

RUNNYMEDE



RESPONSE TO

Strength in Diversity

Towards a Community Cohesion and Race Equality Strategy

16th September 2004

**The Runnymede Trust
Suite 106, London Fruit and Wool Exchange
Brushfield Street
London E1 6EP
www.runnymedetrust.org**

We welcome the opportunity provided by this consultation paper to respond to some of the key issues facing the UK in coming to terms with the multi-ethnicity of its citizens. The questions posed are central to the work of the Runnymede Trust. In our response we have highlighted where our current thinking on each question lies and made reference to fuller explanations in Runnymede Trust literature and forthcoming work about which we would be happy to enter into further discussion.

It goes almost without saying that the bulk of our response will be based on the deliberations of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain. The Commission set out to fulfil a similar task as a strategy on race equality and community cohesion in its remit;

to analyse the current state of multi-ethnic Britain and to propose ways of countering racial discrimination and disadvantage and making Britain a confident and vibrant multicultural society at ease with its rich diversity

Runnymede has worked with the report as the basis for its thinking since its publication, building on its scholarship to stimulate debate and understand new challenges and dilemma. This response will serve to highlight the parts of the report that we believe are of ongoing relevance in setting out a strategy for race equality and community cohesion, and will include references to more recent efforts from Runnymede to contribute to a vision of a more successful multi-ethnic society. A summary of the vision set out in the report forms Appendix I.

The main strength of *Strength in Diversity* is to relate a coherent vision of society to policy issues which impact on race equality and community cohesion. This approach is welcome and a sign of the government's increasing maturity and expertise in engaging with these issues. We hope that the strategy that evolves from this paper maintains a distinctive vision and enables positive change in our society.

Encouraging debate

We share the minister's wish for 'honest and robust' debate on issues of 'race', racism and community cohesion. We appreciate, from experience, what difficult and emotive topics 'race' and community cohesion are. This paper is an important contribution to setting out a vision for the government's approach. We would be interested in finding out how more people can be engaged in discussion of the crucial questions that it poses.

A non-conventional consultation may require a less conventional approach to encouraging engagement with it. Further, the next stage of the process must move to some concrete commitments so that participants can gauge the benefits of their involvement. One way to do this may be to encourage debate on the wording of a formal declaration about the kind of multi-ethnic society we want to achieve, similar to that adopted in Canada (see Appendix II for the approach suggested in the report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain), for inclusion in citizenship ceremonies and in literature reminding citizens of their rights and responsibilities.

Recognising international obligations and opportunities

The European Union, alongside the Council of Europe, plays an increasingly important role in the shaping of domestic policy around race equality. The adoption of the Race and Employment Directives and the incorporation of the European Convention on Human Rights into UK law through the Human Rights Act are both good examples of the added value brought by European institutions to British equality legislation. Many European member states face

similar challenges to those experienced in the UK and highlighted in *Strength in Diversity*, in particular in relation to the exclusion or segregation of ethnic minorities and the rise of political extremism. Responses to these problems are therefore more and more to be found in cooperation with our European neighbours, through exchange of practices and further harmonised standards and laws. We would therefore hope that any race equality and community cohesion strategy places itself firmly within a European context and embraces the positive impact that European policy can bring to the eradication of racism.

The UN World Conference Against Racism (WCAR), held in Durban in 2001 reflected the importance of discussing racism and ways to combat it globally. The Durban conference, and the European preparatory conference that preceded it in Strasbourg in October 2000 produced a number of valuable conclusions and recommendations that we would like to see translated to the domestic agenda on race equality. One of the clear outcomes of the WCAR was the commitment by national governments to implement the WCAR recommendations through a National Action Plan Against Racism (NAPAR). We are concerned that no mention is made of the NAPAR and of Durban in *Strength in Diversity*. Whilst we appreciate that there is overlap between a NAPAR and the current Strategy, and that developing a NAPAR would lead to unnecessary duplication of work, we would welcome clarification on the relationship between the two.

How can we ensure that people feel a sense of pride in being British – without feeling that they have to leave other traditions behind? How can we ensure that pride in being British is combined with respect for other people's identities? What role can shared values play in this?

The creation of a sense of pride in being British is not a simple task and it is difficult to know how to 'ensure' what is essentially an emotion, or indeed what the proper role is for government in so doing. The emphasis in the question on 'pride in being British' might be misleading. Especially given the desire to address the need for community building within a nation on micro- and macro- levels, whilst avoiding the negative outcomes of patriotism (i.e. over-emphasis on territorialism, exclusive of other loyalties, stifling of criticism). Instead, a focus on how to build a sense of common belonging in Britain might help to avoid the ease with which debates about patriotism descend into accusations of in- and out-groups, treachery and disloyalty.

A sense of common belonging,

. . . is tied to a community of men and women, not to the territory. It involves fellow-feeling and mutual concern, not glorification of a nation that is supposed to transcend them all. . . it represents a quiet loyalty and commitment to one's fellow members and a willingness to fight against injustices, not an exuberant, unconditional and blind love (Bhikhu Parekh)

Creation of a sense of common belonging cannot be guaranteed by policy, however, certain things can be done to **facilitate** its development.

- Firstly, a strong democratic structure in which all voices can be heard and in which debate and disagreement are resolved in a just manner. This must operate at local regional, national and international levels. Efforts to undertake civil renewal are

important in this and we welcome government's approach to this agenda. Meaningful participation from all communities at the most appropriate level of decision-making is crucial, from parliamentarians and policymakers to school governors and CDRP members.

- Secondly, building a pluralistic human rights culture as the basis of shared values in our society. (See report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain, Chapter 7). The passing of the Human Rights Act was a significant landmark for which the government should be applauded. Moving to ensure that the Act is properly understood and respected is now a key task. Human Rights are the necessary basis of the moral community of a democracy.
- Thirdly, ensuring equal citizenship in which every member of the community feels equally valued and enjoys the same rights and opportunities. Tackling institutional racism, combating inequalities in health, housing, access to employment, inequalities in education, and discrimination in the criminal justice system, as well as combating racist and other hate crime, are all part of building the sense of common belonging.

A Single Equality Act would help to make sense of the importance this government attaches to equality and help all communities (especially those who have historically been marginalised) to receive support in challenging inequity. It would also be recognition that the principle of equality is indivisible, promote solidarity between those who are discriminated against and respond to existing inconsistencies between statutes. (For further discussion see Runnymede Bulletin no. 338 and our response to the recent DTI consultation - www.runnymedetrust.org/about/policyResponses.html)

In an emphasis on common belonging, the identities of all are respected since belonging is itself predicated on mutuality, rather than on a potentially exclusive notion of heritage or nation. Without respect for others' identities, there is unlikely to be any fellow feeling. Such a lack of respect militates against common belonging. Building understanding about the diversity of identities in Britain (including, but not limited to, ethnic and religious identities) is a key part of facilitating respect. Creating opportunities for improving understanding has been crucial to the success of many community cohesion initiatives. Bringing communities together to foster understanding and hopefully respect is vital as a contribution to building a sense of common belonging. (For further discussion of common belonging see extract from Bhikhu Parekh Appendix III)

Shared values emerge from the democratic dialogue and will be weaker or stronger in relation to the strength of that dialogue. The values can be typified as procedural and substantive. After deliberation, the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain noted (p.54);

Procedural values are those that maintain the basic preconditions for democratic dialogue. They include people's willingness to give reasons for their views, readiness to be influenced by better arguments than their own, tolerance, mutual respect, aspiration to peaceful resolution of differences, and willingness to abide by collectively binding decisions that have been reached by agreed procedures.

