

Building Cohesive Communities:

A Report of the Ministerial Group on Public Order
and Community Cohesion

INTRODUCTION

- 1** The inter-departmental Ministerial Group on Public Order and Community Cohesion was announced in the Home Secretary's statement on the 10 July to the House of Commons, following serious disorder in Bradford on the 7-9 July.¹ The Group was asked to report to the Home Secretary on what Government could do to minimise the risk of further disorder, and to help build stronger, more cohesive communities. This Report sets out what action has been taken to date, and what further action we propose.
- 2** The Home Secretary's statement stressed the importance of involving local people in our work. As part of the Government's initial response to the disorder, an independent review team was also established under the chairmanship of Ted Cante. The Community Cohesion Review Team was given a specific remit to obtain the views of local people and community organisations. Their report² to the Ministerial Group is published alongside ours. We are very grateful to Ted Cante and his team for their report, and their co-operation in allowing us to draw extensively on the issues they have identified in framing our own recommendations.
- 3** We are also grateful to David Ritchie, chair of the Oldham Panel, and to Lord Clarke, chair of the Burnley Task Force, for sharing details of their work and main findings. Like Lord Ouseley's earlier report³ on Bradford, the Ritchie⁴ and Clarke⁵ reports are addressed to the people of Oldham and Burnley respectively.⁶ We have also taken account of the progress and initial findings of Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) research⁷ into segregation in the North West of England and the Policy Innovation Unit (PIU)⁸ study into ethnic minority access to the labour market.
- 4** The Community Cohesion Review Team have been enormously helpful in shaping our proposals for action by Government. The team has identified many important issues, and their report contains a wealth of valuable description and analysis. There is strong consensus between the findings of the Review Team, the Oldham Panel, the Burnley Task Force, and Lord Ouseley's report for Bradford City Council. We explore these in chapter 2.
- 5** The remit of the Ministerial Group was to look at what practical help – in the short, medium and long term – the Government can give to help communities to find solutions to the problems manifested by last summer's disorders in Bradford, Burnley, Oldham and other towns and cities.

1 Home Secretary's Statement, Hansard Column 663-674 10 July 2001.

2 Ted Cante, Community Cohesion Review Team, 2001.

3 Community Pride not Prejudice – Making Diversity Work in Bradford, Sir Herman Ouseley, July 2001.

4 David Ritchie, Oldham Panel, one Oldham one Future, 2001

5 Lord Clarke, Burnley Task Force 2001.

6 The Home Office supported the Community Cohesion Review Team, and has contributed to the administrative costs of the Oldham Panel.

7 Racial Segregation in the North of England and its Implications for a Multi-Racial Society, CRE report in preparation.

8 Ethnic Minority Access to the Labour Force, PIU, report in preparation.

- 6** Our report sets out the action that has already been taken, including the summer activities programme which involved some 200,000 young people in all 9 regions of England, and the steps taken to appoint facilitators to foster dialogue within and between fractured communities. We have highlighted where developing Government policy has reflected the issues we raise in this report. We set out in chapter 3 how main programmes will be refocused to promote more cohesive communities, and set out actions for Government.
- 7** This report is a key step in the process of building stronger, more cohesive communities, reflecting the Government's commitment to civil renewal. But it is just the beginning. Our central recommendation is the need to make community cohesion a central aim of Government, and to ensure that the design and delivery of all Government policy reflects this. We recognise that in many areas affected by disorder or community tensions, there is little interchange between members of different racial, cultural and religious communities and that proactive measures will have to be taken to promote dialogue and understanding. We also take on board the need to generate a widespread and open debate about identity, shared values, and common citizenship as part of the process of building cohesive communities. This debate will feed into the citizenship education programme, and proposals to promote the common rights and responsibilities around citizenship for those seeking residence in this country.
- 8** The issues the independent review teams have raised are serious and complex. Cattle, Clarke, Ritchie and Ouseley have all identified segregation, along racial lines, as a growing problem, and a significant contributory factor to the disturbances. It has proved easier to describe the problem than to identify precisely why it has occurred – or indeed why, in a country that has often seen different communities tending to concentrate in certain areas of towns and cities – it should have assumed such importance in certain places.
- 9** Government is committed to tackling these issues. But it is important that our response is the right one, based on robust evidence, and an understanding of 'what works'. Until our evidence base is clearer, we are not in a position to prescribe detailed policy proposals on all the issues raised. Where this is the case we spell out the need for detailed research and further work.
- 10** There are no easy answers or quick fixes to the deep fracturing of communities on racial, generational and religious lines now evident in parts of Bradford, Burnley and Oldham. The causes are multi-layered and complex, and tackling them will require sustained effort, over several years, across Government working in partnership with local agencies and people, if our most fractured communities are to become cohesive ones, uniting people around a common sense of belonging regardless of race, culture or faith. The development of effective policy responses must be truly inclusive, involving all sections of all local communities.
- 11** The Government already has in place significant programmes designed to tackle the underlying social problems that are apparent in the affected towns, and other deprived areas. There are no shortcuts to the long-term improvements these programmes will bring to communities like those in Bradford, Oldham and Burnley.

- 12** Investment is being made into housing, transport, education, health and regeneration. Action is being taken to tackle anti-social behaviour and to reduce crime. SureStart, improved school standards and the Children's Fund are all intended to improve the life chances of children and young people. But we must now ensure that these, and other programmes, all contribute effectively to the development of community cohesion. This is the corner stone of the actions we propose in Chapter 3.
- 13** The importance of our work has been underlined by the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington DC on 11 September and the consequent rise in racial incidents and community tensions. The Muslim community has condemned the terrorist attacks and the Prime Minister and other senior Ministers have stressed their support for the Muslim community and condemned racist activity. There is regular contact between Government officials and the police with Muslim and other faith leaders and community representatives to monitor the situation.
- 14** The reports of Cante, Clarke, Ritchie and Ouseley bring to life the feelings, views and aspirations of all the local communities in areas where there were disturbances. Cante makes comparisons with communities whose experience had been much more positive. The Ministerial Group is clear that we must listen to and involve local people in developing policies which meet their needs. Young people of all communities must be included, as must women, and Muslim women in particular, whose voice has not been heard clearly so far. Initiating a wide and open debate around the issues raised in this report is, we believe, the essential next step.
- 15** Many of the recommendations Cante, Clarke, Ritchie and Ouseley make are aimed at local Government, and at other local agencies and organisations. While central Government clearly has a crucial role to play in empowering and enabling local communities, many of the solutions to the problems identified must be found and implemented at a local level. The action we have already taken, and the further work we propose in Chapter 3, is intended to support local community solutions, rather than impose them from the outside.



John Denham

CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 1	7
Background	
CHAPTER 2	10
Identifying the issues	
CHAPTER 3	18
Government's response: action taken and proposals for further action	
CHAPTER 4	34
Next steps	
ANNEX 1	35
Glossary	
ANNEX 2	36
Ministerial Group on Public Order & Community Cohesion	

Chapter 1

Background

- 1.1** The violent community disorders which erupted in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham during the summer of 2001 were some of the worst in 20 years. There was less serious disorder in a number of other places and many more towns, mainly in the North, were identified by the police as being at significant risk of serious disorder. There have been sporadic incidents of further community disorder since the summer.
- 1.2** The disorders involved hundreds of mainly young people, inflicted injuries on over 400 police, and caused millions of pounds worth of damages¹.

	BRADFORD EASTER	BRADFORD JULY	BURNLEY	OLDHAM
No's involved in Disorders	Approx 100	400-500	400	500
Injuries	No police injured 20 members of the general public	326 police 14 members of the general public	83 police 28 members of the general public	2 police 3 members of the general public
Cost of damage	Estimated at £117,000	Estimated at £7.5-£10 million	Estimated at over £0.5 million	Estimated at £1.4 million

- 1.3** The first outbreak of serious disorder was in Bradford on Sunday 15 April. This was followed by those in Oldham, on 26-29 May and Burnley, on 24-26 June, and finally the second outbreak in Bradford on 7-10 July. Serious disturbances also occurred in Leeds on the 5th June and Stoke-on-Trent on the weekend of the 14-15 July.
- 1.4** 395 people were arrested in conjunction with the disorders in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham. In Oldham, court proceedings have now begun against the 12 men charged with violent disorder in relation to the initial incident. In Bradford, 58 people are awaiting trial on charges which include rioting, and violent disorder. Court cases in Burnley are still pending.

