Incompetent or just racist?

By Simon Holdaway

The Inquiry into the police investigation of Stephen Lawrence’s murder has ended its first session of hearings. The second session will move from the police investigation to policy reform, specifically the reform of policies related to the policing of racial attacks.

If the Inquiry team restricts itself to this narrow field of police work they will neglect the critical and, in my view, historic opportunity now before them. It is simply not possible or desirable to separate the particular investigation of the Lawrence murder, or the response to racial attacks, from contemporary police work in general and the wider reform of the police.

Race relations are a litmus test for the competence of policing itself, not just the policing of ethnic minorities. This has been the case in North America, South Africa, Northern Ireland, England and many other societies.

The Inquiry team therefore has precious little room for manoeuvre. Recommendations for reform must be sharp and brave, which means that their understanding of police race relations must be equally sharp.

“What’s hopelessly incompetent (better than horribly racist)” This was how the Observer (31.5.98) described Detective Chief Superintendent Brain Weedon, officer in charge of the investigation of the murder of Stephen Lawrence. Weedon was either incompetent or racist.

Here lies a misunderstanding of the ways in which ‘race’ is manifest in relationships between the police and ethnic minorities, which risks distorting the findings of the ‘Lawrence Inquiry’. The inquiry will lead to a cul-de-sac if it analyses the murder investigation in terms of individual officers as racists, as a few rotten apples who have tainted the barrel of policing. It will lead to a cul-de-sac if it describes the Metropolitan Police, and thereby its officers, as straightforward part of a racist police (presumably in a racist society). The notion of a racist police is usually little more than rhetoric, a vista floating somewhere (rarely on terra firma), capturing the ideas and action of societies, institutions, organisations and individuals, so general and diffuse that it fails to provide an adequate handle on practical reform.

The central task of the Inquiry is to resist either form of analysis. They must identify clearly the ways in which ‘race’ is apparent within policing, and how relationships between officers and ethnic minorities are sustained within the routine, day to day world of policing. Without a finely grained analysis of the day-to-day world of police work, not least the occupational culture of the police, there cannot be an adequate understanding of the incredible catalogue of errors culminating in the Lawrence Inquiry.

What are the findings of the Inquiry so far?

1. The pertinence of race
The evidence presented to the Inquiry documents officers’ complete misunderstanding and, at times, seemingly wilful neglect of how ‘race’ enters into their mundane relationships with black people. Officers did not look at the Lawrence family and decide “We will discriminate on the grounds of their being black” as much as fail to realise the special difficulties the family faced, their perception of the police, the needs of black people and, crucially, the action needed to take such views into account. Stereotypical views of black people entered the investigation but, essentially, race was neglected. The result was calamitous.

2. Defining racial attacks
It is clear that none of the officers involved in the murder investigation had a clue about the police definition of a racial attack or appropriate action following its use. The
definition was agreed by the Home Office and the Association of Chief Police Officers in 1985 (yes, 1985) but, despite claims to managerial competence, it has not been embedded into officers’ routine work. The distinction between police policy as it is written and police policy in action remains as potent as ever. Relationships between black people (and members of other ethnic minorities) and the police have been and in the future will be damaged if chief officers do not learn how to translate policy into action.

3. Management and accountability
This evident failure of police management, despite all the claims of managerial competence to which the senior ranks of the Met have laid claim for many years, points to the key issue of the accountability of the Commissioner and his staff. It points directly to the ineffectiveness of the management of the Met. T he Inquiry has heard about a failure to implement the fundamental definition of a racial incident within the Met, and so many other policies have been shown to be little more than words on paper. Worse still, against the evidence that must have been available to him about five years ago, the Commissioner failed to admit that his officers were lacking. When it was clear finally that they had failed, he sent his Assistant Commissioner to the Inquiry to apologise to the Lawrence family. That apology was wholly inadequate because it was indeed too late. Why did he not act to reform his force as soon as he read the Police Complaints Authority report about the investigation into Stephen Lawrence’s murder? Why did he allow the Lawrence family to suffer for so many years, denying his officers had done anything fundamentally wrong, prolonging the dreadful hurt the victims of the crime experienced? We cannot allow the Commissioner to remain so aloof. It is more than difficult to see how he or his Assistant Commissioner can hold the Home Secretary’s confidence, or the confidence of a large section of the population of London. They should do the honourable thing and resign.

Her Majesty’s Inspectorate should conduct regular, special inspections on the Met and other forces - they must. They need strong disciplinary powers to ensure that policy is implemented and their findings must be made public. Public trust in the Met and, by implication, constabularies policing our metropolitan centres has to be regained.

4. Listen
Listen to victims and to members of ethnic minority groups. Officers did not treat Duwayne Brooks, Stephen Lawrence’s friend, who was with him when he was murdered, as a victim, likely to have been traumatised by the terrible events he had witnessed. They questioned him repeatedly about the reasons for his presence at the site of the murder - regarded in stereotypical rather than human terms. If Brooks was treated like this, how much easier for officers to regard black communities and other minority ethnic groups in stereotypical terms - criminalising, marginalising and devaluing their status and rights as citizens. Ways have to be found for the police to listen to black people. That is not easy because not all voices are sincere, in tune with wider sympathies or constructive in any sense. Maybe the Commissioner could start by listening more carefully to his own black officers. There is evidence that he is failing to do that. From there he should develop a sensitivity and response that moves from his own ranks out, into the communities.

5. The occupational culture of policing
Whatever chief police officers may say about organisational change within their constabularies, the occupational culture of the rank and file and, we now know, of senior officers is not conducive to the fostering of harmonious relationships between officers and ethnic minorities. This has been pointed out time and time again. Last year, in this bulletin, I wrote about the ways in which my report about the resignation of black and Asian officers from the police service had been frustrated by some chief constables and by the Met Office. The argument was that the occupational culture was now being tackled effectively. Not so. The Lawrence case, not least the verbal evidence of officers at the Inquiry, demonstrates that the occupational culture is alive and well, well enough to sustain negative relations with ethnic minorities. And thinking about how to change the culture of policing will have to be undertaken and real monitoring of change must be sustained.