Substantive values are those that underpin any defensible conception of the good life. They include people's freedom to plan their own lives, the equal moral worth of all human beings, and equal opportunities to lead fulfilling lives and to contribute to collective wellbeing. Such values are not arbitrary and are not those of any one community or society. They are embodied in international human rights standards and

form part of moral dialogue in all parts of the world. On the basis of such values it is legitimate to ban female circumcision, forced marriages, cruel punishment of children, and repressive and unequal treatment of women, even though these practices may enjoy cultural authority in certain communities.

Procedural and substantive values such as those outlined above are society's moral capital, and form the basis of what all people are entitled to demand of themselves and each other. Subject to the constraints of these values, different individuals and communities should be free to lead their self-chosen life.

Shared values are key in building a common sense of belonging in Britain. They are values pursued, reinforced, and shared by promoting and ensuring human rights, maintaining and strengthening democracy, and enabling and facilitating understanding and mutual respect between individuals and communities.

Relevant Runnymede Trust publications:

Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report (2000)
Cohesion, Community and Citizenship (2002)
Civil Renewal, Diversity and Social Capital in a Multi-Ethnic Britain (2004)
Social Capital, Civil Renewal and Diversity: Conference Proceedings (2004 forthcoming)
This is Where I Live; young people, heritage and belonging (2005 forthcoming)

In what ways can we promote British citizenship for all, particularly among young people?

If, as noted above, the key to creating a sense of common belonging is through improving the democratic dialogue, building a pluralistic human rights culture and ensuring every member of the community feels equally valued, then promotion of an inclusive concept of British citizenship requires a similar approach.

Alongside ongoing efforts to ensure that British citizenship confers and assures protection from violation of human rights, and equal life chances, serious consideration should be given to providing opportunities to celebrate and confirm the rights and responsibilities of citizens. We welcome the government's decision to institute citizenship ceremonies and look forward to their ongoing development in a manner that can involve more members of the community in welcoming new citizens (see Runnymede Bulletin 335). We appreciate the vision set out in *'Life in the UK'* to develop a syllabus that gives potential new citizens the opportunity to learn more about the rights and obligations of a British citizen. However, the government could be more ambitious in its aim to help all citizens recognise these rights and obligations. British citizens receive the right to vote at eighteen without any recognition of this watershed. The entrance to the electoral register should be a moment to celebrate, and an opportunity to reinforce the importance attached to full citizenship. The government could use this opportunity to engage with young citizens, encourage them to participate as full citizens, and remind them of the multi-ethnic nature of British society, through its formal declaration (see above).

Consideration should be given to other means of creating opportunities for recognition of the importance of citizenship, for example through public holidays. National days can be celebrated

in a manner that promotes an inclusive conception of citizenship and belonging. A public holiday to mark the contribution of citizens could be a great opportunity to build a sense of common belonging. National days of this type are common in other countries including Canada, Australia, US and France.

While young people are an important audience for learning about citizenship, it is also important to seek opportunities for older people to engage with this agenda. The syllabus developed to support potential new citizens is capable of forming the basis for a wider group of people to engage with the key concepts of British citizenship – through adult education, literacy classes, parenting classes, prison education etc. The government should support the development of citizenship learning through curricula beyond the formal classroom.

The introduction of a citizenship component to the National Curriculum in England and Wales is welcome. Our efforts in promoting a curriculum that better recognises the ethnic diversity of British society have been facilitated by teachers having the opportunity to develop a stronger focus on citizenship. Research could be usefully undertaken to discover how effective citizenship teaching is in combating racist attitudes and promoting community cohesion.

Involving young people in debate about citizenship and giving them opportunities to engage in active citizenship are commendable approaches. We are pleased to note that citizenship forms a core part of the recommendations of the Working Group on 14-19 Qualification Reform. Our current project 'This is Where I Live' shows the potential benefits of engaging young people in this debate for better insights into policy.

Relevant Runnymede Trust literature:

Developing Community Cohesion (2002)

Complementing Teachers (2003)

Real Histories Directory (www.realhistories.org.uk launched April 2004)

This is Where I Live; young people, heritage and belonging (2005 forthcoming)

How can we ensure that all communities see racism, racial and religious harassment and hate crime as unacceptable and are able to act to drive them out?

A great deal has already been done to challenge racist views in the UK. It is now generally unacceptable in the workplace or other public settings to use racist language or discriminate overtly on the basis of race or ethnicity. This is a major achievement of successive governments, a wide range of activists, organisations and individuals who have advocated for anti-racism. Institutional racism and racisms in the overt forms of harassment and hate crime do persist, however, alongside more covert indirect discrimination. Being a victim of crime is always distressing, racist crimes are especially grave since they undermine victims' humanity, disabling any sense of common belonging, denying equal citizenship and mutual respect.

From our research it has become evident that whilst there is a major emphasis on work with people already convicted of racist violence and a similar level of work with victims, there has been little written on work done to challenge the attitudes of potential perpetrators of violence. In our recently published Working Paper '*Preventing Racist Violence: Interim Findings*' we

suggested that despite some *de facto* mainstreaming, a more strategic approach from government would be useful in extending work with potential perpetrators of racist violence.

Whilst this *de facto* mainstreaming is welcome, it does not satisfy the need for a formal strategy and structure to promote preventative work. This would be beneficial in a variety of ways.

- It would send a clear signal, coming from central governmental level, that preventing racist violence is a priority and needs to be tackled in a holistic, cross-departmental way.
- It would devise clearly defined strategies that would provide the space to look in particular at potential perpetrators of racist violence, an area which, as illustrated in our research so far, needs to be developed more explicitly, given better support and delivered more effectively.
- It would help make the links between the wide range of sectors that carry out this type of work. The various types of intervention that play a role in preventing racist violence are located in a range of sectors, and guidance is needed in order to link their work. Although some cases of effective partnerships have been identified, this needs to happen more systematically.
- It would allow for further mainstreaming of work with potential perpetrators to challenge their attitudes; but this mainstreaming would form part of a strategy developed at central level, rather than happening in a *de facto* unstructured way.
- Finally, a central structure, supported by a well-formulated strategy would clarify how responsibility can flow from central government level through to the local level in delivering projects to tackle racist violence by working with potential perpetrators.

A clear strategy for primary and secondary prevention initiatives, building on and enhancing existing work, would go some way to reducing racist violence, especially when targeting interventions in areas at higher risk of racialised tensions.

Further, a Single Equality Act would give some support to the understanding that equality is indivisible and that all are protected from unjustifiable discrimination. Such clarity would be of benefit to those enforcing criminal law with regard to incitement and racist and religious violence.

Relevant Runnymede publications:

Perpetrators of Racist Violence (2001)
Preventing Racist Violence: Interim Findings (2004)
Preventing Racist Violence (2004 forthcoming)

How can we most effectively respond to the threat from political and other forms of extremism, including understanding and tackling its causes?