¹ Factual evidence on disorders obtained from local police forces: Greater Manchester Police, West Yorkshire Police, Lancashire Constabulary, 2001.

1.5 We have not attempted to undertake a detailed analysis of the sequences of events leading to each disturbance, nor of the disorders themselves. As always, there are conflicting histories of the events of the preceding days, weeks and months. Even eye-witness accounts of the events themselves can vary. Our prime aim has been to identify the underlying causes which made these areas prone to the violence. Whilst each disturbance may have had a particular trigger event, or events, few of those who spoke to the Cantle Review Team believed such ‘flashpoints’ themselves explained what had occurred.

1.6 Nonetheless, it is worth highlighting a number of features which, to a greater or lesser extent, all the disturbances shared:

- all of the wards affected were amongst the 20% most deprived in the country – and parts of Oldham and Burnley rank in the most deprived 1%² All have average incomes which are amongst the lowest in the country³. Many of the areas involved also had low education attainment standards in schools⁴;
- the participants were overwhelmingly young men. Those arrested were predominantly between 17-26;
- both white and ethnic minority young men were involved. Most were local to the area. The ethnic minority young men involved were largely of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin;
- disturbances occurred in areas which had become fractured on racial, generational, cultural and religious lines and where there was little dialogue, or much contact, between the various groups across those social divides;
- in many, but not all cases, trouble arose after months of racial tension and widely reported racial attacks – both Asian on white, and white on Asian⁵;
- the disorders themselves took place either in, or on the margins of areas inhabited predominantly by Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities;
- far-right organisations had been active in some, but not all of the areas, although rumours of far-right activity were reported by the police to have raised tensions in other areas;
- the arrest or failure to arrest certain individuals, assaults and other criminal activities often played a part in spreading disturbances; and
- the disorders escalated as word of them was spread (e.g. by mobile phones) and others joined in.

2 Daneshouse in Burnley and Alexandra in Oldham (Indices of Deprivation 2000).

3 All the wards involved are ranked in the most deprived 10% in terms of income (RDS research ID 2000).

4 University, Bowling and Undercliffe and Toller in Bradford, and Alexandra St Mary’s in Oldham.

5 In this report we use terms like ‘white’ and ‘Asian’ to shorthand the reference to different ethnic groups, but are very aware that there is no such thing as a single, homogenous Asian, Muslim, Pakistani, Bangladeshi or White community. Within and between the component parts of those communities there are significant differences in attitudes, beliefs and opinions.

- 1.7** There have been suggestions, referred to by Cattle, Ouseley and Ritchie, as well as anecdotal evidence relayed to Ministers, that the disorders were in some way related to drug dealing in those areas. Some of these related to drug dealers and suggested violence was directed at white drug dealers, others that police failure to take action against drug dealers had encouraged a sense that lawless behaviour would be tolerated.
- 1.8** While there is no doubt that both drug abuse, and drug dealing, are serious problems, the claim that drug related activity played a significant part in the disturbances was not supported by either the police, or by the local Drug Action Teams.

Chapter 2

Identifying the issues

- 2.1** Nothing can excuse the kind of violence and wanton destruction of property inflicted on the communities caught up in last summer's disorders. The police – of whom over 400 were injured – did a difficult job very well in protecting the public. The damage done to local businesses, and to the image of, and relations between, those communities will not be made good quickly. It is the ordinary, decent and law-abiding majority affected who have suffered most.
- 2.2** Condemning such violence and destruction is not enough. If we are to prevent further disturbances and build more cohesive communities we need to look beyond the immediate events and consider the underlying causes. We focus in this chapter mainly on Bradford, Burnley and Oldham but as indicated earlier the threat of disorder was much more widespread.
- 2.3** The Community Cohesion Review Team has identified a wide range of problems and issues. Their report draws very similar conclusions to the Oldham Panel, the Burnley Task Force and Lord Ouseley's report for Bradford City Council. We are very grateful for the care they have taken to reflect the views of local people in their reports.
- 2.4** However, as we noted in the introduction, we do not have a full understanding of all the complex inter-actions of factors which have caused some communities to become so deeply fractured, and segregation to develop to such an extent, in certain towns and cities. The Ministerial Group has sought to identify the key issues that need to be tackled and the further work that needs to be done to shape appropriate policy responses. In this Chapter we outline those issues. In Chapter 3 we outline the work that we have set in train to shape future policy responses.
- 2.5** There are important areas where we have drawn clear conclusions about what actions Government should take. In a number of areas we have identified the need for further research and analysis. But we should stress two conclusions:
- firstly, we are clear that these are not matters that can be resolved purely through academic research and analysis. Understanding how the issues are seen and understood by local people is central to shaping effective policy responses. We need to involve local communities in the process of developing future policy
 - secondly, the interaction between a series of economic, social and cultural issues must be understood. It seems unlikely that tackling one or more problems in isolation will provide a successful response to a complex and multi-layered situation.

Key Issues

2.6 We have drawn on the detailed descriptions and analysis contained in the reports of Cantle, Clarke, Ouseley and Ritchie – and from other sources including the CRE and PIU – in setting out the following brief overview of the key issues. There is a large measure of agreement on the following being the most important factors:

- the lack of a strong civic identity or shared social values to unite diverse communities;
- the fragmentation and polarisation of communities – on economic, geographical, racial and cultural lines – on a scale which amounts to segregation, albeit to an extent by choice;
- disengagement of young people from the local decision making process, inter-generational tensions, and an increasingly territorial mentality in asserting different racial, cultural and religious identities in response to real or perceived attacks;
- weak political and community leadership;
- inadequate provision of youth facilities and services;
- high levels of unemployment, particularly amongst young people;
- activities of extremist groups;
- weaknesses and disparity in the police response to community issues, particularly racial incidents; and
- irresponsible coverage of race stories by sections of the local media.

We discuss these briefly below.

Identity and Values

2.7 Ouseley and Ritchie both highlight the divisive ‘them and us’ attitudes which characterise relations between the different sections of the communities in Bradford and Oldham. Similar observations are made by Cantle and Clarke in their reports.

2.8 A positive approach to celebrating diversity has undoubtedly been a key factor in enabling some communities to deal with the inevitable tensions between different groups more effectively than others, as the Cantle Team found in Birmingham, Leicester and Southall. The most successful have been those which have, in addition to this, succeeded in uniting diverse groups through a shared sense of belonging to, and pride in, a common civic identity.

- 2.9** Issues of identity and values are intrinsically difficult and controversial. They raise questions which go to the very heart of what we mean when we talk about concepts of citizenship, community and civil society. All of these are contested and perhaps because of this there has been a reluctance to discuss them openly.
- 2.10** The group most vulnerable to doubt and confusion about identity and values is young people. Where there is little opportunity for interaction outside of their immediate group, many young people grow up, as Ouseley observes, ‘ignorant of other cultures and lifestyles’¹. Ignorance of others is an obvious source of conflict. It feeds the territorial instincts of young men and makes it easier for myths and jealousies to flourish.
- 2.11** A civic identity which serves to unite people and which expresses common goals and aspirations of the whole community can have a powerful effect in shaping attitudes and behaviour. Shared values are essential to give people a common sense of belonging regardless of their race, cultural traditions or faith.
- 2.12** Positive action must be taken to build a shared vision and identity and in the next chapter we set out how this can be taken forward at national and local level.