6. The success of research
Academics who study the police and race relations have not always been popular with chief officers. T he Lawrence case vindicates what they have told chief officers clearly for more than two decades. The ‘rotten apples’ argument was challenged over twenty years ago. Chiefs were informed about the occupational culture over twenty years ago. Chiefs must learn to listen more purposefully, not least the Commissioner and his senior command.

Once again, race relations has acted as a litmus test for the British police. The Met has failed its black communities miserably. It will take enormous effort and commitment to regain the public confidence they have lost. The police cannot now be allowed to put their own house in order - they have said they have done so, and been found wanting in the most terrible of circumstances.

Simon Holdaway is Professor of Sociology at Sheffield University. He is a former police officer and has published extensively on many aspects of policing, especially the issue of race relations.
Key Evidence at Lawrence Inquiry

The first part of the Public Inquiry into the death of Stephen Lawrence came to an end on Friday 17 July. For 56 days over four months the Inquiry tried to piece together the events surrounding the fatal stabbing and why there are no successful convictions for the racist murder. Below we summarise some of the key evidence presented to the Inquiry as reported in the daily press.

Stephen Lawrence was killed by a gang of white youths at a bus stop in Eltham, southeast London, on 22 April 1993. He was waiting for a bus with his friend Duwayne Brooks. Just before Stephen was attacked one of the youths was heard to shout “What? What? Nigger!” They then charged across the road and stabbed Stephen twice and left him to bleed to death. Five men have been suspected of his murder - David Norris, 21, Neil Acourt, 22, his brother Jamie, 21, Luke Knight, 20, and Gary Dobson, 22. All five were arrested and charged two weeks later but the charges were dropped due to insufficient evidence. Neil Acourt, Dobson and Knight were charged with Stephen’s murder in a private prosecution brought by the family and were acquitted at the Old Bailey in 1996. Once prosecution brought by the family and were charged with Stephen’s murder in a private prosecution brought by the family and were acquitted at the Old Bailey in 1996. Once

Chronology of the Stephen Lawrence case
22 April 1993: Stephen’s death.
22 April 1993: “First” investigation into Stephen’s death starts.
7 May 1993: Five arrested.
16 August 1993 - 3 November 1993: Review by Detective Chief Superintendent Barker of the investigation.
15 December 1997: PCA publish a highly critical report.
2 May 1997: Family ask the Home Secretary, Jack Straw for a Judicial Inquiry.
31 July 1997: Public Inquiry announced.

The Inquiry’s Terms of Reference
On 31 July 1997, the Home Secretary announced an Inquiry established under Section 49 of the Police Act 1996, the first time such powers had been used since the Scarman

Lawrence Inquiry: formerly accused leaving the Inquiry

23 March
Opening speeches by lawyers representing the Inquiry, the Lawrence family and the Metropolitan Police.

25 March
In a statement to the Inquiry, Mrs Lawrence says that the family were treated with disdain and were kept in the dark about the investigation into her son’s death. She says that a senior police officer, Detective Chief Superintendent William Iisley, was handed a list of suspects compiled by the family which he screwed up into a ball before their eyes.

Constable Linda Bethel, one of the first officers on the scene tells the inquiry that she did not know that Stephen had been stabbed until three hours later.

26 March
Conor Taaffe and his wife Louise who prayed beside Stephen as he lay dying in a pool of blood, tell the Inquiry of his last moments. Stephen’s friend and companion, Duwayne Brooks, had told the Taaffes that he thought Stephen had been hit with an iron bar.

PC Anthony Gleason denies failing to pass on Duwayne’s description of the killers to his colleagues working on the case in the vital minutes after the murder.

27 March
The legal team representing the Lawrences accuses Sergeant Nigel Clement of lying about his actions on the night of the murder. Mr Clement is alleged to have invented his attendance at the murder scene and that his claim to have made a thorough search for the sus-
perts was false. Mr Clement denies this.

Two sisters who live opposite the murder scene say that the police did not take a statement from them. Helen Avery, then 14 and trained in first aid, says that she and her stepfather offered to treat Stephen but were refused by police.

30 March
In a statement read out to the Inquiry, Neville Lawrence says that his family had heard from a woman who visited their home that three of the suspects had washed blood off themselves in her house on the night of the murder. This information was passed to the police, he says. Mr Lawrence voiced his deep unhappiness about the way the family had been treated by the police.

31 March
Mandy Lavin, a night services manager at Brook Hospital, describes her “unease” at the police approach to black victims of violence. Constable Michael Pinecoffin, admits he did not make any notes of conversations with local residents on the night of the murder.

1 April
Sergeant Andrew Hodges, a member of the Territorial Support unit, says that a car full of white youths “laughing and joking” had driven past Stephen’s body as it lay on the road. The details of the Y-reg Vauxhall Astra were radioed to police but it was not stopped until more than a week later. The occupants - Daniel Copley and Jason Goatley - have since been convicted of offences connected with the murder.

Inspector Steven Grover denies that he is racist. He did not give first aid to Stephen because others appeared to be doing so. It was not because he did not want to get his hands “dirty with a black man's blood”.

6 April
Chief Superintendent Christopher Benn, the most senior officer at the scene on the night of the murder, says he did not consult intelligence records for information about the suspects. Detective Constable Stephen Pye tells the Inquiry that a house-to-house search was aimed at finding witnesses rather than the suspects and admits that nothing was achieved that night.

8 April
Detective Inspector Phillip Jeynes, who retired from the Met October 1997, admits that the police had enough evidence to arrest the suspects within three days. He says that the police received phone calls from the public naming the five youths and found an anonymous note in a phone box pointing to the suspects’ involvement, and a man came personally to Eltham police station saying they should be investigated.

20 April
Jeremy Gompertz QC, representing the police at the Inquiry says that Sir Paul Condon was concerned that police officers called at the inquiry were being treated unfairly and there was a danger of further damage to race relations.

21 April
Detective Sergeant David Kirkpatrick tells the Inquiry that knives, a sword and an air gun were found at Neil and Jamie Acourt’s home during the arrests two weeks after the killing. He says that with hindsight he did not know why the search was not ordered within days but after speaking to an expert at Scotland Yard, he was told it was too late to be any good anyway. In 1993 he was asked to go to one identity parade but refused to go to others because he did not have a mobile phone. The bags could have contained blood stained clothing.