It is commendable that the paper attempts to tackle political disengagement, however the yoking together of race equality and 'political and other forms of extremism' may lead to some confusion of the intended message of the strategy. The problem of anti-social extremism is

real. The racialisation of it is unhelpful. It could be read as a carrot and stick approach, i.e. race equality and community cohesion are offered in exchange for an end to extremism. Community cohesion becomes not an aim in and of itself, but a means to legitimate censure of certain communities, for not doing enough to 'integrate'.

Race equality and community cohesion are fundamental bedrocks of a civilised multi-ethnic society. The existence of anti-social extremists is a challenge to any society but should not be too closely linked with the pursuit of equality and cohesion. Given the difficult nature of this debate, it would have been useful if the paper had explained more precisely what forms of extremism the government is concerned with. It is possible to hold extreme views but also be committed to democracy and human rights. The kind of extremism that is so problematic for any society is that which rejects the procedural and substantive values mentioned above which form the core of the common values and the basis for a sense of common belonging.

The approach to tackling anti-social extremism is to reiterate the shared values entailed in British citizenship and empower citizens to own these values, ensure equality of opportunity, and enable people to develop respect for identities other than their own. This balance between cohesion, equality and diversity, is key in developing a focused response to the problem of anti-social extremism. By attacking certain already marginalised groups, the feeling of victimisation can be exacerbated leading to more negative responses, and a downward spiral leading to extremism.

Relevant Runnymede publications:

Islamophobia (1997)

Cohesion, Community and Citizenship (2002)

This is Where I Live; young people, heritage and belonging (2005 forthcoming)

How can we build on the progress that has been made and ensure that the duty on public bodies to promote good race relations makes a real difference in the way that public bodies deliver race equality and community cohesion?

As noted above, the government cannot deliver community cohesion; it can only expend its efforts in such a way as to **create the right conditions for it to flourish**. An essential means of creating these conditions is through ensuring race equality. Government departments must lead by example, ensuring their own practices are in line with the letter and spirit of the Race Relations (Amendment) Act.

A well-resourced and competent equality body will need to adopt greater efforts to ensure that race equality is observed across the different public services. The CRE's framework for inspectorates is a very good start but the need for inspectorates to significantly change their focus to speak more to the public and by implication to minority ethnic communities, rather than just to the public services, has never been more important. Inspectorates will also need to reach out to communities beyond those they have been used to and the voluntary and community sectors have to begin to see inspectorates as their champions of race equality.

In order for this to be an effective relationship, many organisations in the voluntary and community sector will need support and capacity building in order to engage in effective

partnership. Inspectorates are public bodies as well and cannot be immune from the onus on public bodies to consult better, monitor more effectively and engage with minority ethnic communities. See Appendix IV for further discussion of this issue from our publication 'Guardians of Race Equality', the extract chosen highlights the changes that will be necessary for inspectorates and regulatory bodies to make the Race Relations (Amendment) Act more effective.

Relevant Runnymede publications:

Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report (2000)
Guardians of Race Equality (2003)
Realising the Vision (2004)

How can we more effectively target policies to tackle the specific disadvantages experienced by different sections of the population, within a strategy that delivers equality for all?

We welcome the work that has been done to respond to economic disadvantage. Efforts to tackle child poverty and to rejuvenate neighbourhoods blighted by unemployment, crime, and low expectation all have an important part to play in delivering racial equality as people from certain minority ethnic groups are more likely to be poor and socially excluded. A crucial part of building a more cohesive society is to work to reduce economic inequalities (see Appendix I and Chapter 6, Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain) without which most of the other measures will only have limited impact.

An effective means of better understanding and responding to specific needs of communities is to involve them more fully in decision-making processes and delivery of the necessary services. Some progress has been made along these lines and a sensitive and effective approach to civil renewal should enable further positive change. It is worth remembering however, that the BME community and voluntary sector does not necessarily start from a similar position to the rest of the voluntary sector and will need longer-term support in developing capacity in order to thrive. Our 1999 research on '*The Information Needs of London's Voluntary Sector: Ethnic Minority Issues*' raised some of the capacity building issues that existed. Advances in technology present new opportunities to ensure that many more groups and organisations can have meaningful access to resources to support their development and the pursuance of their charitable aims.

More effective targeting of policies requires more effective monitoring of need. The Race Relations (Amendment) Act has been a key driver in extending the collection and use of ethnic monitoring data. Organisations need greater support in making monitoring more effective, comparable, and yet relevant to their immediate environment. The ethnic categories included in Census 2001 were a great improvement, especially in the inclusion of categories for people with mixed ethnic heritages. However, whilst maintaining the need for comparability, they need to be constantly revised, as identities remain fluid. This is even more important in the light of immigration in larger numbers from countries that have had little (or interrupted) previous tradition of emigration to the UK. Local dynamics can be completely masked by slavishly adhering to Census 2001 categories and subsequently services can miss their mark. For example, Gypsy/Traveller, Latin American, Cypriot, Turkish, Lebanese, and Balkan

communities are all subsumed into the White category, yet their experiences, needs, and uses of services are likely to be very different. Public services need to be able to cope better with the diversity of the communities they serve and be more confident in making decisions about the appropriate level of monitoring and data collection in order to improve service delivery (see p.292 of the Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain for further discussion).

Relevant Runnymede publications:

Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report (2000)
The Information Needs of London's Voluntary Sector: Ethnic Minority Issues (1999)

What more should be done to embed race equality in the delivery of public services?

The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 is a significant and very welcome piece of legislation. The Act needs to be implemented fully by public services at every level. In the report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain, we detailed over 130 recommendations for various improvements in public services. Our April 2004 briefing paper 'Realising the Vision' noted the considerable movement in the public services to respond to many of the issues raised.

Despite the significant progress, there is not space in this document to list the many specific areas that need attention. The pursuit of race equality is unlikely to be achieved so easily and we should remain vigilant and open to significant changes in order to ensure no group suffers from unjustifiable discrimination.

The proposed changes to the Commission for Racial Equality must not put the progress made in jeopardy, indeed it must enable its successor body to be even more effective in making the Race Relations Act and its amendment work, through test cases, investigations, research and promotion. Our response to the DTI consultation 'Fairness for All' sets out our position on the kind of body that will be necessary to ensure race equality remains at the forefront of efforts in the public services (see the Runnymede Trust website; www.runnymedetrust.org/about/policyResponses.html)

Relevant Runnymede publications:

Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report (2000)
Realising the Vision (2004)

What further actions can we take that will ensure public sector workforces are representative of the communities they serve?

We agree that employment in the public services is crucial, not simply because of a 'business case' for diversity that argues that ethnic diversity is uncomplicatedly related to more effective service delivery, but also because the public services have been a route to empowerment for many people from Black and minority ethnic communities, and because public services are the

'windows' of the state; failure to tackle inequalities within them is a reflection of a failure of the state.

While a majority of public authorities now comply with their duty to monitor their workforce and certain workplace decisions, it is not clear that sufficient use is made of the results of monitoring in terms of modifying policies or practices. We welcome the commitment of government in setting targets and applaud its success where these have been achieved. We hope that the challenge of reducing the size of the civil service workforce, and reducing concentrations in London and the Southeast, will not lead to new inequalities. Target-setting and outreach work aimed at underrepresented groups is, in the short and medium-term, the most effective route to recruitment. At the same time, urgent attention must be given to the unequal outcomes of the education system in order to open up the whole range of employment opportunities to all.