Cohesion and Segregation

- 2.13** Until this year, segregation was a term that was rarely used in discussion of community relations in Britain. The CRE’s view is that ‘compared to racial discrimination, racial harassment, and immigration control, racial segregation has not been a major concern in British race relations and it has received little attention’².
- 2.14** Bradford, Burnley and Oldham could all be described as multi-racial on the basis that they are racially mixed communities. But to do so would miss the observation of Lord Ouseley that ‘different ethnic groups (in Bradford) are increasingly segregating themselves from each other and retreating into ‘comfort zones’ made up of people like themselves’³.
- 2.15** There are a number of reasons why people may choose to be close to others like themselves. These include the need for security and support, access to schools, and proximity to shops and places of religious worship. For ethnic minorities, such as the Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham, language may also be an important factor if they do not speak English.
- 2.16** There is nothing intrinsically wrong about people exercising choice in this way. It is something which successive groups of immigrants have done for centuries. But there are reasons why we should be concerned about the apparent trend towards more segregated communities:

1 ‘Community Pride Not Prejudice – Making Diversity Work in Bradford’, Sir Herman Ouseley, July 2001.

2 ‘Racial Segregation in the North of England’, CRE report in preparation.

3 Ouseley Page 16.

- geographical segregation is likely to contribute to a lack of opportunity for different communities to meet, to have a dialogue and work together
- a trend towards segregation may be a symptom of deeper concerns, fear of racist attacks, or of deep seated prejudices and racism
- segregation may not reflect choice but a real and damaging lack of choice about housing, jobs and schools.

2.17 At this stage it is difficult to identify what is cause and what is effect in the development of segregated communities. It is equally difficult to be certain whether the geographical concentration of different communities in different areas always give rise to problems of community cohesion or whether other factors have to be present for difficulties to arise.

2.18 We cannot claim to be a truly multi-cultural society if the various communities within it live, as Cattle puts it, a series of parallel lives which do not touch at any point. Housing, education and employment are key areas in which the communities in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham appear to be growing further apart.

2.19 Cattle, Clarke, Ritchie and Ouseley found that most young people want to grow up in a mixed and inclusive society, and favoured multi-cultural schools.

Weak Political and Community Leadership

2.20 It would be unfair not to acknowledge the immensity of tasks which confront the leaders of councils, public services and local communities of Bradford, Burnley and Oldham and places like them. Nor have the problems described by the review teams emerged overnight.

2.21 But it is clear that weakness in leadership has been manifested by:

- the absence of an agreed vision of how things could be better;
- an inability to broker relations between key interests and work up agreed solutions (or workable compromises) to housing, regeneration, employment and education problems;
- a consequent lack of drive to create purposeful, inclusive and effective Local Strategic Partnerships;
- an inability to communicate the vision and how it might be achieved to the wider community, and to counter false perceptions about resource distribution; and
- a lack of organisational capacity and know-how to deliver/implement solutions.

2.22 The consequence is a cycle of failing business and community confidence, erosion of trust in civic institutions to resolve problems and risk of increased disorder. It is also less likely that opportunities will be created to enable different communities to meet and work together.

- 2.23** This is in contrast to those areas (city centres and neighbourhoods) which have been able to recover from similar clusters of problems and regenerate themselves. One of the preconditions of these successes has been leadership from a local partnership, local authority, Mayor, resident's leader or social entrepreneurs.
- 2.24** The effects of weak political leadership emerge over a long period of time. It reflects the failure of the local democratic process to produce local leadership which is committed to tackling conflict and social divisions. We believe it is important that political parties recognise their responsibilities for addressing these issues honestly and with a commitment to community cohesion and to avoid seeking electoral advantage in ways that damage community cohesion.
- 2.25** The capacity of community, faith and business leaders to work together, to represent all parts of their communities and constituencies effectively, and to promote community cohesion must also be developed. Unless the capacity of local leadership is developed, it will be difficult, if not impossible for communities to take responsibility for finding the solutions to their problems.
- 2.26** We do not underestimate the size of this challenge. Nor are we singling out for criticism those who have tried with good faith to lead their towns and communities over the past years. They have a right to expect support from central Government and its agencies.
- 2.27** National Government policies must be designed to develop the capacity of local political and community leaders. In the next Chapter we set out how the Government will help to strengthen and develop local government and leadership in the local community.

Children and Young People

- 2.28** Cantle, Clarke, Ouseley and Ritchie all draw attention to the extent which young people's voices have been largely ignored by decision-makers in the areas where there were disturbances. Some young people complained that the older community and religious leaders who claimed to represent them failed to articulate the experiences of the young.
- 2.29** Young people must be enabled to contribute fully to the development of cohesive communities and to have their own, distinctive voice. We welcome the positive attitudes of the great majority of young people and their aspirations to live in successful, diverse communities.
- 2.30** We recognise the importance of enabling young people to have a voice in shaping their local communities. We return to this in Chapter 3.

Youth Facilities and Services

- 2.31** Both Ouseley and Ritchie make direct links between the lack of youth facilities and involvement, particularly of young men, in anti-social behaviour. Cantle⁴ describes facilities for young people as being in ‘a parlous state in many areas’ with some of the impressive schemes seen by the Review Team ‘dependent on the goodwill of dedicated helpers to survive’.
- 2.32** The extent to which youth facilities are segregated in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham has been drawn to our attention by the CRE⁵. In some cases this simply reflects the locality in which the facilities exist but even centres in more racially mixed areas often serve only one community.
- 2.33** At national level the Transforming Youth Work review⁶ revealed that the quality and quantity of youth services varies dramatically across the country, with service providers ranging from local authorities, voluntary sector organisations, and faith groups to targeted schemes like the Youth Justice Board’s Youth Inclusion Programme. There are also the very serious problems of capacity, funding, quality and the recruitment and retention of staff.
- 2.34** We discuss the development of youth provision in the next chapter.

Employment

- 2.35** It is clear that, with the decline in traditional employment opportunities Bradford, Burnley and Oldham and similar cities and towns share high levels of unemployment. This reduces the opportunities for contact between communities and restricts social mobility. There are a number of features that need to be tackled through local and national economic and employment strategies. These include:
- wide variations in unemployment levels within relatively small areas;
 - higher unemployment levels amongst Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities;
 - higher unemployment amongst young people;
 - racism and racial discrimination within the labour market, including in the public sector; and
 - areas of high white unemployment not easily identified from large area statistics.
- 2.36** More needs to be done to understand the obstacles that prevent the some ethnic minority communities from being more successful in local labour markets. It will also be important to establish whether the statistics that reveal the disadvantage of minority groups may be disguising the existence of small but significant numbers of white adults who are similarly unsuccessful in finding work.

4 Ted Cantle, Community Cohesion Review Team 2001.

5 ‘Racial Segregation in the North of England’, CRE report in preparation.

6 ‘Transforming Youth Work’, consultation paper launched March 2001 by Malcolm Wicks DfES.

- 2.37** Action on employment is outlined in the next chapter. The PIU report on Ethnic Minorities and the Labour Market, is clearly relevant.

Regeneration

- 2.38** Much has been done by the Government in recent years to regenerate our most rundown inner cities and towns and to empower local communities. There have been many initiatives at national, regional and local levels to tackle the problems of deprivation and decline.
- 2.39** But the Cattle, Ritchie and Ouseley reports all identify access to Government grants and regeneration funds as a source of tensions between communities pitting neighbourhoods against each other in competition for resources. There is also a perception that funding approaches overlook pockets of extreme deprivation, in relatively better off, and often predominantly white neighbourhoods.
- 2.40** These programmes relied on one-off regeneration expenditure which made it difficult for local authorities and other local agencies to develop and deliver a long term, comprehensive approach to addressing poverty and poor standards in their area. Previous approaches often overlooked the importance of involving the public, private and voluntary sectors and residents in the regeneration of their areas. Also, regeneration funding did not in many cases meet the needs of ethnic minority populations and ethnic minority people were extremely under-represented amongst those running regeneration projects.
- 2.41** All of these factors have over time generated resentment about both perceived and real inequalities between neighbourhoods and between different ethnic groups. The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, launched by the Prime Minister in January 2001, is designed to redress many of these criticisms. The strategy addresses deprivation in all disadvantaged neighbourhoods and not just a lucky few. We believe that greater transparency is needed to counter perceptions of unfairness and to ensure greater coherence. We also believe that regeneration programmes must have a responsibility to positively build community cohesion. How we can address this, through the National Strategy, is set out in Chapter 3.