23 April
Civilian police photographer Peter Finch says that he watched as two men carried black plastic bags from a house under surveillance on consecutive days but could do nothing because he did not have a mobile phone. The bags could have contained blood stained clothing.

Detective Stephen Knight, leader of the surveillance team, tells the inquiry that he was the only person to carry a mobile phone but that he had not started work on the case until five days after the murder because he had been on annual leave.

27 April
Retired Detective Sergeant John Davidson tells the Inquiry that the murder was not racially motivated within the official definition because one of the youths, David Norris, was also suspected of attacks against white victims. He says “This was not racism, this was pure, bloody-minded thuggery. Stephen would have been killed had he been black, white, green, blue or yellow. They picked on him because he was there, not for any other reason.” The inquiry hears that Mr Davidson failed to take evidence from vital witnesses. He admits that “good potential evidence” had been lost.

28 April
Detective Constable Chris Budgen admits that the killers might have been caught if the suspects were arrested earlier. He accepts that police liaison had been a failure, with the family viewing officers with deep mistrust in a few days of the murder. He says that Mrs Lawrence “adopted an aggressive stance” and did not “smile at him when he visited the house”. This was the first in a series of statements from police officers putting the blame of the breakdown for liaisons on Mr and Mrs Lawrence and their solicitor.

30 April
Roy Westbrook, who witnessed Stephen’s murder, says that he was not asked to provide an artist’s impression until five years afterwards. In March 1998 he was asked to create an E-fit (a computer-enhanced impression) but after speaking to an expert at Scotland Yard, he was told it was too late to be any good anyway. In 1993 he was asked to go to identity parades but left after being kept waiting at the police station for nine hours. Another witness, Joseph Shepherd, went to one identity parade but refused to go to others after an inspector called out his name in a way that the suspects of the murder could hear it and so identify Mr Shepard.

6 May
Detective Constable Linda Holden, assigned to liaise with the bereaved parents, denies hinting that their son was a cat burglar and member of a gang.

7 May
Detective Sergeant Christopher Crowley is accused of deliberately undermining the murder investigation, leading to a collapse of the
private prosecution brought by the Lawrence family. The inquiry hears that the case was abandoned after the trial judge ruled out identification evidence by Duwayne Brooks. D S Crowley's account of a conversation with Duwayne after an identification parade is a crucial factor that led to the judge's decision. He claims that Duwayne told him that friends had primed him to pick out a suspect.

13 May
Ian Crampton, a former Detective Superintendent until his retirement, admits that he could have arrested the suspects within 48 hours. He says that vital tip-offs about the suspects were not passed on to key detectives meeting 24 hours after the killing.

15 May
Stephen's friend Duwayne Brooks tells the Inquiry that Stephen was not aware of the dangers of being in a racist area at night time. He says that a group of white youths surrounded Stephen and struck him. Mr Brooks says that the police repeatedly disbelieved his account and never considered him to be a victim or a witness in need of protection. He says, "Racist thugs killed Stephen and shattered my life."

18 May
Detective Inspector Benjamin Bullock, second in command of the murder investigation, says that he believed local teenagers had been threatened by associates of Clifford Norris. He tells the Inquiry: "It came to my notice on one occasion that there were people going around, warning off people in general on the estate. I believe they were connected with the Norris father, but I have no direct evidence of it."

Mr Bullock, who is expected to retire next year, also claims witnesses were deterred from talking to the police because of the media's "undue emphasis on the racist nature of the attack."

The Inquiry is also told that Detective Superintendent Bill Mellish, the senior officer who took over the Lawrence investigation in July 1994, gave DI Bullock "a damning professional appraisal". Detective Superintendent Mellish told a Police Complaints Authority team last year that he found a "dispirited and negative team" working in a "dreadful environment". "I cannot recall one innovative or positive strategy emanating from DI Bullock."

26 May
Former Detective Superintendent Brian Weeden, who had been in charge of the inquiry for 18 months, admits that he did not see Stephen's parents until more than a year after he was killed. On the breakdown of the relationships, he says the family should accept some of the blame. He says he wrote to them early on requesting a meeting and inviting them to the incident room. Mr Weeden adds that the family had never received the letter. Mr Weeden admits that when he made the arrests, he made no arrangements to inform the family beforehand. Stephen's parents found out about developments from television and radio news.

Mr Weeden also admits he could have solved the murder "within an hour" but that his investigation was riddled with errors. He also admits that it was recently - after receiving legal advice - that he realised that he could retain suspects as soon as he had "reasonable grounds for belief."

1 June
Detective Sergeant Peter Flook, who was office manager of the incident room set up to deal with the racist murder, apologises to the family and their lawyers over claims that they had hindered the investigation. The Inquiry hears that the five white youths alleged to have stabbed Stephen in April 1993 were named by numerous informants in the first 48 hours, but they were not arrested for at least a fortnight. Mr Flook, now retired, withdraws claims that Mr Khan, the Lawrence family's solicitor, had "pestered" the investigation team and hindered its efforts to find the killers.

8 June
The senior officer who wrote the internal police review of the investigations into the murder is dismissed as an unreliable witness. William Macpherson says that the report written by Chief Superintendent Roderick Barker is "indestructible."

10 June
The former Deputy Assistant Commissioner says that the Metropolitan Police could have sued Neville Lawrence for accusing them of racism. D avid O sland, who is now retired and is a Conservative councillor, says that many of the officers involved in the Inquiry became ill as a result of the allegations of racism. In September 1993, five months after Stephen's death he wrote a memo to Sir Paul Condon saying that his patience with the Lawrence family and their representatives was "wearing thin."

11 June
Doreen Lawrence accuses the police of racism and says that the family were treated as if they were little more than obstacles to the murder investigation. She says: "What went wrong? Something did. Their [the police officers'] attitude tells me it was racism. The police were not interested in keeping us informed about the investigation. We were simply regarded as irritants."

Giving his evidence, Neville Lawrence says that it is like a "knife in my stomach to know that we are here five years later, still talking about the death of my son, and no one has paid for it."

17 June
The Metropolitan Police Commissioner, Sir Paul Condon, makes an apology to Stephen's parents for failing to bring his killers to justice. His message is delivered by Assistant Commissioner Ian Johnson. He tells the family: "We have let you down. We could have and should have done better. On behalf of myself and the Commissioner, who specifically asked me to associate himself with these words, and the whole of the Metropolitan Police, I offer my sincere and deep apologies to you."