Progression within the public services once recruited remains a more difficult nut to crack. We are working with the General Teaching Council for England to help facilitate opportunities for teachers from Black and minority ethnic communities to recount their experiences, network, and contribute to a better understanding of the reasons why teachers from certain ethnic backgrounds are less likely to progress into school management. Our work with FTSE 100 companies showed that these problems are not limited to the public sector.

Relevant Runnymede publications:

Improving Practice: A whole-school approach to raising the achievement of African Caribbean youth. (1998)

Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report (2000)

Moving on Up Racial Equality and the Corporate Agenda: a study of FTSE 100 companies (2000)

Widening the Talent Pool (2002)

Divided by the same Language (2003)

How should we work with the private sector to promote race equality?

The Race Relations (Amendment) Act enables some leverage over the private sector – particularly in terms of procurement. If properly implemented the duty to promote race equality could be extended to a far larger part of the economy. In order for this to be effectively facilitated, guidance and support should be given to those responsible for procurement in public services – from the Ministry of Defence to hospital manager and headteacher – to empower them to use the RR(A)A to its full effect. The knock-on effects could lead to fulfilment of the public duty to promote race equality in business-to-business relationships right along the supply chain.

Through introducing a Single Equality Act, the government could bring some clarity to existing legislation and provide protection beyond employment for religious identities. This would enable a more diverse range of identities to be respected in the workplace.

In encouraging the corporate social responsibility of the private sector, race equality should be high on the agenda. Through volunteering, and mentoring, as well as financial support, industry could play a larger role in supporting the delivery of this agenda.

Employment in certain parts of the private sector continues to reflect and sustain inequalities. In May 1999 the Better Regulation Task Force concluded that non-regulatory means were adequate to promote and achieve race equality in the private sector and recommended that five years was sufficient time to demonstrate this. Five years later, in July 2004, the IPPR Race Equality in the Private Sector Task Force came to the same conclusion, again recommending five (more) years to demonstrate this. The government must be prepared to keep this situation under review and if necessary move to legislate to ensure that equal opportunities are being respected across the private sector.

Relevant Runnymede publications:

Moving on Up: Racial Equality and the Corporate Agenda: a study of FTSE 100 companies (2000)

Widening the Talent Pool (2002)

Divided by the same Language (2003)

Guardians of Race Equality (2003)

What more can we do to build relationships and understanding between people from different backgrounds?

The responses above have suggested some ways in which building relationships and understanding between members of different ethnic communities is vital to developing community cohesion. A significant corollary of engaging people with government and democracy is that relationships and networks are built that focus on common goals. Efforts to engender civil renewal and to use the concept of bridging social capital to measure success may produce positive results. An over-riding principle has to be to create spaces for meaningful dialogue between communities. Not only between white and non-white communities but also between different minority ethnic communities. Creating the space for understanding will hopefully lead to mutual respect and ultimately a sense of common belonging. Understanding the dynamics of such change presents a real challenge and one into which some sensitive research could be fruitfully undertaken.

The media play a significant role in amplifying perspectives that endanger both race equality and community cohesion. The circulation of misinformation should be challenged by authoritative sources. Ensuring that truthful information about groups vulnerable to racism is delivered through the media is especially important given the lack of access that such groups often have to setting media agenda, and the threat that this poses to developing a sense of belonging. Government can and should play a leading role in this.

All organisations can have a role in the enterprise of creating relationships built on shared values and common goals, and a common sense of belonging. Faith groups are an important location but there are other places where people meet and can engage, including workplaces, hospitals and health clinics, schools, sports clubs, the local media, and cultural and artistic

centres. Our conference report, *Developing Community Cohesion* gave some examples of how all of these institutions can contribute.

Runnymede also has a role to play in enabling community cohesion. Our contribution extends beyond policy to include a project (This is Where I Live) that has helped to illuminate young people's conceptions of heritage, identity and belonging through art, drama, photography and music. The results are currently being developed into an interactive resource that can be shared and form a tool for schools and youth workers to use to promote better understanding between communities. 'This is Where I Live' will stand alongside our Real Histories Directory (www.realhistories.org.uk), and 'Complementing Teachers' to enable all communities to better understand each other and have access to resources in order to create and support dialogue.

We look forward to hearing more about the results of the Community Cohesion Pathfinder Projects and hope to be able to engage in understanding better how their work can be transferred and mainstreamed to reflect the core importance of such efforts.

Relevant Runnymede publications:

Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report (2000)
Cohesion, Community and Citizenship (2002)
Developing Community Cohesion (2002)
Realising the Vision (2004)
Civil Renewal, Diversity and Social Capital in a Multi-Ethnic Britain (2004)
Social Capital, Civil Renewal and Diversity: Conference Proceedings (2004 forthcoming)
This is Where I Live; young people, heritage and belonging (2005 forthcoming)

How can we ensure that we have an open debate around how to properly manage migration and prevent abuse of asylum which doesn't fuel prejudice against Black and minority ethnic communities?

The debate about migration is an important one which goes to the core of people's understandings about nation, society and our relationships with each other; it is hardly surprising that immigration has been a significant and contentious political topic for the entire post-war period. Immigration and 'race' have been entangled throughout modern British political discourse. Since the 1966 election campaign in which the Conservative Party campaigned using the motto 'Firm but fair immigration control is the key to good race relations', it has been very difficult to disentangle the two issues. Indeed in 1997, the Labour manifesto echoed these earlier sentiments, entitling its proposed immigration policy 'Firm, Fairer and Faster'. The premise on which this 'entanglement' is based is flawed. There is no logical or natural link between immigration and race relations. The political discourse on immigration has become racialised in a large part due to the legacy of Enoch Powell. The government are therefore tasked with building a new consensus that separates 'race' from immigration.

The government has made attempts to develop such a new consensus. But these attempts have involved a number of political decisions which sit uneasily together, e.g. a greater concern with and expressed solidarity for the plight of Africa on the basis of our shared humanity, coupled with pride in reducing the number of people seeking asylum from Africa regardless of

events in Sudan, Somalia, Sierra Leone, Zimbabwe etc. By attempting to walk this tightrope the government is in danger of pleasing nobody.

Leadership is required from government in this matter: as recognition of international loyalties and obligations, as a defining issue for the vision of society the government is working towards, and in order to set the parameters of the debate. Unpopular though this approach might make the government, it is a nettle worth grasping in order to create a lasting consensus that values human rights, and recognises the contribution of immigration to the success of British society. It would be worthwhile to consider instituting an independent commission on immigration, asylum and nationality to provide a focus for approaching a new consensus and also to remove the issue from the narrower focus of the electoral concerns of political parties.

Unhelpful statements by government to justify increasingly harsh measures for asylum seekers, continue to fuel media comment that undermines attempts to build the conditions for community cohesion. The media have a significant role to play in the debate and have often been responsible for inappropriate accusations against asylum seekers and heightening tensions towards newcomers to our society. The impact of negative media coverage is counter-productive to community cohesion and also often to race equality. A sensitive response to media editors that maintains the democratic right to criticise and upholds freedom of speech, while ensuring racial tensions are not inflamed, needs to be developed.