Activities of Extremist Groups

- 2.42** It is important neither to ignore, nor to overstate, the role of the far right in fomenting tensions which led to the disorders. The British National Party targeted areas in Greater Manchester and Lancashire at the June General Election and were clearly seeking to exploit tensions between the white and Asian communities.
- 2.43** Actual and – equally important – rumoured far right activity was a focus for some organised response by young Asian people which, in turn, reflects a level of distrust about the police handling of racist incidents.

Local Media

- 2.44** Whilst not the cause of any of the disorders, sections of the local media attracted considerable criticism in representations made to both Cantle and Ritchie. The main criticisms were of biased reporting of race issues – particularly racial attacks by Asians on white people – over a long period and inflammatory reporting of the disturbances. Cantle and Ritchie point to the cumulative effect that such reporting can have in souring community relations. We welcome the evidence provided by Ritchie that the local media in Oldham have taken this on board and are taking steps to ensure more balanced reporting.

Policing and Crime Reduction

- 2.45** We recognise that there are policing issues which need to be addressed. Firstly, the summer's disorders presented Lancashire, West Yorkshire and Greater Manchester with considerable public order challenges and they all needed to call upon mutual aid to control the disturbances and restore law and order. Secondly, the Review Team observed that the approach taken and the quality of policing that ethnic minorities and others experienced varied across the country.
- 2.46** The issue of drugs and drug dealing has been raised as a contributory factor during the disturbances, although we have been unable to find direct corroborative evidence to support this. Tackling drug dealing, crime and anti-social behaviour are important in making strong cohesive societies a reality.

Summary

- 2.47** The factors which contributed to the disorders are complex and multi-layered. There is a wide measure of agreement in the reports of Cantle, Clarke, Ritchie and Ouseley on the factors which were the most important in creating the community tensions which triggered the disorders. In Chapter 3 we describe what Government is already doing to address the issues raised and set out our proposals for further action.

Chapter 3

Government's response: action taken and proposals for further action

- 3.1** Government is already doing a great deal to regenerate communities, to improve public services, raise standards in schools, and cut crime. Relatively new programmes such as the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, ConneXions, and the New Deal, Sure Start, National Childcare Strategy, and Excellence in Schools will need time to have their full effect. The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000, which took effect only this year, will also have a significant impact on the diversity of the public sector work force and the delivery of local services. We believe that there is a need for a more holistic approach to regeneration and building civic renewal to focus and inform our efforts. This is captured by the concept of community cohesion which is discussed in the report of the Community Cohesion Review Team.
- 3.2** Community cohesion requires that there is a shared sense of belonging based on common goals and core social values, respect for difference (ethnic, cultural and religious), and acceptance of the reciprocal rights and obligations of community members working together for the common good. None of this can be imposed by Government – it is something that communities must achieve for themselves. But we can provide a lead in articulating a vision and taking the practical steps necessary to empower and support communities to turn the vision into reality.
- 3.3** The disorders, and the reports that were commissioned following them, have highlighted clear gaps in our knowledge. We need to improve our evidence base on segregation and its relationship to multiple barriers to opportunity and achievement. In the meantime, there are steps that we can and must take now to deal with the problems where we find them and promote greater cohesion in all our communities.
- 3.4** The Inter-departmental Ministerial Group was asked to identify what can be done to minimise the risk of further disorder and what practical help we could give to local communities to enable them to find their own solutions. In the immediate wake of the disturbances, the Ministerial Group, with other agencies, took a number of initiatives to assist local communities. These are described below.

Immediate Response

- 3.5** We reacted quickly to the disorders. A programme of additional summer activities aimed mainly at young people was funded and we set in train the appointment of facilitators to foster dialogue within and between communities.

- 3.6** In July we agreed to fund a programme of additional summer activities mainly aimed at young people. An extra £7 million was made available by the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) and the Home Office to help groups and individuals run additional summer activities. As a result 207 schemes covering all 9 regions in England, were supported during the summer at a total cost of £6.5 million. Over 200 000 mainly young people benefited. Additional activities, supported by the DTLR Activate programme, received the remaining £0.5 million.
- 3.7** Through the NRU we have appointed regional co-ordinators in all 9 of the GO regions in England. Their job is to deploy community facilitators in areas which are experiencing or are at risk of experiencing community conflict. 34 are already in place with more to come in the new year. Community facilitators are there to bring together local people and foster dialogue about local grievances or misunderstandings which are threatening good community relations. Their job is to prevent the growth of community resentments and encourage the search for positive solutions to local problems. They aim to create the space for people to discuss their differences and suggest positive ways forward which avoid confrontation.
- 3.8** Following the disturbances in Oldham, Bradford and Burnley a joint letter was sent from the DTLR and the Local Government Association (LGA) to all local authorities. The letter focused on good practice and short term measures that could be taken to prevent and deal with outbreaks of civil disorder. In September the LGA, together with the CRE, organised a round table conference which ministers attended, to build on their earlier initiative. They issued good practise guidance advising authorities how to deal with community tensions, following the terrorist attacks of September 11. They have organised a further meeting in December, at which they will consider the feedback from local authorities in key areas of employment, education, housing, health and social care, youth and young people. We welcome this approach as a positive example of partnership working to address national issues at a local level.

Medium and longer – term actions

High Quality Services

- 3.9** In this report we have looked at those factors directly contributing to community tensions and community cohesion. However, it is important to restate briefly the Government's commitment to delivering high quality public services to all. The importance of improving the quality of the environment in deprived parts of the town is referred to by Clarke and Ritchie in their reports. Education achievement is low in each of the areas affected by the most serious disturbances. The measures we outline here go alongside and supplement the measures already being taken to modernise and raise the standard of key public services.

Identity and Shared Values

- 3.10** Civic identity is important as a means to unite people and express common goals and aspirations of the whole community. A uniting identity can have a powerful effect in shaping attitudes and behaviour which are conducive to community cohesion. Shared values are essential to give people a common sense of belonging. The need to articulate a clear set of shared values around which

people from diverse backgrounds, faiths and cultural traditions can unite, has been brought into sharp focus by this summer's disorders and increased community tensions following the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington DC.

- 3.11** We recognise the importance of open and constructive debate about citizenship, civic identity, shared values, rights and responsibilities. It is only through having such a debate that we will have the basis for bringing together people of different races, cultures, and religions in a cohesive society and within cohesive communities. We intend that national Government should take the lead in promoting such a debate, and we hope that local government will also recognise the need for this dialogue to take place at a local level.
- 3.12** It will be important for Government to be clear about some key, but contentious issues in this debate. In an open liberal democracy, citizenship is founded on fundamental human rights and duties. The laws, rules and practices that govern our democracy, uphold our commitment to the equal worth and dignity of all our citizens. We must tackle head on racism and Islamophobia. It will sometimes be necessary to confront cultural practices that conflict with these basic values, such as those which deny women the right to participate as equal citizens. Similarly, it means ensuring that every individual has the wherewithal, such as the ability to speak English, to enable them to engage as active citizens in economic, social and political life. Common citizenship does not mean cultural uniformity. Our society is multicultural, and it is shaped by the interaction between people of diverse cultures. There is no single dominant and unchanging culture into which all must assimilate. The public realm is founded on negotiation and debate between competing viewpoints, at the same time as it upholds inviolable rights and duties. Citizenship means finding a common place for diverse cultures and beliefs, consistent with our core values.
- 3.13** The articulation of these common values will feed into the broader citizenship agenda, which remains a core plank of government's future social policy development. Ministers will provide a lead on this in the coming months. We will establish a Panel of people with relevant skills and experience from outside Government to work with the Ministerial Group in taking this forward. The Immigration, Asylum and Citizenship White Paper, due for publication in the New Year, will focus on promoting citizenship for those entering the country and those seeking naturalisation – including recognition of and adherence to fundamental rights and duties, and to English as our shared language.
- 3.14** On a local level, we will want to pilot this approach to building civic pride, and a sense of shared values, with key local authorities and in a small number of local communities, including those where disturbances occurred. Here, we will work to resolve conflict and reduce inter-community tensions, drawing on national and international experiences such as those in the USA and Northern Ireland, working with the recently appointed community facilitators.

