



Changing attitudes:

Reducing Hate Crime in Europe conference

21 June 2006





Changing attitudes: Reducing Hate Crime in Europe conference - 21 June 2006

Report contents

	Page
Preface	4
Message of endorsement from Baroness Ludford MEP	5
Executive summary	6
Edited extracts of speeches / presentations by:-	
Suhail Aziz, Chair of London Probation Board	7
David Scott, Chief Officer, London Probation (Morning chair of conference)	7
Tim Godwin OBE, Chair of the London Criminal Justice Board	9
Erik Bleich Assistant Professor, Middlebury College, Vermont, USA	11
Lord Goldsmith QC, Attorney General, UK	15
Larry Ray, Professor of Sociology, University of Kent	20
Harinder Athwal, The Federation of Black Drug and Alcohol Workers	22
Viv Ahmun, Chief Executive In-Volve and member of London Probation Board	24
Mrs Unaiza Malik, Treasurer of the Muslim Council of Britain	25
Panel Questions and Answers (Peter Herbert QC – Panel Chair)	27
Workshop reports	35
Protecting victims by challenging perpetrators' attitudes	36
Models of effective working between the Criminal Justice System and voluntary sector	37
Questions and comments from workshops	38
Refugees as victims of hate crime	39
Tackling hate-motivated extremism and radicalisation	40
Race Hate Crime – Learning from the experience in Northern Ireland	41
What we can learn from the experiences of our European partners – Malta, Bulgaria and Germany	42
Criminal Justice responses to crimes of hate in London	43
Speaker biographies	45
Delegate list	52

Preface

As Chair of the London Probation Board and Chief Officer of London Probation respectively, we, and our staff in the Equality and Diversity Directorate have been very closely linked to the creation and delivery of this European partnership project. For us, it is a mark of our serious commitment to eradicating crimes that arise from attitudes of hate; crimes in which victims are targeted because of their race, faith, sexual orientation or other distinguishing features. These allow the offender to legitimise their action because of the prejudice that they hold towards the target group.

The conference offered a wide range of opportunities for delegates to hear from experts, learn in workshops and meet like minded people with whom to develop practitioner networks.

This project began before the impact of the events in London commonly referred to as '7/7'. The tragedy of those events has emphasised the far-sightedness of trying to share the good practice London Probation has developed and piloted with other EU states who are now experiencing the difficulties of attempting to change

attitudes and protect particularly visible minorities from becoming the victims of hate crime. The subject is large and most of our knowledge comes from experience of working with racist crime, domestic violence or sexual offending. This first stage of the project has focused on developing knowledge of race and faith-based hate crime.

The conference was the European partnership project's main international event, with participants from Malta, Germany, Northern Ireland and the USA as well as support from Bulgaria. At the conference, a paper was disseminated for the first time, mapping the comparative position of each partner country in terms of crimes of hate as well as setting them in the context of the wider European situation. This is the first of a series of papers that will contribute to the final report of the project and so increase knowledge and awareness of crimes of hate and some of the ways in which we can combat the attitudes that underpin them by working together.

In commending this written record of the events of the conference on the 21st June to you I would like to particularly thank some of the key staff that have developed the project. Firstly, Alan Weston, our Diversity and Confidence Manager who, together with Maqsood Ahmad then Director of Diversity, conceived the project and by working with Linda Pizani-Williams (Director of European Institute of Social Services [EISS] at Kent University), brought together the partnership. We would also like to acknowledge our thanks to the project partners, University of Bremen, Germany, Initiatives for International Cooperation, Bulgaria, Mid - Dlam Gwad - Dawl, Malta, and Northern Ireland Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders [NIACRO].

Thanks to the London Criminal Justice Board (LCJB) and the London-wide Race Hate Crime Forum for their support and participation.

Thanks also to Professor Larry Ray for his work in assessing and finding meaningful comparisons to explain the comparative positions of each partner and again to Alan Weston who has project managed the undertaking, this conference and the range of local and international events that led up to it.



Suhail Aziz
Chair, London Probation Board



David Scott
Chief Officer, London Probation

Message of endorsement for conference on Reducing Hate Crime in Europe

From Baroness Sarah Ludford MEP

Vice-chair of the European Parliament's Anti-Racism and Diversity Intergroup

I am extremely sorry I cannot be with you in person today, but would like to take this opportunity to congratulate London Probation for the excellent work they have done so far in taking the lead in this worthy project to understand, and therefore be better placed to tackle, hate crime across Europe.