What more should we be doing to support integration of new arrivals – and to involve existing citizens in this as a two way process?

We welcome the government's development of a new strategy for the integration of refugees and look forward to the positive changes that it may bring. The involvement of existing citizens in integration of all new arrivals is equally important. We have noted above a number of ways in which the understanding and practice of citizenship can be extended to larger numbers of people in Britain. This approach will make it easier to include newcomers within the learning and debate.

We hope that Basic English language training can be extended free of charge to everyone who requires it in England. We have some concerns about the ways in which the proposed citizenship tests will be administered and look forward to some clarification on these issues from the Home Office.

It may be interesting to learn from the model employed in France to welcome new citizens to towns, *Accueil des Villes Françaises* (AVF). With modification, it could be a visionary model that engages current citizens in getting to know those new to towns and offers a means of developing 'neighbourliness' and establishing contacts. The need for such a welcome is real for immigrants, but also for current citizens moving between UK towns and cities. Such a scheme could be a practical way of making real the government's commitment to civil renewal and the building of bridging social capital.

How can we ensure that, in the true spirit of civil renewal, public service reforms consistently build cohesion and foster understanding between people from different cultures?

We have highlighted the potential of the civil renewal agenda to build cohesion, foster understanding, and promote racial equality throughout this response. Runnymede is in the process of carrying out more detailed work on the ways in which this potential can be made real. With the support of the Active Citizenship Centre we will be hosting a major conference to work with practitioners to understand how civil renewal can be more closely linked to race equality and community cohesion. We are also working to delineate more precisely how social capital can be used as a construct to better understand the dynamics of social networks and be used to inform policy, taking into account the challenges posed by ethnic diversity. The results of this work will be shared with government in an ongoing, constructive debate.

Relevant Runnymede Trust publications:

Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report (2000)
Cohesion, Community and Citizenship (2002)
Civil Renewal, Diversity and Social Capital in a Multi-Ethnic Britain (2004)
Social Capital, Civil Renewal and Diversity: Conference Proceedings (2004 forthcoming)
This is Where I Live; young people, heritage and belonging (2005 forthcoming)

Appendix I

The Turning Point – six tasks in the years ahead

Taken from the Summary of the report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain 'Community of Citizens and Communities' published October 2000

England, Scotland and Wales are at a turning point in their history. They could become narrow and inward-looking, with rifts and divisions between themselves and amongst their regions and communities. Or Britain could develop as an outward-looking community, at ease with its internal diversities. To do so, it needs to engage in six overarching tasks in the years ahead. The tasks affect everyone, and every community, organisation, institution and neighbourhood. They are as follows:

- To rethink the national story and national identity
- To recognise that all communities are changing
- To hold a balance between cohesion, difference and equality
- To address and remove all forms of racism
- To reduce economic inequalities
- To build a pluralist human rights culture

Rethinking the national story and national identity

'Nations and peoples,' writes the novelist Ben Okri, 'are largely the stories they feed themselves. If they tell themselves stories that are lies, they will suffer the future consequences of those lies. If they tell themselves stories that face their own truths, they will free their histories for future flowerings.'

Many of the currently dominant stories in Britain need to be re-thought, for they omit large sections of the population. Britain is a recent creation, not ancient, and colonialism and empire were integral to its making. Therefore virtually all current citizens are part of a single story – though their ancestors, of course, engaged with it in a range of different ways. The *Windrush* did not dock in 1948 in a culturally homogeneous country, nor in a foreign country. The journey was an internal one, from one part of a single system to another. Nor did the *Windrush* dock in a country that was politically and ideologically united. On the contrary, it came to a land riven by debates and disputes which pre-dated its arrival by many decades. Similarly Africans, Bangladeshis, Indians, Irish, Pakistanis and many others came to a country that was already culturally and ideologically diverse, with a range of different self-understandings and stories. People in Britain have many differences. But they inhabit the same space and share the same future. All have a role in the collective project of fashioning Britain as an outward-looking, generous, inclusive society – a community of communities and citizens.

Identities and communities in transition

Stories are true or false not only about the past but also about the present. The customary mental picture of Britain as a 95/5 society – where 95 per cent are thought to belong to one vast majority since they are white and five per cent to various minorities since they are not – is not an accurate one. Homogeneity in the so-called majority is a myth, not a true story. So is the idea that 'minorities' have more in common with each other than they do with people in the so-called majority. All communities are changing and all are complex, with internal diversity and

disagreements. Neither 'minority' communities nor 'majority' communities are static. They change in response to their own internal dynamics and also as a result of the interactions which they have with each other.

Cohesion, equality and difference

The present government has stated that it is committed 'to creating One Nation', a country where 'every colour is a good colour ... every member of every part of society is able to fulfil their potential ... racism is unacceptable and counteracted ... everyone is treated according to their needs and rights ... everyone recognises their responsibilities ... racial diversity is celebrated'. Such a statement invites several searching questions. What values and loyalties must be shared by communities and individuals in One Nation? How should disputes and incompatible values between different communities be handled? How is a balance to be struck between the need to treat people equally, the need to treat people differently, and the need to maintain shared values and social cohesion?

The fundamental need is to treat people equally *and* to treat them with due respect for difference; to treasure the rights and freedoms of individuals *and* to cherish belonging, cohesion and solidarity. Neither equality nor respect for difference is a sufficient value on its own. They must be held together, mutually challenging and supportive. Similarly, neither personal liberty nor social cohesion is sufficient on its own. They too must be held together, qualifying and challenging each other, yet also mutually informing and enriching.

Dealing with racisms

In other European Union countries it is customary to use the phrase 'racism, xenophobia and antisemitism' as a way of summarising the issues to be addressed. The phrase is cumbersome and is unlikely to be widely used in Britain. It is, however, helpful, for it stresses that hostility which uses skin colour and physical appearance as markers of supposed difference does not represent the whole picture. There is also hostility using markers connected with culture, language and religion. The plural term 'racisms' is sometimes used to highlight such complexity. There are always two strands, physical and cultural, but these intertwine in different ways at different times, and in different places.

Racisms exist in all countries and cultures. In Britain, anti-Black racism is different, in its history, dynamics and effects, from anti-Asian racism. Both are different from anti-Irish racism (a form of racism which has played a significant role in the formation of Britain over the centuries), antisemitism and anti-Gypsy racism. In recent years there has been a resurgence of anti-Muslim racism, also often known as Islamophobia. Distinctions must be drawn between the racism of individuals and the racism of institutions, and between institutional racism and violent racism. All kinds of racism must be addressed. Also anti-racism, therefore, must have a range of priorities and strategies.

Reducing economic inequalities

In Britain more than in most other European countries there has been a rise over the last 20 years in material inequality – a higher proportion of people have lower than average incomes, are affected by poor housing and by lack of amenities and facilities, and suffer from poor health. The problems are compounded by lack of political influence. Within this overall picture, African-Caribbean, Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities are disproportionately affected.