Cohesion/Segregation

- 3.15** Our understanding of the reasons for communities becoming fractured and of the dynamics of segregation is still developing. We have begun a programme of work and research to give us a fuller understanding of the nature and scope of the problem.
- 3.16** While we cannot at present be sure of the full extent of segregation in Britain, there are a number of actions we can begin to take to tackle the negative effects of segregation, and the associated barriers to choice. **We propose that community cohesion should be made an explicit aim of Government at national and local levels.** To support this:
- cross-governmental working on community cohesion established over the last few months should continue, in order to develop coherent strategies to tackle barriers to choice, and promote mutual understanding and interaction within and between communities. It will also be important to consider how, in the future, relevant government policy might be assessed for its impact on community cohesion;
 - we will be looking to the Local Authorities in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham to publish their plans for promoting community cohesion by April 2002, and for all local authorities to consider community cohesion as part of their community development plans in the future; and
 - a research programme will be commissioned to give us a fuller understanding of segregation in this country. It will be important to better analyse existing data, new census data, and Neighbourhood Statistics to gather information on segregation.
- 3.17** We will need to establish how community cohesion might be measured in the future to establish both a baseline and to assess future progress. It is likely that local surveys to establish how people see and feel about their own community and locality will play an important role.
- 3.18** Government policy must promote cross-community relations wherever possible – through youth work, schools, health and social care provision, regeneration, culture and sport.

Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000

- 3.19** The changes made to the Race Relations Act 1976 by Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 provide a legislative framework through which to take forward the development of community cohesion. The obligations, which come into force in April 2002, impose a positive duty on public bodies to promote race equality that will provide a framework for analysing policy and for monitoring impact in all the main policy areas. The duty not only requires public bodies – such as Local Authorities, the police service, schools and hospitals – to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful race discrimination in performing their functions, but also to promote equality of opportunity and good relations between people from different racial groups.
- 3.20** The Act will also ensure that public services are provided in a way that is fair and accessible to all, irrespective of race or colour. The Government is committed to implementing and monitoring this crucial piece of legislation. We are working closely with the CRE, who launched the consultation for the draft code of practice on the 3 December. This code will provide practical guidance to

help public bodies comply with the general and specific duties imposed by the new legislation and will help to bring about real and positive change on the ground.

- 3.21** The Government is committed to diversifying the public sector workforce to ensure that it is truly representative of the multi-cultural communities it serves. The Home Secretary's employment targets cover the Home Office and its key services (including the police); the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 will require all public bodies to monitor their workforces by ethnicity and publish the outcomes annually. The Government is committed to outlaw discrimination in employment on grounds which include religion by December 2003, as required by the Article 13 EC Employment Directive.

Housing

- 3.22** Housing is a major determinant of the shape of communities. A decent home is crucial in improving the quality of people's lives. The Government believes that people should, wherever possible, be able to exercise meaningful choice over housing options, including the area in which they live. Choice may contribute to the concentration of people from one ethnic background in particular localities. This is not in itself a problem and there are many examples of successful communities in the UK and overseas that have high concentrations of residents from one ethnic background.
- 3.23** However there is clear evidence that concentrations of people from one ethnic background in certain areas of housing, and their separation from other groups living in adjacent areas has contributed significantly to inter-community tensions and conflict. We must therefore develop policies which ensure that individuals have real housing choices and ethnic groups are not concentrated in some of the worst housing stock through, for example, fear or discrimination.
- 3.24** Local authorities, as part of their strategic housing role, need to identify and plan for the improvement, renewal or replacement of unsatisfactory housing stock throughout their area. Resentment at perceived preferential treatment can contribute significantly to hostility between different groups of residents. It is essential that the needs of all neighbourhoods are understood and appropriate policies developed to ensure that housing conditions are improved in all areas where problems exist. There is still a need to prioritise, which is potentially divisive. A transparent prioritisation process undertaken on a fair and rational basis, with the needs of each and every section of the community properly taken into account, will reduce the potential for generating bitterness and conflict.
- 3.25** The Government published, on 23 November 2001, an Action Plan¹ for addressing the housing needs of black and ethnic minority people. For the first time the plan brings together the full range of housing policies and initiatives that tackle ethnic minority issues in housing. It contains over 70 specific action commitments ranging from assessing whether race issues are adequately treated in local authority housing strategies, through to allocations policy and new research for improving the evidence base on ethnic minority issues housing issues.

¹ 'Addressing the housing needs of Black and Minority Ethnic People: A DTLR (Housing Directorate) Action Plan', 23 November 2001.

- 3.26** The DTLR is piloting a new approach to local authority lettings which is designed to make the process more open and transparent, and to give applicants a more active role in the choice of home. Choice Based Lettings offer the opportunity to promote awareness of, and access to, local authority housing for groups whose take-up is low. One pilot study is in Bradford. The impacts of the pilots on ethnic minority issues communities will be carefully evaluated to assess whether the extension of choice benefits or disadvantages ethnic minority communities, and if the latter what the barriers are and how they might be overcome through scheme design or other means.
- 3.27** The DTLR is also encouraging local authorities to take a strategic approach to housing so that they identify needs better, plan more systematically, and work in concert with others. This will help make best use of the increased resources allocated to authorities and Registered Social Landlords. They are also improving their evidence base. This includes gathering feedback on ethnic minority issues satisfaction with housing, incorporating ethnic diversity across all aspects of the DTLR housing research programme, commissioning work on demographic change in relation to ethnicity and examining data from the 2001 Census.
- 3.28** Delivering improvements on the ground will critically depend on individual local authorities, individual housing associations and individual organisations in the field. The government is committed to ensuring that they have the necessary support to carry through their responsibilities, and will monitor progress.

Education

- 3.29** Education has a key part to play in building community cohesion based on tolerance, respect and understanding. The Government's overarching commitment to education, and to raising school standards, has already had real effect on the ground. The Secretary of State for Education's speech to the General Synod of the Church of England on 14 November signalled the Government's approach. The key messages, which are at the centre of policy in this area, were:
- inclusiveness at the heart of faith school policy;
 - partnership arrangements between schools;
 - schools as a community resource;
 - narrowing the achievement gap between different ethnic groups;
 - promoting community cohesion through post-16 education and training; and
 - more ethnic minority head teachers, teachers, governors and support staff in schools.
- 3.30** DfES have already introduced a number of policies that will help bring this about, and which could be adapted to address the specific problems found in fractured communities:
- encouraging schools with particular specialisms, such as Specialist schools or Beacon schools, to make partnerships with other schools and the wider community to share their expertise and resources;

- Excellence in Cities, a targeted programme of support delivered by local partnerships of schools and authorities working together to a common agenda. The programme is aimed at providing deprived inner city pupils with the same opportunities as their counterparts anywhere else in the country;
- a culture of improvement for all pupils and minimum achievement targets at GCSE for all maintained schools and local education authorities;
- various programmes to support learning in and out of school; and
- the citizenship programme of study which includes diversity of national, religious and ethnic identities and the need for mutual respect and understanding.

3.31 DfES will strengthen these policies specifically to address the issues raised here in the following ways:

- revised guidance for specialist schools to include specific examples of cross cultural activities between schools, and making it clear that proposals in this area would be welcomed;
- selecting two or three local education authorities to focus specifically on area-wide strategies to address segregation as Diversity Pathfinders;
- ensuring that when decisions are made on proposals for a new school (including faith schools) the potential for inclusiveness is a factor that will be taken into account;
- local education authorities will be expected to set local targets for narrowing the achievement gap between some ethnic minority groups and their peers;
- providing funding for partnerships between two or more schools for partnerships dedicated to cross-cultural issues;
- increasing the number of ethnic minority teachers, governors and support staff; and
- directing increased early education and childcare funding to the most disadvantaged areas, where new Neighbourhood Nurseries will be at the heart of the community and make particular contribution to closing the childcare gap.