He continues: "Mr Lawrence, I want to say to you that we have let you down. It has been a tragedy for you. You have lost a son and not seen his killers brought to justice."

"It has been a tragedy for the Metropolitan Police, who have lost the confidence of a significant section of the community for the way we handled the case. I cannot understand and explain some of what went wrong. I cannot and do not seek to justify it." Mr Johnson also apologises for his obstinacy over the years in refusing to acknowledge mistakes in the way the original investigation was conducted.

18 June
Lord Justice Simon Brown dismisses a judicial review application by four of the five suspects to challenge a summons to attend the public inquiry. However, Lord Justice Brown says that the five may not be asked whether they killed Stephen.

22 June
It was reported that in a letter in Police Review, Sergeant Mike Bennett, chairman of the Metropolitan Police Federation, says that the hearing was undermining race relations, exactly as the "militants and agitators" involved wanted.

29 June
The testimony of the five white youths begins with Jamie Acourt denying either being a racist or carrying knives. Sir William Macpherson warns him against committing perjury. Acourt becomes taciturn and hostile. He admits he has been caught carrying knives by the police and prison warders but insists he cannot remember a police surveillance video of his brother Neil and the other suspects which showed them using racist language and talking about shooting black people, skinning
The Norris link

The Inquiry heard allegations that Clifford Norris, a notorious London criminal, may have had an influence on the police investigation through a corrupt relationship with officers. One officer, Detective Sergeant David Coles, of the Flying Squad was observed meeting Clifford Norris in a pub in Kent. Coles’s told a police disciplinary hearing in 1994 that he was cultivating Norris as an informant, but investigators concluded that there was a much closer relationship than he was prepared to admit. Mr Coles was serving under Ian Crampton, the detective superintendent who later led the Lawrence investigation for the first three days. Mr Coles was also one of the officers assigned to guard Duwayne Brooks, the main witness to Stephen’s murder, when he gave evidence at the Old Bailey in the private prosecution.

them and setting them alight. His brother Neil also denies remembering the details. He says he was angry at being accused of Stephen’s murder and has been “persecuted” ever since. Fear of attack had forced him to start carrying a knife for protection, he says.

David Norris says there was no evidence whatsoever against him. He denies knowing that his father Clifford had tried to influence another criminal trial through bribery and jury nobbling. He admits that he had been arrested for the stabbing of Stacy Benefield in May 1993, for which he was later acquitted. Michael Mansfield QC for Mr and Mrs Lawrence put it to Norris that his father had given Benefield £2,000 before the trial to change his evidence with a further £5,000 promised later. He says that the jury foreman who was at the time on bail for dishonestly handling £23,000 and later convicted, offered David Norris a job.

Mr Mansfield also urges Norris’s mother Teresa not to influence his answers. She could be seen shaking and nodding her head.

The Inquiry breaks into chaos after members of the Nation of Islam force their way into the room where the hearing is being conducted. During the upheaval police spray CS gas on the people waiting to come into the Inquiry. One member of the group, wearing a transmitter, walks into the hearing shouting: “This is a sham. You are stopping the people from coming into the Inquiry.” To the Lawrence family he shouts: “You have got to stand firm, brothers. Slavery is over.”

There is a crowd disturbance outside. A Metropolitan police spokesman says CS gas has been sprayed by one officer after two officers were knocked to the ground and were kicked. Lee Jasper, chairman of the National Black People’s Alliance, says: “There was an obstruction, but it was peaceful. It [the CS gas] was completely avoidable.”

30 June

Both Luke Knight and Gary Dobson insist that the extreme racist language used by them and captured on a police surveillance video was due to “immaturity”. Knight praises Enoch Powell for warning that black immigrants would “ruin the gaff”. He insists that he no longer uses racist language and denies provocative behaviour as he left the inquiry. Mr Mansfield says: “You shouted out as you left the premises ‘black bastards’ didn’t you?”

Asked about the image of one of the youths brandishing a knife in the video, Knight says they had been mucking about out of boredom.

Gary Dobson, who regularly uses the word ‘nigger’ on the video, says: “It was all mindless humour. I am not a racist.”

As the men leave on the second day of their evidence youths throw bottles and cans at police who stand behind riot shields. The men issue a hand-written statement. It reads: “In 1993 we were all arrested for the murder of Steven (sic) Lawrence, which we all vehemently deny. We sympathise with Mr and Mrs Lawrence and their tragic loss of their son. We understand their quest to discover what happened to their son and why no one has been convicted of his murder. Our lives have changed for ever - we will fight these accusations until we are satisfied that our names have been cleared.”

1 July

A former Assistant Chief Crown Prosecutor (now retired) says he asked the Lawrence family not to undertake a private prosecution in case it failed and stopped the men suspected of the murder of their son Stephen being tried again. Howard Youngerwood says that no competent criminal lawyer could have contemplated proceeding with the case in July 1993 three months after the killing because of the lack of hard evidence. Mr Youngerwood says that he had been led to believe that there was little possibility of prosecuting the suspects. He says that any attempt to try the other two suspects, Jamie Acourt and David Norris, would be problematic because they could argue that widespread publicity meant they would not receive a fair trial.

16 July

Commander Raymond Adams, who went on permanent sick leave shortly after becoming involved in the investigation, tells the Inquiry that he was not corrupt. He had given the task of arranging liaison between the police and the Lawrence family, but denied knowing the identity of the five murder suspects until four years after the initial investigation. He admits meeting a senior officer from Scotland Yard to discuss the parameters of his answers to the Inquiry in a pub in June 1998. At first, he denies knowing the name of the officer or the name of the pub and its exact location, but later recalls the details. He denies that he had met Clifford Norris.

17 July

Imran Khan, the solicitor for the parents of Stephen Lawrence, tells the inquiry that he regrets not being firmer with the police. Mr Khan, the 88th and final witness to give evidence, had been accused by several police officers involved with the murder case of hindering their efforts to catch the killers by his persistent demands on behalf of the Lawrence family for information about the progress of the murder hunt.