In absolute figures, as distinct from proportions, far more white people are affected by inequality than others. For this reason as for others, efforts to reduce inequality must be concerned with the whole population, not with some communities only. They must not, however, be colour-blind or culture-blind, or blind to the racist violence and harassment which occur primarily in areas of social deprivation.

Three main approaches to combating social exclusion and inequality must be combined: (a) improving physical infrastructure (b) using welfare-based measures and (c) pursuing labour market strategies to improve underlying economic potential and performance. A single-pronged attack will not work. All measures to combat social exclusion must take into account the fact that different communities are affected by inequality in different ways – colour-blind and culture-blind approaches do not and will not work.

A pluralist human rights culture

Racial justice is a quintessential human rights issue. The new Human Rights Act has great potential for bringing about a cultural shift, and for providing new grounds on which the victims of racism can challenge the infringement of their rights. Human rights principles provide an ethical code for how individuals should treat each other, and the ground rules for negotiating conflicting rights in a multi-cultural society. They must accordingly be centre-stage in all discussions and negotiations in multi-ethnic Britain, not left to lawyers and the courts. They are a language everyone must learn to speak and use.

The language of human rights does not belong to any particular group, creed or culture, but on the contrary is universal. However, it is essential to recognise the rights that people have as members of religious, cultural and linguistic groups – for example the right to express cultural identity, and to transmit language and culture to the next generation. Human rights must be interpreted and applied in a culturally sensitive manner, and may sometimes entail different responses in different individual cases, depending on community background.

Appendix II

Example of a Declaration on Cultural Diversity – closely based on the Canadian Multiculturalism Act

IT IS HEREBY DECLARED TO BE THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM TO:

- Recognise the freedom of all members of society to preserve, enhance and share their cultural heritage;
- Recognise and promote the understanding that cultural diversity is a fundamental characteristic of the national heritage and identity and that it provides an invaluable resource in the shaping of the UK's future;
- Promote the full and equitable participation of individuals and communities of all origins in the continuing evolution and sharing of all aspects of UK society and assist them in the elimination of any barrier to such participation;
- Ensure that all individuals receive equal treatment and equal protection under the law, while respecting and valuing their differences;
- Promote the understanding and creativity that arise from the interaction between individuals and communities of different origins;
- Encourage and assist social, cultural, economic and political institutions to be respectful of the UK's multi-ethnic character

IT IS FURTHER DECLARED TO BE THE POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM THAT ALL STATE INSTITUTIONS SHALL:

- Ensure that UK citizens of all origins have an equal opportunity to obtain employment and advancement;
- Promote policies, programmes and practices that enhance the ability for individuals and communities of all origins to contribute to the UK's continuing evolution;
- Collect statistical data in order to enable the development of policies, programmes and practices that are sensitive and responsive to the multi-ethnic reality of the United Kingdom;
- Make use as appropriate, of the language skills and cultural understandings of people of all origins and community backgrounds

Appendix III

Common belonging

Bhikhu Parekh, Chair, Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain

Published in *Cohesion, Community and Citizenship* (2002), Runnymede Trust

The common sense of belonging then is not the same as nationalism and patriotism. It is tied to a community of men and women, not to the territory. It involves fellow-feeling and mutual concern, not glorification of a nation that is supposed to transcend them all. It is critical and reflective, and combines attachment to the community with a capacity for detachment. It certainly has an emotional component, but the latter is guided by a careful assessment of the well-being of the members of the community. It represents a quiet loyalty and commitment to one's fellow-members and a willingness to fight against injustices and inequalities, not an exuberant, unconditional and blind love. We do not have a single and evocative term to express such a sense of community or common belonging. The Indian poet Tagore coined the beautiful word *swadeshchintā* that expresses it well. Loosely translated, it means 'an anxious concern for the well-being of one's community'. Gandhi's *prajāprem* (love of one's people) points in the same direction.

A political community then needs a common sense of belonging to hold it together and sustain a regime of rights, obligations and sacrifices. This raises the question as to how to cultivate such a sense of belonging. It clearly cannot be based on a shared religion or ethnicity as many an earlier writer had argued, both because a common religion or ethnicity does not ensure unity and because it has no relevance to a society whose members belong to different religious and ethnic groups. A shared national culture, on which many conservative writers insist, runs into similar difficulties. Many modern societies are multicultural and, even in those that are not, citizens deeply disagree about such crucial cultural issues as the meaning of life as well as of different human activities and relationships, the importance of religion, the structure of family, marriage, and the role of the state. A shared vision of the good life cannot be the basis of a common sense of belonging either, for the simple reason that there is no rational way to resolve the deep moral disagreements that characterise all modern societies. An agreement on the principles of justice, as John Rawls insists, is necessary but not enough (see *Theory of Justice*, 1997). No political community can be based on the principles of justice alone, because many matters relating to the common good are not concerned with redistribution or individual claims and fall outside the category of justice. Furthermore, justice is a cold virtue and does not by itself inspire the active loyalty, commitment and mutual concern that lie at the basis of a shared life. Since principles of justice, at least as Rawls understands them, are universal in nature, they cannot explain why one should be committed to this community rather than another and prefer it to the latter.

Broadly speaking, the common sense of belonging, the sense of mutual concern and commitment, requires the following (they do not guarantee it, by the way, for nothing can, but they do facilitate its development):

- First, an agreement on how the community should be constituted and its collective affairs conducted. Since its members are likely to disagree on many public issues, they must agree on the ways of resolving their disagreements and taking collectively binding decisions. This involves agreement on the structure of civil authority, decision-

making procedures and the basic public values that should inform and guide its decisions. Members of a community cannot all be expected to agree on how to lead their personal lives. Neither can they be expected to agree on what substantive goals or vision of the good life their community should pursue. Socialists, marxists, liberals, conservatives and others have very different ideas on how to structure their society, and these differences cannot be conclusively resolved. If we added religious people, secularists and others, the disagreements would become even more intractable.

- Some values, however, go to the heart of any possible conception of the good life, and are in that sense so basic that an agreement on them is essential. If some members of the community thought that human life had no value and that they might kill those they dislike, or that human beings had no worth and might be enslaved or bought and sold, they would not be able to create or sustain a common life. A political community requires a minimally shared moral community as its necessary basis, and calls for an agreement on such basic procedural and substantive values as the sanctity of human life, human worth, tolerance, peaceful resolution of differences, mutual respect, and basic liberties. Since these values are essential to a minimally decent human life, we can legitimately claim universal validity for them and expect every political community to embody them in its institutions and policies.
- No community, however, can be based on these minimum values alone. While meeting their requirements, it would build a distinct moral life based on such other values as enjoy a broad consensus among its members, and embody these in its institutions and practices. Some of its members might also press for other values such as economic equality, classless society and solidarity. Until they succeed in persuading their fellow-members, these values remain open to debate and democratic struggle and cannot claim general allegiance.

The moral life of a political community then is articulated on at least three levels, each enjoying a different degree of consensus and moral authority.

1. Some of its values, those that I have called basic human values, are universally valid, morally compelling, and admit of no compromise. Some others are distinctive to a community and form part of its cultural and moral identity. If they conform to the basic human values, they are binding on its members, but admit of compromise in exceptional cases. Yet others are subject to debate and enjoy only a limited moral consensus. A common sense of belonging requires recognition of these differences, demanding agreement where it is justified and tolerating and even welcoming differences where it is not.