3.32 The DfES has set out its vision for education for 14 – 19 year olds in the White Paper, *Schools: Delivering Success*², and will also take some specific measures to build community cohesion into post-16 education and training. These are:

- the duty on Learning and Skills Councils (LSC) to promote equality of opportunity between people from different racial groups in all its policies and provision, providing additional support where necessary for young people from ethnic minority backgrounds, should be reinforced through the LSC Grant letter and associated guidance documents;
- the DfES and LSC will continue to provide appropriate support for all forms of post-16 providers, including FE colleges, in respect of race equality issues and monitoring race equality performance, taking relevant action to address shortcomings;

² 'Schools: Delivering Success' White Paper, 5 September 2001

- the DfES and LSC will commission work involving local voluntary organisations and statutory bodies to devise local strategies for helping more people from ethnic minority groups back into learning;
- the LSC should ensure that in developing its new funding system for post 16 learning it takes full account of the additional cost of reaching out to harder to help young people and adults in disadvantaged groups;
- the ConneXions Service, which joins up the work of six government departments to deliver advice, guidance and access to personal development opportunities to all 13-19 year olds, will be available throughout England by 2003; and
- a three year promotional campaign will target young people from minority ethnic groups to encourage them to take up Modern Apprenticeships.

Community Leadership – Supporting Communities

- 3.33** Government has a key role to play in strengthening civic leadership and institutions. We need to be ready to offer support to local communities, local government, and other delivery partners before problems become acute. We also need to be able to identify emerging problems through better links with local authorities and local communities.

The Role of Local Government

- 3.34** Local Government is central to initiating and driving change at the local level. Communities everywhere face rapid changes to their economy, environment and social mix. The leaders of those communities have to adapt continually to such changes. The best councils anticipate change and respond accordingly. Shifts in economic activity are met by developing new foundations on which to build economic success. Changes in cultural mix are met by developing positive community relations strategies and promoting inclusiveness.
- 3.35** Councils are uniquely placed to respond to these rapid changes. The recent introduction of statutory community strategies, the broad new enabling powers to promote community well being, and the development of more efficient, transparent and accountable local governance will all strengthen councils' capacity to do so.
- 3.36** The Local Government White Paper will propose further measures to increase councils' democratic legitimacy and help them to develop responsive and accountable governance. It will announce steps to assist the development of effective local partnerships and provides councils with further powers to serve their communities. The introduction of a comprehensive performance management framework will ensure that councils deliver services to acceptable standards in all areas, and our deregulatory powers will give councils more room to respond effectively to local priorities.

Community Support Teams

- 3.37** The Ministerial Group and the DTLR have agreed a series of measures to provide a more strategic, coherent and timely response to communities where community relationships have broken down and/or local leadership needs support. Action is now being taken by the NRU

to develop a pool of people and a skills base that can be deployed flexibly and directly across a variety of institutions in areas at risk. They will form the Community Support Teams. These people will include senior personnel able to support and develop local political leadership to supplement the organisational and management capacity of key organisations such as Local Authorities and LSPs; and the provision of expert advice on for example housing and regeneration. It is intended to provide this support for a limited time with the aim of raising standards and transferring knowledge and skills to the area.

- 3.38** **NRU will develop packages of support along these lines initially in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham, in consultation with local agencies in these areas.** This will support the community facilitators already in place to foster dialogue and heal divisions between communities.

Role of the Government Offices (GOs)

- 3.39** We will retain the Regional Co-ordinator posts within GOs. Regional Co-ordinators will be responsible for building a longer-term strategic approach to the capacity building that began with community facilitators. In particular they will work to develop mediation, facilitation and conflict resolution skills within communities, foster community dialogue and advise on the development of representative community networks who can engage effectively with local decision makers.

- 3.40** The GOs form a key link between central government and local communities. They have given substantial resource and support to this work already, and are committed to ensuring that community issues remain embedded in their work across a range of programmes and partnerships. We will reinforce GOs to develop their role, and to ensure that they can play a more active role in supporting work on community cohesion and race. GO North West and GO Yorkshire and Humberside are committed to follow up action in Oldham, Burnley and Bradford, in conjunction with the respective Local Authorities and other delivery partners. Across the GO network the approach being developed involves:

- integrating the Home Office's Crime Reduction Teams, supporting the new community facilitator co-ordinators, and 'mainstreaming' crime reduction, race and cohesion priorities across the board;
- focusing activity under a range of different programmes so they mutually support community cohesion;
- ensuring that community cohesion issues are centre stage in their work with Local Strategic Partnerships;
- broadening the skills and experience they can deploy, through co-location and inward secondment of experts from a range of community backgrounds; and
- increased liaison with Regional Sports Boards.

Children and Young People

- 3.41** Young people were prominent in disturbances this summer. They and their concerns must be at the heart of national and local policy solutions. Cante, Clarke, Ritchie and Ouseley give a clear message that children and young people wish to grow up in an inclusive, mixed, society. We must ensure that policies encourage the interaction and re-engagement of children and young people from different faiths and cultures. This applies within the education system, other forms of youth provision, and to sport and cultural activity.
- 3.42** Earlier this year, the Government published a consultation document³ for a new overarching strategy that will set out a new vision for childhood and youth, and inclusive, dependable services. The strategy will be highly relevant to the challenges faced in rundown inner cities and towns. We have also launched a set of core principles which apply to central Government departments, to bring children and young people into the heart of policy making.
- 3.43** As part of the consultation on the strategy, the Children and Young People's Unit (CYPUP) is setting up small seminar discussions and workshops with local community groups, children and young people and key local service providers across England, with workshops in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham planned over the winter. These workshops will focus on community cohesion and how we can achieve it.
- 3.44** The LGA has agreed six commitments which aim to find new ways of tackling the issues that really matter to local people. One of these commitments, 'Supporting Children and their Families', is piloting new ways of joining up key services such as social care, leisure, education, community safety and health in six projects involving eight pathfinder local authorities. Over the next two years these innovative pilot schemes will be evaluated against a set of key performance indicators and, where successful in preventing family breakdown and tackling social problems such as school exclusions and youth offending, will be rolled out across other local authority areas. The pathfinder authorities will also be identifying any barriers to implementing more successful practices and engaging with central government in seeking ways to overcome any such obstacles.

Participation

- 3.45** The Government has recently published principles⁴ for participation by, and consultation with, young people in the development of all relevant government policy. Government departments will now develop proposals to foster participation in their policy formulation. The LGA is similarly promoting best practice in young people's involvement with local government.
- 3.46** The CYPUP has recently begun a programme working directly with young people, so that they can advise Government, political parties, the Media and the Electoral Commission on the best ways to re-engage young people in the formal democratic process, ensuring that more young people exercise their right to vote.

³ 'Building a Strategy for Children and Young People: Consultation Document', 21 November 2001 – CYPUP

⁴ 'Learning to Listen: Core Principles for the Involvement of Children and Young People', 2 November 2001 – CYPUP

Youth Services

- 3.47** Government is committed to rebuilding youth services and supporting the valuable contributions of the voluntary sector in this area. Concerns over funding, capacity, consistency and quality of youth services were all raised as important factors in the context of this summer's disturbances. Youth work interventions have demonstrated the value that they can add to young people's lives. DfES and the Home Office are working closely together to develop a government response to *Transforming Youth Work*, taking into consideration the findings of the cross-cutting Children at Risk spending review and the findings of Cante and the other reports. This work seeks to define what an 'adequate and sufficient' youth service should look like.
- 3.48** Government must ensure that youth service provision encourages mutual understanding and interaction between children from different communities. We propose that the provision of youth services is considered as part of the Spending Review 2002.
- 3.49** In the short term, work is now underway to develop and plan additional summer activities for summer 2002. £7m will be made available to fund these activities. It is expected that £5m will be allocated in December 2001 and the remaining £2m will be retained by Regional Co-ordination Unit to augment existing provision. This will be distributed by GOs.
- 3.50** The CYPU (in tandem with the Treasury) are co-ordinating a cross-cutting review of services to children at risk. As part of this they will consider longer-term provision of purposeful activity and summer programmes for young people.