The Inquiry is told that Metropolitan Commissioner, Sir Paul Condon and Clifford Norris, the father of one of the suspects, David Norris will not be called. Clifford Norris is serving nine and a half years in prison on drugs and arms charges. Consideration was also given to calling a young man who saw the murder, and an informer given the pseudonym James Grant, who provided police with names of four suspects the day after the killing (Reports taken from various newspapers including the Guardian, Independent, Daily Telegraph and Daily Mail).

Part 2 of the Inquiry - September to December 1998

Part 2 of the Inquiry will focus on the lessons to be learned for the investigation and prosecution of racially motivated crimes. The closing date for written submissions was 31 July. Public hearings, at which interested organisations and individuals may make oral submissions on the lessons to be learnt will be held at the end of September.

Detective to lead race reform

One of Scotland Yard’s most experienced detectives has been appointed to shake up the Metropolitan Police’s investigation into racist and violent crime in the wake of the shortcomings revealed by the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry. Deputy Commissioner John Grieve, who is now head of the Anti-Terrorist Branch, has been appointed Director of Racial and Violent Crime.
News round-up

Black women buck the earning trends
Black women have overtaken both black men and white women in the pay stakes, according to an article published in July. The article, published in the Employment Policy Institute, claims that workers from ethnic minority backgrounds tend to get paid less than their white counterparts, even taking into account educational qualifications. However, black women have managed to buck the trend, according to the report.

Taking figures for 1997, black women earn on average £6.10 an hour, compared with £5.19 an hour for white women and £5.85 for black men. Their earnings advantage shows up both at the top and bottom ends of the labour market. Despite this, the report says that overall ethnic minorities tend to lose out in the labour market. They are less likely to be employed than white people, and apart from Indian men and black women ethnic minority workers earn less than their white counterparts. The situation is worst for Pakistani and Bangladeshi workers, who are four times as likely to be unemployed and earn on average £2.00 an hour less than whites.

Fundamentalist religion report rejected
The European Parliament on 14 July voted down a controversial report on the threat that religious fundamentalism could pose to the European Union. The report, by Dutch Christian Democrat member Arie Oostlander, had been criticised for focusing on Islam while ignoring other religions, such as Christianity.

It was rejected by 305 votes to 158, while 27 members abstained on the grounds they believed the EU had no power to intervene on religious matters. In a debate on 13 July, several parliamentarians said the suspected murder by Protestants of three Catholic children in Northern Ireland showed that no single religion should be singled out for attention. In the report, Oostlander said he explicitly did not address the very violent conflict in Northern Ireland, which is essentially more social than religious (Q-News July 1998).

London's Schools may lose cash to shires
More than £200m could be transferred out of London schools into coalfield areas and shire counties under plans being considered by ministers. Councils in London are furious at the proposals, which could bring an end to extra funds being directed at schools with large numbers of ethnic minority pupils. Those outside London say the capital's schools have been cushioned for years by government funding formulas and have smaller classes as a result.

The move, overseen by a technical working group of local authority and central officials, would rejig the “additional educational needs” allowances for areas where poverty is high. Instead of using race as a indicator, the money might be more heavily invested in areas where there is a lot of council housing, where babies are commonly born below average weight or where seven year olds' test results are poor. Backers of the changes say that while some ethnic minority groups have higher than average exam results, white working class boys tend to lag behind and need extra help.

The Independent reported that one of five options seen in the paper would give an extra £92.5m to coalfield areas and an extra £115 to the shire counties. It would deprive inner London of £102m and outer London of £124m. The least radical option would leave inner London £57m poorer and outer London £37m poorer. The shires would gain £86m and the coalfields £31m (Independent 3.7.98).

A Sikh view of racism
A white mini-cab driver who wore a turban for one day to put himself in the place of his Asian colleagues faced racist hostility. John Proudlock said he was taken aback by the attitude of other drivers and passengers. One passenger checked the fare before turning to his companion and saying in a loud whisper: "you never know with these guys." His worst experience was when he drove a man aged around 50 to a hospital. As Mr Proudlock helped him into a wheelchair into the hospital, he said: "I had to get a fucking wog, didn’t I?" Mr Proudlock also noticed that he was tipped significantly less than usual (Daily Telegraph 3.7.98).

Data on young people
Key Data on Adolescence by John Coleman, Trust for the Study of Adolescence, 1997. The last two decades have seen some major social changes: increasing divorce rates, rising unemployment changes in the education system and growing pressure on health and welfare services. This book is a useful tool which helps the reader understand many of these changes. It is a collection of essentially statistical data covering a whole range of areas including education, families, crime and mental health. Most of the information is general but some is broken down by ethnicity and gender. Further information from: TSA Ltd, 23 New Road, Brighton, East Sussex BN1 1WZ. Tel: 01273 693311.
Caring for Muslim Families in

Social and welfare care services continue to fail Muslim communities. Fatima Husain looks at the initial findings of a project examining social care in three European countries.

The current University of North London EU-funded project on Muslim Families in Europe is a qualitative study of Muslim communities in Brussels, Copenhagen and London. The research has been concentrated on the largest groups of Muslims in each country: the Pakistanis in London, the Moroccan community in Brussels and the Turkish and Pakistani communities in Copenhagen. The reason that two communities were studied in Copenhagen is that the ethnic Danish population constantly makes comparisons between these two communities.

The perceptions of Muslims in each country is quite distinct. In Britain we have an emerging new identity of British Muslim which appears to be superseding that of national and regional allegiances as well as the later identity of British Asian. At the level of political and social consciousness, the Muslim community is beginning to express its distinctness and its unique nature as a community bound by religious principles. The recent report on Islamophobia commissioned by the Runnymede Trust has highlighted the fact that discrimination faced by Muslims as a religious community has either been ignored or overlooked.

Press scapegoating in Denmark While the idea of a multiracial, multi-ethnic and multi-religious Britain seem to be gaining ground, Denmark appears to be poised on the brink of implementing discriminating laws that specifically target visible ethnic minorities. In current debates on immigration the ‘newest’ community to have arrived in Denmark, Somali refugees, is facing the brunt of this discrimination. While the media mounts a campaign describing the Somalis as ‘exploitors of the generous welfare system’, Danish politicians are soon going to vote on a new Integration Law that will not allow newcomers the choice of settlement. Forced settlement throughout Denmark will be imposed for three years, during which time a new immigrant family will receive less money than a Danish family on benefits. At the end of this three-year period, the newcomers can receive their residency upon successfully passing examinations on Danish language and culture. The new law has wide public support and the idea behind it is to help these people to become Danish. Interestingly enough, the largest groups of immigrants to Denmark are of Scandinavian and German origin but the ‘immigrant debate’ has always centred around the visible ethnic minority communities, who are for the most part Muslim.