2. The common sense of belonging requires equal citizenship. This means that every member of the community should feel an equally valued part of it and enjoy the same rights and opportunities as others – his interests should receive equal consideration, his views should be heard and respected, and so on. Belonging to a community of men and women is conditional upon being accepted as one of them. Equal citizenship both signifies and gives reality to such reciprocal acceptance. Since justice implies equal citizenship, it is one of the essential conditions of a sense of community.

3. Since members of a political community often belong to different religious, cultural, ethnic and other communities, which are partly constitutive of their identity and matter much to them, the political community should respect their legitimate differences and allow them to express

their identities in appropriate ways. If belonging to it required that they should abandon other forms of belonging, they would consider the moral and cultural price too high and would resent and feel alienated from it. Respect for non-political identities is therefore essential for a common sense of belonging. The respect has its obvious limits, for no political community can accommodate all forms of diversity or meet their unreasonable demands. It is therefore vital that a political community should provide institutional mechanisms for negotiating their differences and resolving their conflicts in a spirit of democratic participation. It should also create conditions in which its members can live with their multiple identities, and possess the confidence to view each one of these critically and moderate its demands in light of the others. Political and non-political identities can fertilise and complement each other. One can be British as well as, and deepen and enrich one's Britishness by virtue of being, Scottish or Indian and Muslim or Hindu. The political identity should therefore be so defined that members of the community can all own and identify with it, albeit in their own different ways. Such a mediated form of common belonging does justice to both political and non-political identities, and benefits from their creative interplay.

Common belonging has an irreducible emotional component. Self-interest, equal citizenship, respect for one's culture, etc., give one good reasons to want to belong to a community, but these are not enough. These conditions might be met, and yet one might feel no particular attachment to the community. The converse is just as true. How one can build up such an emotional attachment, feel at home in the community, and wish to remain part of it is not easy to specify. Familiarity plays an important part, for when one understands a community and knows one's way around in it, one is likely to feel at home in it. Familiarity in turn is a product of socialization, which is why those who are born and have grown up within a community generally tend to feel attached to it and why first-generation immigrants remain relatively detached.

How one is treated by the community also plays an important part. Those who are devalued, mocked, taken lightly, treated as outsiders, made butts of offensive jokes, and so on, build up alienation and resentment and do not feel a sense of attachment to the community. It is therefore essential that the experience that the members of a community have of its major institutions should be one of respect and fairness. The educational, economic, political and other institutions of a society, which profoundly shape the perceptions and emotional responses of citizens, should be inclusive, hospitable to differences, reflect a wide range of sensibility such that they are not identified with a particular class, gender or race, and should empower their members so that they do not feel like helpless objects of another's will.

Even when these and other conditions are met, a sense of common belonging cannot be guaranteed. For all kinds of reasons, some groups of citizens might never feel part of the community even though they have no grounds for it. And even when a society has successfully fostered a sense of common belonging, it cannot be sure that the latter will last forever. Unavoidable economic and technological developments might create unexpected conflicts of interests. New moral and cultural trends might give rise to forms of life to which some groups of citizens might be antipathetic. New immigrants might arrive, bringing with them unfamiliar ways of life and thought. International conflicts might lead some members of the community to privilege their transnational identity and distance themselves from their fellow citizens. Every political community needs to be alert to these and other challenges, and find ways of renewing or winning afresh the allegiance and loyalty of those in danger of becoming disaffected and detached.

Appendix IV

Regulation, review and partnership

Rob Berkeley, Senior Research and Policy Analyst, Runnymede Trust

Published in *Guardians of Race Equality* (2003), Runnymede Trust

'Forty-two' yelled Loonquawl. 'Is that all you've got to show for seven and a half million years' work?'

'I checked it very thoroughly,' said the computer, 'and that is quite definitely the answer. I think the problem, to be quite honest with you, is that you've never actually known what the question is.'

Douglas Adams, *Hitchhikers' Guide to the Galaxy*

The meaning and purpose of inspection have changed over time. It continues to provide vital assurances to the public, to departments and to the service providers, and to scrutinize accountabilities, but it is also increasingly making a contribution to service improvement. Some inspectorates are achieving this shift more quickly than others.

OPSR, Inspecting for Improvement

The quest for a successful multi-ethnic society is defined by our ability to understand what changes we need to make in order to create a society in which all citizens can share a sense of belonging, in which an effective balance between cohesion, equality and difference can be struck.

Above I have argued that our public authorities are key actors in supporting the creation of a sense of belonging. Building trust in these authorities therefore becomes a significant act in developing the kind of society for which we strive, a society 'at ease with itself'. A key means of building trust in public authorities with minority ethnic communities is to respond to institutional racism by working to eliminate it, and also to work to actively promote equality of opportunity and good relations between different ethnic groups. The public also needs to know that this work is happening and that organisations are employing their best efforts to ensure that they play their full role in this field.

For this reason, the Race Relations Amendment Act (2000) is powerful, innovative, and crucial legislation. The successful implementation of the legislation is now the key challenge. With the imperative of building trust in public authorities for citizens from minority ethnic communities, regulators and inspectorates need to consider their activities in the light of how to best respond to their enhanced responsibilities. Below some of the major challenges and opportunities that face inspectors and regulators are discussed

Self regulation

'Race' and racisms are very powerful social constructs, the result of complex histories, constantly reproduced and redefined and vital to our understandings of late modern societies. Any response to building trust in public institutions around race equality needs to recognise the embeddedness of 'race' and its complexity. To this end, an approach to race equality that does not lead to fundamental change and shifting of world-views will not be strong enough. Change cannot be merely cosmetic. To confine the opportunity that the RRAA presents to that of a 'tick-box' exercise would be a terrible waste. Regulation and inspection need to be developed in

such a manner as to offer support to public authorities to engage with the elimination of institutional racism in more than a cursory fashion.

The report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain presented a model which started with organisational self-review at its base and built a regulatory framework which supported and developed this approach (see above). This is important for more than just administrative convenience. Successful models of review can engage professionals and practitioners as the experts, involve the whole organisation, build internal capacity and understandings, and encourage individuals to take responsibility at all levels in an organisation. Successfully implemented reviews of this type are far from form-filling and lip-service – and form-filling and lip-service are simply unacceptable in meeting the challenging agenda for race equality that is necessary for a successful multi-ethnic society to thrive.

Intelligent accountability

Onora O'Neill argues in a different context for 'intelligent accountability' rather than an accountability that deprofessionalizes, and destroys the confidence of, and in, practitioners.

If we want greater accountability without damaging professional performance we need intelligent accountability. . . Intelligent accountability, I suspect, requires more attention to good governance and fewer fantasies about total control. Good governance is possible only if institutions are allowed some margin for self-governance of a form appropriate to their particular tasks, within a framework of financial and other reporting. Such reporting, I believe, is not improved by being wholly standardised or relentlessly detailed, and since much that has to be accounted for is not easily measured it cannot be boiled down to a set of stock performance indicators. Those who are called to account should give an account of what they have done and of their successes or failures to others who have sufficient time and experience to assess the evidence and report on it. Real accountability provides substantive and knowledgeable independent judgement of an institution's or professional's work.