Sport and Culture

- 3.51** Sporting and cultural opportunities can play an important part in re-engaging disaffected sections of the community, building shared social capital and grass roots leadership through improved cross-cultural interaction. DCMS work in this area includes:
- investing £7m in sports leadership awards to train 14-19 year olds to take a leadership role in their schools and communities. A consortium of 3 organisations will deliver the scheme including the British Sports Trust who this summer provided Junior Sports Leader and Community Sports Leader award training to mixed communities in Oldham in a scheme set up by Greater Manchester Police. The Youth Sport Trust, who manage the Sport MV scheme will also be a partner;
 - Sport England Active Community Development fund is working with groups whose participation levels in sport and physical activity are low, in particular Pakistanis and Bangladeshis;
 - Sporting Equals – a CRE/Sport England funded body set up to address racial inequalities in sport and new Racial Equality in Sport Charters are now being launched in Local Authorities as a result of Sporting Equals' work;
 - The Space for Sports and the Arts programme is providing up to £130m (£75m from the Treasury's Capital Modernisation Fund and £55m from the Lottery) towards improving sport and arts facilities in some 300 primary schools in deprived areas. As well as aiming to improve educational standards, Space for Sport and the Arts targets segregation and exclusion by making the new or renovated facilities open to the wider community;

- Creative Partnerships targets school children living in 16 deprived areas in England to provide them with exciting opportunities to experience the arts and creativity first hand. The partnership between schools, local authorities and a variety of creative organisations will benefit from £40m investment over the next two years; and
- The Museum and Gallery Education Programme (MGEP) consisting of 65 individual projects managed by the Campaign for Learning in Museums and Galleries (CLMG) and the Learning Circuit. An important aspect of this project was delivering cross cultural thematic educational experiences. The Programme represents a major commitment to the educational potential of museums and galleries by the DfES who have collaborated with DCMS. In November 2001, £1m further funding for educational work in museums and galleries was announced. The DfES also funds the Museums and Galleries. Lifelong Learning Initiative (MGLLI) – a series of demonstration projects exploring how cultural bodies can open up learning opportunities for adults.

Employment

- 3.52** The Department for Work and Pensions is committed to increasing the employment rate of people from ethnic minorities and to narrowing the gap with the overall employment rate, as well as building employment opportunities for those from all communities and backgrounds.
- 3.53** In order to tackle urban unemployment, Action Teams for Jobs work from outreach sites with people in living in disadvantaged neighborhoods. Where there are significant numbers of ethnic minority people, they often recruit staff from the community, work with local voluntary organisations and use their premises for outreach work.
- 3.54** Rebuilding run down local economies is key to the long term regeneration of disadvantaged neighbourhoods and the re-engagement of socially excluded people. Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) have considerable discretion to aid this process, in line with local circumstances. They have been given four objectives by the Government, all of which are relevant to the neighbourhoods under consideration here:
- promoting economic development and regionally based growth;
 - promoting social cohesion and sustainable development through integrated local regeneration programmes;
 - helping those without a job into work by promoting employment and enhancing the development of skill relevant to employment; and
 - promoting enterprise, innovation, increased productivity and competitiveness.

RDAs have been given a range of targets to deliver by 2004/05. These include working with Local Strategic Partnerships and other stake holders, to tackle poverty and social exclusion through promoting economic development in the most deprived areas by reducing deprivation by 10% in those wards which are currently in the bottom 20% of the Indices of Multiple Deprivation.

3.55 Centrally aggregated employment figures often hide significant pockets of extreme deprivation. The introduction of Neighbourhood Statistics should provide better information, including on employment, at a neighbourhood rather than ward level, and enable better targeting in the future. The collection of regular data on ethnicity is a matter of serious concern given that we are reliant on the 10 yearly census for any low level data – this means that we are currently in the position of having to use 1991 data. Improving this situation is a key priority for Neighbourhood Statistics.

3.56 Understanding the causes of disadvantage in the labour market, and what government can do to counter this, are clearly important. The PIU project, *Improving labour market achievements for ethnic minorities in British Society*, due to report in Summer of 2002, will be a major contribution to the development of a clear strategy. **It will build on existing work to address the causes of the differentials in labour market achievement, and make clear recommendations for future government action. The PIU study will pick up the issues raised by our work.**

Regeneration

3.57 The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal launched in January 2001 is the government's main vehicle for tackling the underlying causes of poverty and deprivation in communities experiencing conflict. The strategy aims to narrow the gap between the outcomes in deprived areas and the rest by harnessing the main programme expenditure of Government Departments, rather than relying on one-off regeneration spending.

3.58 The disturbances in the summer highlight gaps in the National Strategy which we have to address if it is to be successful in revitalising neighbourhoods and reducing deprivation in fractured communities. The main areas where we need to do more are:

- helping communities resolve their conflicts so that they can successfully engage with each other, local agencies, and decision makers so that all members of the community can participate in the renewal of their neighbourhoods;
- building strong and representative civic leadership and local institutions which can identify and deliver solutions to address the underlying causes of conflict and deprivation through the establishment of Community Support Teams (para 3.37 above refers);
- tackling longstanding inequalities in the standards of main services and levels of resources received by different ethnic groups; and
- encouraging better cross-community and cross-cultural co-operation.

This is an exceptionally challenging task, but we have already begun this work.

3.59 The National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal places a great deal of emphasis on the role of local agencies in deciding how to tackle the renewal of their area and distributing and prioritising funding. In the most deprived areas, new infrastructure and programmes are being introduced to achieve this:

- Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) will provide a single vehicle for bringing together public, private, voluntary and community sectors to develop and implement a comprehensive and strategic approach to renewing deprived communities in their area. It will fall to LSPs to prioritise and target expenditure accordingly and to justify these decisions as part of a local neighbourhood renewal strategy which meets the needs of all communities and neighbourhoods in the area;
- Neighbourhood Management will provide the infrastructure for this joined up approach to be repeated at a neighbourhood level, to enable local people to take a lead role in designing and delivering the renewal of their neighbourhood, with someone visibly taking responsibility at the sharp end;
- the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund will help kick start the bending of main programmes to address problems of deprivation;
- the Community Empowerment Fund will help develop the infrastructure for communities to engage more effectively with each other, with service providers and with the LSP. And the Community Chest will fund small grant schemes so that communities can run their own projects;
- the Neighbourhood and Street Wardens programmes will provide a visible and recognisable presence to deter crime and tackle low-level anti-social behaviour;
- a key priority for the Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) is to ensure that neighbourhood renewal both involves and benefits ethnic minorities. NRU is implementing an Action Plan which aims to ensure that every single aspect of the NRU's work is responsive to the needs of the black and minority ethnic community; and
- the National Strategy also contains many changes to main stream programmes that will have an impact in raising standards in many thousands of poor neighbourhoods – the key to tackling deprivation will be the improved use and targeting of core main programmes such as health housing and policing, which received substantial increases in the last spending review.

3.60 In addition, NRU will review its own funding mechanisms to ensure that there is transparency in both calculation of allocations and selection of areas. NRU will also build on their existing strategy to ensure genuine equality in terms of resources, participation and outcomes for all communities.

3.61 We know that the large number of Area Based Initiatives (ABIs) can lead to confusion, misunderstanding and duplication of effort on the ground. The Regional Co-ordination Unit (RCU) are reviewing the operation of ABIs, looking particularly at the options of merging or mainstreaming individual programmes and of pooling budgets at the local level. Effective LSPs will also be encouraged to make proposals for greater ABI flexibility to fit local circumstances.

3.62 It will, however, be important to retain some focus on area/geographically based targeting, so as not to compromise our ability to target resources at the most deprived areas. This is critical to our objective of narrowing the gap between the worst neighbourhoods and the rest. The National Strategy also contains many changes to main stream programmes which will have an impact in raising standards in many thousands of poor neighbourhoods – the key to tackling deprivation will be the improved use and targeting of core main programmes such as housing and policing, which received substantial increases in the last spending review.