The debate on multiculturalism in Belgium has been simmering on the back burner for a number of years. The principal reason this debate is not a relevant issue for politicians is because most of the immigrants are not Belgian citizens and therefore do not have the right to vote. This lack of political will is expected to change as the younger generation of Moroccans and Turks become Belgian citizens and exercise their political rights.

The differences between these three countries are also demonstrated in the terminology used to define immigrants. In Britain there is a clear progression in the creation of identity and the self-definition of each minority community. In Denmark the terms immigrant, first generation, second generation and even third generation immigrant are used. This terminology clearly points to the visible ethnic minority population as ‘not Danish’ and creates a sense of alienation and marginalisation which has been expressed by Danish born ethnic minority youth.

Citizenship and employment In Belgium the term ‘foreigner’ (étranger) is the most commonly used term even for those born and brought up in Belgium. The emphasis in Belgium seems to be on the idea of socialisation (reinsertion sociale) and citizenship through gainful employment. This concept of proper citizenship, applied to ‘foreigners’ as well as to ethnic Belgians, is implemented through re-training programmes, internships and individual contributions to Belgian society through paid employment.

Identity of the community as being Muslim also appears to vary. In Britain and Denmark, the Pakistani communities express their religious identity quite forcefully. It has been commented that this identification has roots in the socio-religious struggles of the Indian Sub-Continent where religious identity has been expressed just as strongly as national allegiances.

In discussions with youth in Brussels, identity as a Muslim was expressed strongly, however most admitted that their knowledge of religion was based on what they had been told by their parents. One recurrent theme along with that of being a Muslim was that religion was generally interpreted incorrectly or inappropriately by youth as well as parents. It is feared by many that Algerian militancy and clandestine groups originating in France have already started to influence the disenfranchised and marginalised youth. In Denmark such groups as the Khilafa movement are gaining popularity among Pakistani youth. The Turkish community’s expression of religious identity had depended more on strategy - that is, when it becomes necessary their religious affiliation may be expressed but in most cases religious identity is second to their nationality as Turks. This could again be a reflection of the secularisation of Turkish society under Ataturk, and it would be interesting to see if changes in the political atmosphere in Turkey will manifest themselves in the Turkish communities in Europe.

In looking at Social Service provision in each country certain problems that have been mentioned in discussions and interviews are the lack of knowledge about Islam and what in the Islamic sense constitutes a religious way of life. Discriminatory treatment both by social workers and other staff has been described by Muslims in all three countries. A contributory factor is the lack of communication, due mainly to the lack of appropriate interpreters. Very few social services offices have a directory or pool of trained, objective interpreters that can be accessed as needed. The use of family members, particularly of children and husbands, as interpreters for women is frequent. In most instances no alternatives are available and in Belgium it is the responsibility of the client to provide an interpreter when needed. Untrained or poorly trained interpreters along with the lack of bilingual professionals, particularly in the mental health profession, have often led to misdiagnosis and inappropriate or unnecessary treatment. The prevalence of myths and stereotypes about Muslim families has not been challenged. In particular, the stereotypes about forced/arranged marriage, the helpless mother and the patriarchal brutal father figure are persistent and widely accepted in all three countries.
In the education system, particularly in Belgium, teachers appear to be discriminatory in their assessment of ethnic minority students. In the three-tiered secondary education system, most minority students are sent on teacher referrals to what is known as the 'professional secondary school' which has the lowest academic standards of all and is known for its poor teaching quality. Similarly, in Denmark, many Turkish students go to the less academic secondary schools where they receive an education in a technical profession. However, their employment prospects are dependent on finding an internship as part of the training and most do not succeed. This has led to a prevalent belief in Denmark that Turks are lazy but Pakistanis are hardworking and better educated. Indeed, Pakistanis have, despite discrimination, achieved higher levels of secondary and post secondary education. The reason for this difference is rarely analysed or examined beyond superficial commentaries and the differences are attributed to a communal/national characteristic.

What is apparent from these initial findings is the disturbing level of discrimination that is taking place in these three countries. While some of it is general discrimination against visible ethnic minorities at a specific level, prejudice is directed at Muslims. However, in Britain, there is the prejudice and discrimination against Muslims been clearly documented. Attempts are being made by organisations in Denmark to document incidences of racism as being manifestations of Islamophobia.

These are the preliminary findings based on interviews conducted in the three countries. The collaborating partners are the Indo-Pakistan Cultural Centre, Islington, Service Social des Etrangers d'Accueil et de Formation, Brussels and Dokumentations og Rådgivnings Centeret om Racediskrimination, Copenhagen. An in-depth final report will be available in December 1998 and a conference will be held in Spring 1999.

Dr Fatima Husain is a researcher in the Faculty of Environmental and Social Studies, University of North London and is currently working on the above EU funded project on Muslim Families in Europe: Social Care Provision. This project is supervised by Professor Margaret O'Brien, Head of Research and Development at the Faculty of Environmental and Social Studies. Dr. Husain can be contacted at F.Husain@unl.ac.uk

**Women win racism charge**

Four young Asian women have won nearly £50,000 compensation in an industrial tribunal ruling that describes their employers as "unbelievable, evasive, contradictory and out to smear". The workers at the Yorkshire Envelope Company in Bradford were ordered not to speak Urdu, barred from observing religious holidays and taunted racially by senior staff. They also had unjustified cuts in pay and practices that the tribunal in Leeds described as "systematic discrimination".

Asma and Saima Nazir, twin sisters aged 21, additionally won a ruling that they had been constructively dismissed by the company. They bought the tribunal hearing with Shabnum Sharif, aged 18 and Naeed Akhtar, aged 19, and were represented by Courtney Hay of the Northern Complainant Aid Fund, based in Bradford. The tribunal described in scathing terms the catalogue of injustices to the women and the subsequent attempts to cover them up. "Rarely have we seen a case where there has been so much evasion and contradiction and where it is clear that the respondent set out to smear the applicant" (Independent 24.7.98).