(Onora O'Neill, Reith Lecture, 2003)

This may appear to be a reductive vision of accountability. The temptation for inspectorates and regulators may be to respond to such a vision by arguing that their concern for the public interest makes standardisation, detail, and ease of measurement essential. Yet in terms of race equality at least, a drive for standardisation may serve to disengage practitioners, leading to race equality becoming another concept imposed from the 'over-controlling centre', rather than about the professionalism of their practice. A model of self-review, internally developed targets, regular reporting and honest dialogue with regulatory and inspecting bodies, with an underpinning of minimum standards, is likely to yield more enduring change.

As ever, there is a balance to be struck. Trust is not better developed through claiming to know all of the answers, but rather through an honesty and transparency in coming to terms with the challenges. As the MORI/Audit Commission research noted:

53% identify admitting responsibility when they make mistakes and 44% learning from mistakes as important in determining trust in public services

Inspection regimes need to respect organisations' professionalism and internal strengths in coming to terms with such an important set of issues. At the same time they need to behave as

a sensitive guarantor to the public of the efforts of public authorities. Supporting organisational self-review is an effective means of attempting to square this particular circle.

The Office of Public Service Reform published a review of inspection in 2003 that defined three types of inspection.

Best practice in inspection today aims to deliver, to the extent appropriate, all three types, according to the assurances needed, the direction being received by the inspectorate, and the inspectorate's own capacity for change.

- *Type 1 inspections give assurance on whether the processes being followed by the service provider are reliable and meet basic standards. Inspectors may also provide complex information as part of their assessment work.*
- *In type 2 inspections, further development of performance indicators has been used to identify the relative achievement of individual providers, and a greater specificity of information. Type 2 inspection is more concerned with accountability and presents a challenge to the providers to improve.*
- *In type 3 inspections, inspectors are playing a more active part in securing improvement, while retaining their independence. Less emphasis is placed on checking compliance, and more on the user perspective.*

Office of Public Service Reform (2003)¹

Of these three types of inspection, type three inspections lend themselves more readily to building trust on race equality. The emphasis in type three inspections on the outcomes of the service and the perceptions of users rather than on checking compliance, would appear to be an approach which allows for the inspected organisation to take ownership of the changes, while the inspectorate is a contributor to improvement on behalf of the public.

Public Involvement

As noted above, building trust is dependent on honesty, information-sharing, responding to needs, and keeping promises. All of these activities require creating a dialogue with people and especially (though not exclusively), in the case of race equality, minority ethnic communities. The OPSR report noted that:

Independent inspection plays an important role in providing assurance to the public, but we found that most members of the public do not know about the contribution inspectors make to high standards of service. Inspection in the public sector is good at providing assurance but it can do more, and it can communicate its findings more effectively.

In considering how to communicate more effectively with the public, inspectorates and regulatory bodies should give attention to how they can learn to better communicate with people from minority ethnic communities. There are a number of ways in which this can be achieved, through media targeted specifically at minority ethnic communities, through existing networks such as the voluntary sector, through statutory networks such as Race Equality

¹ OPSR (2003) *Inspecting for Improvement: developing a customer focused approach*. London: HMSO.

Councils, or through developing networks of practitioners and professionals in specific public policy arenas.

Involvement, however, needs to yield benefits for those being engaged as well as for the inspectorate. Consultation must be meaningful and needs to be a dialogue rather than a PR exercise. If consultation is undertaken, then organisations must explain the decisions they have taken and why they have not adopted the suggestions given to them.

Further, when approaching voluntary sector organisations, inspectorates will need to understand their capacity to respond. For example, since the requirement to produce race equality schemes came into force, many organisations have found themselves inundated with requests to respond to schemes. This is frustrating for organisations that want to be supportive but who could not possibly have the capacity to respond to the hundreds of requests for significant analysis of documentation. Involvement must be meaningful, proportionate, communicated to all relevant parts of our communities, and seen as a crucial part of any inspectorate's work in building trust on race equality in public authorities.

Inspectorates as public authorities

Inspectorates and regulatory bodies are often also public authorities and as such are bound under the duties of the Race Relations Amendment Act. They generally do not have the benefit of external inspection in order to support the development of their organisational self-review, although many inspectorates use the feedback they receive from those they inspect to judge the effectiveness of their own efforts. In line with their status as public authorities they have a duty to promote racial equality. In order to do this effectively, they will need to further open up communication with the general public and specific groups to ensure that they are seen as exemplars of effective race equality practice.

This extends not only to their pronouncements, but their capacity to deal with issues around race equality, the kinds of priorities they adopt in their roles as regulators or inspectors, and the profile that they have beyond those that they inspect. One of the recommendations of the OPSR report for inspectorates is that they should be:

Developing their organisational and leadership capacity to facilitate innovation, including personnel policies, to draw in and refresh the skills and competencies needed for the range of their inspection work

The RRAA has meant that the range of inspection work has changed. Inspectorates will need to consider this as an opportunity to look afresh at their personnel policies to ensure that the relevant expertise is brought into the organization, or that other ways are found through which to access it. Some inspectorates have been resourceful in using external expertise to develop their approach to race equality, others have brought senior members into their teams with expertise in the field; a further approach has been to use the expertise of lay inspectors to respond to skills gaps.

Inspectorates are bound by the public duty to consider the impact that their work could potentially have on race equality and good relations between ethnic communities, and to prioritize changes in their practices that could work to promote them. I have argued here that the impact could be great and that therefore changes will need to be commensurate. The lack

of an inspectorate for inspectorates means that they will have to work doubly hard to engage the public in order to build trust in themselves.

Managing expectations

Effective communication will also enable inspectorates and regulatory bodies to be clear about what their role is and what they can deliver. Trustworthiness is dependent on honesty. In becoming champions of race equality, inspectorates and regulators will have to be mindful of what they can achieve and what impact they can have in the short and medium terms. Understandably there is impatience for change – especially in terms of the raw outcomes of public service activity that show a disproportionate level of negative effects across so many indicators for people from certain minority ethnic communities. Inspectorates will be promoting race equality alongside a wide range of other organisations and as such will be committed partners in the elimination of discriminations and the promotion of a successful multi-ethnic society.

It needs to be better communicated that many inspectorates are small organisations with legal limitations to their ambit. This is not iterated here as an excuse but as a means of assuring that those who suffer the vicissitudes of racism do not have expectations of inspection that cannot be fulfilled. It will also enable inspectorates to enter into partnership with other organisations to challenge racism and promote race equality, rather than being seen as the sole answer to the problem.

These challenges are not easy to respond to and will involve significant change for many inspecting bodies. For some, there will be opportunities afforded by the changes and mergers that are already in train. For others, responding to race equality may mean reassessing the approach that they have adopted to date. The onus is on inspection and regulation bodies to be torchbearers for the promotion of race equality. The importance of public authorities in creating a common sense of belonging in a successful multi-ethnic society is clear. A common sense of belonging is therefore dependent on our ability to build trust in our public authorities on race equality. Inspection and regulation are key drivers in the task of developing trust in public authorities. Inspection and regulatory activity then is about more than guardianship, it is also about the success of a multi-ethnic society viewed as a community of citizens and a community of communities.