawkspur colleagues were, however, significantly developing that point. Here it became the individuals in the organisation itself that could be subject to transferences, and to be aware of their countertransference reactions. This work was happening as they cooperated to build latrines, plant vegetables, organise the cooking rotas, and negotiating the terms of reference of the various in-camp committees. They were experimenting and developing the idea of planned environment therapy. This carried theoretical and therapeutic import: ‘it is in the sphere of the transference, and especially the transition from transference relationships to real object relationships that, . . . we find one of the most important uses of environmental therapy’ (Franklin 1945:6).

The End
The first Hawkspur experiment came to an end with the opening of the Second World War, as referrals of young men dried up and the country diverted resources and men into the war effort. Attempts to repurpose Hawkspur itself foundered, and in January 1941 Q moved its work across country to Bicester, near Oxford, to a grim and sprawling former Workhouse called Mile End House. Here, in a complex and fascinating but ultimately unsustainable arrangement, Wills and the Hawkspur staff, ten of the remaining campers, and up to 50 evacuated children who were considered too difficult to place with families in the surrounding counties were thrown together into a single community. It is an astonishing episode in the history of therapeutic community, overflowing with lessons and insights; but would be entirely forgotten were it not for the fact that Donald Winnicott became involved, and was transformed by it as a theoretician and practitioner (Winnicott 1984; Fees 2010), notably influencing Barbara Dockar-Drysdale and the Mulberry Bush School in turn (Reeves 2002; Price et al. 2018). The Mile End House enterprise came to an end in April 1942. Hawkspur sprang back to life in 1944 as a Camp for [challenging] Boys, and survived long enough to change Chris Beedell’s life, turning his immense skills and influence to therapeutic community and residential child care as a researcher, trainer, educator, and consultant/manager.

Conclusion: descendants of gods

Hawkspur has not yet had its ‘Northfield Treatment’, a la Harrison (2000). In effect it has been crushed by its history and successors, many of which it directly and indirectly influenced. Franklin, the primary theoriser was a woman, Jewish, and “difficult”. Her invisible college of psychiatric and psychoanalytic collaborators were women like Melitta Schmideberg, whose contributions to practice and theory have themselves been buried until recently, or men who aged out or, like Carroll, died prematurely in the post-war period when Maxwell Jones was arising as the “father” of therapeutic community, and the mythology of the Northfield generation was consolidating, such that it would be observed that it was ‘populated by Olympian psychiatrists and psychotherapists. We can treasure this fabled past, and know we are the descendants of gods.’ (Hinshelwood 2000:7). This origin myth was securely fixed in adult psychiatry, and while Wills, the main storyteller of Hawkspur, had the fortune of being male and even got an OBE, he was non-medical and had the misfortune of working with children, whose place in the story is to be marginalised. The diversity of interests highlighted in this paper will be a further factor, as people dispersed, and their origins in Hawkspur diffused in new initiatives.
History is political, and the full reasons will be complex. But something of immense value is lost when we ignore and do not remember the creativity, discoveries, and problem-solving woven into our future by a predecessor. And from Q and Hawkspur even the surface influences are remarkable: Carroll on Northfield; Winnicott on Barbara Dockar-Drysdale and the Mulberry Bush School (Price et al. 2018); Franklin, Wills and Barron on multiple institutions and people, but very significantly in the Planned Environment Therapy Trust, the successor organisation to Q, and the unique therapeutic community archive and research library it created; Chris Beedell, and the generations of therapeutic child care workers he trained at the Advanced Child Care Course he created at Bristol University.

Burrow beneath the surface of the family tree and it becomes more remarkable still. Hawkspur was overtly organised to serve a new client group (‘those others’ in Franklin’s language) and was referenced by David Henderson in 1939, as a potential remedy to problems posed by apparently growing numbers of people who could be described as enduring ‘psychopathic states’ of mind (Henderson 1939). He went onto influence the Mental Health Act of 1959, remarkable amongst other things for its (otherwise puzzling) inclusion of ‘psychopathy’ (Jones 2016) and of course gave his name to the Henderson Hospital, the renowned Democratic Therapeutic Community.
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