**Exclusions Bulletin**

School Exclusions joining up the evidence, is a useful 16-page Bulletin published by the London Research Centre. It examines the Government's Social Exclusion Unit's recent report called Truancy and School Exclusion in the light of other research. It considers the perceived 'crisis' of school exclusions in the context of recent educational reforms, the reaction of schools and the over-representation of particular groups of children. For information contact LRC, 81 Black Prince Road, London SE1 7SZ.

**Teachers guide**

Racial equality in schools is about raising the achievement of pupils and guaranteeing them a high quality education. The Association of Teachers and Lecturers at the launch of a new guide, Racial Equality in Schools, in June. The guide draws together practical ways in which teachers can tackle inequality in schools. It takes a positive approach, noting the success that policies against discrimination and stereotyping had had in improving girls' performance. In the introduction the guide says: "The fact that racism still exist in education could be a cause for pessimism amongst teachers. If discrimination remains after more than a decade of anti-racist and multicultural education, what hope is there that racial disadvantage can be rooted out of the system? But progress has been made on many fronts." The Association says that the goal of racial equality is not out of reach.

Racial Equality in Schools, price £3.99, is available from the Association of Teachers and Lecturers, 7 Northumberland Street, London WC2N 5DA.
Policing news

Police stop and search report
In some areas of the country black people are more than eight times more likely to be stopped and searched by police than their white counterparts, says an article in a May-August issue of Statewatch magazine. The article says that the overall rate of stop and search in England and Wales is 17 per 1,000 of the population. The rate varies widely among police forces, with four (Devon and Cornwall, Dorset, Humberside and Wiltshire) stopping and searching fewer than 5 per 1,000, while Cleveland - the home of the "zero tolerance" approach to policing - stops 48 per 1,000.

The variation in the rate of stop and search between white and ethnic minorities is extremely wide. The article says that four police forces stop more than 100 black people per 1,000 population: Merseyside (189), the Metropolitan Police (141), Cleveland (135) and Dyfed Powys (118). When the differences between black and white people are compared for individual forces, Surrey heads the list with black people eight times more likely to be stopped and searched than whites. In Merseyside the rate is seven times higher. At the other end of scale, Cumbria and Northumbria stop and search more white people proportionately than people from ethnic minority backgrounds. The report says there are fewer differentials between white and Asian people with only two forces - Thames Valley and Bedfordshire - showing notable difference.


Stop and search review in London
The Metropolitan Police is reviewing the use of stop and search powers. Pilot projects using new procedures and better publicity, including a leaflet about the purpose of stop and search and the rights of individuals, began in five areas of London in April, while improvements to training and monitoring are now being introduced across the force. The measures were introduced in response to ethnic monitoring data showing that, in London, black people were four times more likely, and Asians nearly one and half times more likely, than white people to be stopped and searched in the street (Connections, Summer 1998).

Men win damages against police
Two men won £10,850 damages at a London court for false imprisonment and assault against the Metropolitan Police. James Payne and George Himonas, of Enfield, north London, were arrested in 1993 after officers saw them take home four discarded bricks. The court heard Detective Constable Neil Barrie had engaged in a torrent of anti-Irish abuse against Mr Payne and bashed his head against a wall. The police face costs of up to £20,000 (Guardian 3.7.98).

Police Complaints fall
Complaints about racial discrimination by police officers for the year March 1997 - April 1998 fell by 19 per cent to 358, says the Annual Report of the Police Complaints Authority. This is the first reduction since the Authority began the separate recording of racial discrimination complaints in 1990. The Authority received a total of 18,354 individual complaints from the public.

The report shows that the highest number of complaints of racially discriminatory behaviour (38), originated in Area 3 of the Metropolitan Police Area, followed by 34 for Area 2, 31 for Area 4, 30 for Area 1 and 28 for Area 5. Greater Manchester had the most complaints outside London, with 30, followed by 26 in the West Midlands, 14 in West Yorkshire, 12 in Merseyside and 11 in Lancashire.

The report says that the ethnic analysis of the 53 cases of deaths in custody referred to the Authority shows that 46 of the deceased were white and three were black. A further three were Asian, and one was of mixed race background. People from minority ethnic backgrounds accounted for 13 per cent of the deaths compared with 19 per cent in the previous year. "It would clearly be unrealistic to believe that all such tragedies are avoidable. Nevertheless, a recent research study on deaths in custody during 1994 showed that over a third were suicides due to hanging. A further two-fifths were cases of alcohol or drug poisoning in which a speedy response to observed symptoms might have been crucial. The Authority's experience suggests that some deaths could have been avoided if more effective procedures and safeguards had been in place."


Evidence to Lawrence Inquiry
Home Office
All police officers could be asked to take part in race and community relations courses, the Home Office says in its evidence to the Inquiry into the death of Stephen Lawrence. Jack Straw, the Home Secretary, has asked the inquiry to look at whether such training should be central, particularly for CID officers.

The evidence sets out the Government's approach to community relations as the Inquiry, headed by Sir William Macpherson, prepares to enter its second phase. After taking evidence from the main players in the case, Sir William will move on to consider its wider implications.

In its paper, the Home Office says it would welcome the Inquiry's views on ways to protect vulnerable or intimidated witnesses so they could be encouraged to give evidence at trials. It also calls for views on the conclusions of a recent Home Office report called Perpetrators of Racial Harassment and Racial Violence that a more holistic strategy would need to recognise the long-term underlying factors of criminality and racism. This would require intervention with the identified perpetrators, or potential perpetrators, for example school bullies, young people and problem families and the perpetrator community at large.

Little more than one-third of racial incidents were recorded properly by police, according to a recent Home Office study noted by the report. It also notes a survey showing that victims of racial crimes were often dissatisfied with the way police handled their cases.

The report also says that some panels set up by the police and other organisations to deal with racial incidents had become little more than talking shops. Furthermore, the proportion of ethnic minority officers in some areas is still very tiny.