- 3.63** Critically, NRU will make community cohesion a central objective of all its programmes. This will mean fine tuning tools such as neighbourhood management, neighbourhood wardens and the development of community networks, to ensure that they are able to help resolve issues around community conflict and that they reach out to, and fully involve, parts of the community that are often excluded, such as young people and some ethnic minority communities.
- 3.64** It will also mean positively using all available opportunities to promote cross-community and cross-cultural experience. For example, by encouraging the development of cross-community projects as part of NRU programmes, and working with the CRE to ensure that appropriate infrastructures, such as Race Equality Councils, are in place.

Activities of Extremist Groups

- 3.65** It is the responsibility of the mainstream democratic parties to respond to far right organisations through the electoral process. **But we believe it is important that Government also takes the necessary measures to prevent disorder arising from the activities of far right organisations.**
- 3.66** The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) is identifying best practice in responding to rumoured or actual activities that may be triggers for disorders. The Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Bill will make incitement to religious hatred an offence, tackling a loophole which had widely been seen as enabling extremist organisations to target the Muslim community in ways that racial hatred legislation would not tolerate for Jews. It will also expand racially aggravated offences introduced in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 to cover offences aggravated by religious hostility.

Tackling Crime and Disorder

Local Partnerships

- 3.67** Reducing levels of crime and anti-social behaviour are important in the creation of cohesive communities. Fear of crime restricts the lives of individuals and may reduce the opportunities for people from different communities to meet, socialise and work together. The police must have the confidence of all sections of the community, not just in meeting the needs of a diverse community but in their effectiveness in tackling crime and disorder. This confidence is a basic requirement of cohesive communities that are working together to tackle crime.
- 3.68** Effective Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships are not only about helping to reduce crime and the fear of crime: they should also be a means of creating public understanding of, and confidence in, the way in which crime and anti-social behaviour will be tackled, communities will be policed and the important role local people and communities have in supporting the police.
- 3.69** The Police Reform White Paper⁵ published on 5th December stressed the importance of involving voluntary and community organisations in the work of Crime and Disorder Partnerships

⁵ 'Policing a New Century: A Blueprint for Reform' CM 5326.

and consultation on local policing plans. Regional Crime Reduction Directors will offer particular support to the development of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships in those areas where the fragmentation of communities has made the formation of effective partnerships difficult.

Wider Policing Issues

- 3.70** Police reform will improve the quality of community policing, visibility and accessibility, and enable the police to work closely with additional Specials and accredited community safety organisations such as Neighbourhood Wardens.
- 3.71** The Crime Fighting Fund for police recruitment is achieving a significant increase in ethnic minority recruitment as the police work towards the targets set for the recruitment, retention and progression of ethnic minority staff. Following the Stephen Lawrence enquiry, the police will continue to implement agreed measures on the handling of racist incidents, stop and search, and improved community and race relations training.
- 3.72** ACPO have published a manual on hate crime which draws together good practice as a benchmark for further action. Best practice in policing diverse communities has already been identified by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary. The new Home Office Police Standards Unit, will work with the HMIC and the police service to support best practice in all areas.
- 3.73** Policing deeply fragmented communities poses particular challenges and the Standards Unit and the HMIC will do further work to develop good practice advice and ensure that it is followed. Both Bradford and Stoke are amongst the pilot Policing Priority Areas announced in the Police Reform White Paper and Bradford has recently been awarded a street warden scheme.
- 3.74** The police response to racist attacks and incidents, and the policing of drug dealing, have both been identified as issues of concern in the towns that experienced disorder. It is important that the police service pay particular attention to these issues and ensures that local communities understand how these issues are being tackled. More generally, good practice in effective consultation can promote public confidence and tackle perceptions that the police response favours particular areas or communities. The need for effective dialogues and consultation with communities has been acknowledged. ACPO, together with the Home Office, are developing good practice guidance for community consultation.
- 3.75** The National Operations Faculty are producing a good practice guide on policing urban disorder, which will take account of the lessons learned from this summer's disorder. This will cover appropriate use of public order legislation to ban marches; activities of extremist organisations, and the policing of the disturbances. As a first step towards the production of the guidance, a seminar involving all forces affected by the summer disorders and a number of others was held by ACPO on 17 September and a full report of the proceedings has been circulated to forces.
- 3.76** The campaign to recruit more special constables will both increase reassurance and provide an opportunity to increase participation of ethnic minorities. In conjunction with this, measures to recruit additional ethnic minority staff, will make an important contribution to community cohesion.

Chapter 4

Next steps

- 4.1** Government cannot create or impose community cohesion. It is something that communities must do themselves with Government's help as enabler and supporter. The Actions we set out in the previous Chapter should be viewed in that light. They will only succeed in making a real difference if communities are fully engaged in, and take responsibility for, the task of civil renewal.

We have acknowledged our role in taking this forward and we will:

- maintain the inter-departmental Ministerial Group to drive further work on community cohesion and ensure continued cross-departmental working;
 - establish a Community Cohesion Panel, involving people with relevant skills and experience from outside government, to work with the Ministerial Group on policy issues and help deliver the Community Cohesion Agenda – in line with Cante's recommendation to establish a task force.
 - ensure that the Spending Review 2002 is informed by the issues raised in this report and the further work of the Community Cohesion Panel.
- 4.2** The processes, which have led to communities becoming increasingly fractured and polarised, are complex. Reversing them will not be easy. It will require courage in tackling the intrinsically difficult and controversial issues of social identity and values on which cohesion depends.
- 4.3** The wider debate we propose should involve all sections of the community. But within that we agree with Cante that it will be particularly important to reach out to young people. Their voice, as the future of our communities and society, needs to be heard and acted on. So too women whose voice has not, as Cante and Ritchie both note, been sufficiently prominent.
- 4.4** Given the overlapping timetables for our work and that of Cante we have not sought in this report to respond in detail to everything in their report. Many of their recommendations are addressed to local level rather than Government. Most of the key recommendations addressed to Government have, we believe, been reflected in our proposals. We will ensure that those which are not covered by our proposals are fully considered and given a timely response. We will do likewise in respect of any recommendations addressed to the Government by Clarke and Ritchie which are not covered by our proposals in Chapter 3.

Annex 1

Glossary

ABI	Area Based Initiative
ACPO	Association of Chief Police Officers
BME	Black and Minority Ethnic
BNP	British National Party
BURA	British Urban Regeneration Association
CRE	Commission for Racial Equality
CYPU	Children and Young People's Unit
DCMS	Department for Culture, Media and Sport
DfES	Department for Employment and Skills
DTLR	Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions
DWP	Department for Work and Pensions
GO's	Government Offices
HMIC	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
HO	Home Office
LA's	Local Authorities
LCS	Learning Skills Council
LGA	Local Government Association
LSP's	Local Strategic Partnerships
NRU	Neighbourhood Renewal Unit
ONS	Office of National Statistics
PIU	Performance and Innovation Unit
RCU	Regional Co-ordination Unit
RDA	Regional Development Agency
TTA	Teacher Training Agency
YJB	Youth Justice Board

Annex 2

Ministerial Group on Public Order & Community Cohesion

Purpose

The Inter-departmental Ministerial Group chaired by John Denham, announced in the Home Secretary's Statement to the House of Commons on the 10 July 2001, was asked to report on action to minimise the threat of further disorder and build strong, more cohesive, communities.

Scope

The overall responsibility for the Ministerial Group was to gain agreement and support of cross-Government colleagues for the work programme including the medium to longer term issues and to determine the role of the Review Team.

Members

John Denham MP (Chair)

Angela Eagle MP

Bob Ainsworth MP

Nick Raynsford MP

Ivan Lewis MP

Barbara Roche MP

Richard Caborn MP

John Gieve

– Permanent Secretary, Home Office

Gurbux Singh

– Chairman, Commission for Racial Equality

Justin Russell

– No 10 Policy Unit