Sir William Macpherson's Inquiry into the Matters Arising from the Death of
Stephen Lawrence on 22 April 1993 to Date

In Order Particularly to Identify the Lessons to be Learned for the Investigation and Prosecution of Racially Motivate Crimes, Evidence Submitted by the Home Office to the Second Part of the Inquiry, 1998.

**Metropolitan Police**

“We recognise that, in the eyes of individuals and communities in London, police action may be perceived and experienced as racist, regardless of the intent behind the actions.” says the Metropolitan Police’s submission to the Inquiry. The submission says that the service will renew its efforts to design and implement robust systems to ensure that racism is not manifest in any of its practices or by its staff.

Several new measures are also outlined in the submission, including improved training and recruitment, testing new recruits on race awareness and a programme to improve the quality of performance in relation to racially motivated crime. The submission also says that senior managers will be responsible for the screening of all inter ethnic crimes and officers investigating racial violence will be appropriately trained.

Submission to Part Two of the Inquiry into the Matters arising from the Death of Stephen Lawrence, Metropolitan Police Service.

**Informants report**

The Police should change the way they handle informants, says a new report in the wake of a murder committed by a Scotland Yard informant. The report follows the rape and murder in 1995 in Brixton, south London, of Marcia Lawes by Delroy Denton, a Jamaican gangster who had been allowed to remain illegally in the country to assist the police. He was jailed for life in 1996. A working party of representatives from the Metropolitan Police, the Police Complaints Authority and community groups was set up after details of Mr Denton’s relationship with the police were published in the Guardian last year. The report says that informants should only be used when this can be justified under the EU Convention of Human Rights and should not be brought into the UK illegally except in the “most exceptional circumstances”.


---

**News round-up**

**Ethnic minorities short-changed**

Run down housing estates in Bradford, Liverpool and Birmingham could lose millions in government aid to better off council tenants in London, according to an article in New Economy, the quarterly journal of Institute for Public Policy Research. The article casts doubts over the methods used by officials to target England’s worst estates and quotes the Government’s Social Exclusion Unit, launched last year.

According to the article, civil servants have wrongly targeted council tenants in London at the cost of breadline homeowners and renters outside the capital. To qualify as one of England’s 1,370 ‘worst estates’ an area has to contain at least 50 per cent council housing, but the distribution of tenure varies dramatically from region to region and has no direct link to levels of poverty.

This method of identifying the ‘worst estates’ has severe implications for the plight of poverty-stricken homeowners and renters in the North. The article says that London has a different set of pressures on the housing market, with a lower take up rate of right-to-buy and a lower proportion of owner occupation than any other region. Yet in Bradford, Liverpool and Birmingham the ethnic minority population living in the most deprived areas are much less likely to be living in council housing. Similarly, outside of London only a minority of poor white households lives in council housing.

For example in Bradford fewer than 10 per cent of deprived non-white and 30 per cent of white households are in council housing, whereas in Tower Hamlets in London the figure is nearly 85 per cent and 70 per cent respectively. In London as a whole and Birmingham about a third of deprived non-white households and around 40 per cent of whites are in council housing.

The article concludes that a “restrictive view of social exclusion is being deployed based on stereotypical or populist views of the relationship between deprivation and housing tenure and this in itself is exclusionary.” It says that a more valid approach to targeting is to determine thresholds according to household level deprivation rather than characterisation of tenure.

‘Targeting Social Exclusion’, Peter Lee and Alan Murie, New Economy, June 1998. A report by Peter Lee and Alan Murie, Poverty, Housing Tenure and Social Exclusion is published by Polity Press, University of Bristol, Rodney Lodge, Grange Road, Bristol BS8 4EA. Price £11.95.

**Forced marriages**

Violence and intimidation are increasingly being used to force British Asian women into arranged marriages, according to reports in the press in July. The reports suggest that there has been a significant increase since the government’s removal of the ‘primary purpose rule’ in June last year. Until then couples had to prove that the primary purpose of the marriage was not admission to the UK. The reports suggest that the problem predominately affects Muslim women. This was condemned by ethnic and faith-based minority organisations (Independent 20.7.98).
Tackling Social Exclusion Locally: A European Perspective

On June 23, Southwark Equalities Unit launched a report entitled, **Empowering the Margins, Strategies to Tackle Social Exclusion**. The report provides details of a unique and valuable conference of the same title that took place in Southwark last year.

The aim of the conference was to bring together social exclusion practitioners from across Europe, to provide an overview of social exclusion trends and implications in Europe and exchange best practice. In order to do this, it showcased approaches taken by six European member states - United Kingdom, France, Germany, Denmark, Spain and Northern Ireland - to tackle social exclusion locally. During the conference, practitioners were able to exchange information on their projects and identify common themes and recommendations for tackling social exclusion. Some of the themes and recommendations identified were:

**Themes**
- In the last 15 years the incidence of poverty and social exclusion has increased dramatically across Europe. It is estimated that 14 million households, or 20 million people, are in poverty in Europe; 14 million are unemployed (35% of whom have never worked) and 3 million people are homeless.
- The term social exclusion goes beyond the limited idea of poor housing and employment and training, and recognises the complex links between the many factors that results in the exclusion of an individual or group from society.

**Recommendations**
- Local projects need to invest enough time to ensure that they build partnerships which are relevant and sustainable.
- Social inclusion monitoring strategies which reflect the nature and needs of the project.
- There needs to be better co-ordination in the development, implementation and monitoring of social exclusion strategies on the European, national and local levels.

Southwark Council defines social exclusion as "the denial or non take-up of social rights by individuals and groups because of their poverty, lack of power, alienation and experience of discrimination. Social rights include the rights to access to goods and services, involvement in and the ability to influence existing power structures and decision making process and knowledge of entitlements."

The report includes a keynote lecture on 'Social Exclusion in Europe'; 'A Model to Combat Social Exclusion' and 'Criteria for Measuring the Success of Social Exclusion Projects', also edited transcripts of the six workshops. Practically orientated, with an overview of policy and practice from across Europe, this is an invaluable publication for anyone involved in projects to help socially excluded and marginalised groups, whether at a policy or frontline level.

Carol Ugbechie is Research & Information Officer at Southwark Social Exclusion Unit. For more information on the report or to order your copy, priced £9.00 (including postage), telephone Carol on 0171 525 7496.