The AGIS initiative in general and the Reducing Hate Crime in Europe project in particular, are excellent examples of what can be achieved by tackling some of the key criminal issues of our time at European level. However, the superb work done by the project both here in the UK and abroad in Malta, Bulgaria and Germany illustrates once again just how badly EU-wide legislation is needed to establish an agreed definition of race hate crime and minimum requirements for recording and punishing racially motivated incidents.

Studies by the EU's anti-racism watchdog, the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC) show big deficiencies in the way that police respond to race hate crimes across the EU. Official data does not record the true extent of racist crime, and individual investigations often fail to pick up on the racist element in many crimes. Only two Member States record the ethnicity of victims and offenders even of racist crime.

Five years after it was proposed, agreement has yet to be reached on the EU Framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia – a law designed to ensure that the same behaviour constitutes a criminal offence in all Member States and is punishable by equally serious penalties.

The European Parliament gave its backing to the proposals in 2002, but the member governments have been unable to reach agreement on the substance of the legislation. One of the key stumbling-blocks has been the diversity of practice on criminalisation of Holocaust denial, but it is hard to see why there could not be an agreement on the main elements, and one is led to conclude that the political will is in short supply.

There is, however, cause for renewed hope. The Austrian Presidency of the EU has declared itself keen to re-open the discussion on the Framework Decision "in the near future", and as such has invited representatives from all EU member states to a seminar on the "criminal aspects of combating racism and xenophobia", to be organised jointly with the EUMC and the European Commission. This is taking place as you read this message, between June 20 and 22, 2006.

The pan-European banning of racist and xenophobic hate crimes would reaffirm a pan-European commitment to the core EU values of respect for diversity and intolerance of discrimination. In the current political climate where multiculturalism, segregation and integration are hotly debated, it would surely help to build much needed bonds of trust between communities by allowing all European citizens and residents to live without fear.

London, June 2006

Executive summary

This one day international conference, jointly sponsored by the Reducing Hate Crime in Europe partnership (AGIS 2004), London Probation and the London Criminal Justice Board, brought together the London statutory criminal justice agencies, non-governmental organisations from the UK and Europe, voluntary organisations and a range of expert practitioners to explore ways of tackling the attitudes that underpin race and faith based hate crime. The conference comprised 240 participants from a broad range of organisations from the UK and Europe. The conference feedback questionnaire showed over 90% of respondents found it a valuable networking event and nearly 80% took away new ideas to inform their practice.

The conference acted as a platform for its keynote speaker, the Attorney General, Lord Goldsmith, to launch a UK government initiative to improve the way in which racist offenders are prosecuted by the Crown Prosecution Service. The Chair of the London Criminal Justice Board, Assistant Commissioner Tim Godwin OBE of the Metropolitan Police, addressed the difficulty of balancing the need to maintain the confidence of all London Communities at a time when extremist acts have brought minority communities into sharp focus. He spoke in depth of the challenge to maintain an inclusive Police and Criminal Justice system at a time of terrorist activity. Assistant Professor Erik Bleich from Middlebury College Vermont USA set the transatlantic and European context based on his research into approaches to addressing racist violence in the USA, France, Germany and the

UK. His presentation compared and contrasted the issues and the over-arching approaches of each country, its comparative successes and areas for improvement.

In the afternoon Professor Larry Ray from Kent University outlined the comparative positions of the countries in the Reducing Hate Crime in Europe partnership, that is the UK and Northern Ireland, Malta, Germany and Bulgaria. Copies of his comparative study of the partnership countries were included in each delegate pack. Viv Ahmun Chief Executive of In-volve and a member of the London Probation Board, with Harninder Athwal, presented the perspective of young minority ethnic people in London living through the aftermath of the 7 July 2005 bombings. In a passionate and often moving presentation he used statements from young Muslim and other communities about how it feels living in London now. Mrs Unaiza Malik, representing the Muslim Council of Britain, then put in context the position of being both British and Muslim.

The final session of the conference saw a unique blend of expertise and knowledge in the form of a panel who answered questions prepared earlier by delegates. The Chair of the session was Peter Herbert QC, Chair of the London-wide Race Hate Crime Forum. Peter was joined by Elena Noel, who manages the Southwark Hate Crime Project as part of Southwark Mediation Centre; Assistant Professor Erik Bleich, David Scott Chief Officer of London Probation, and London Criminal Justice Board lead officer for Community Confidence, Wendy Ahmun, who has a

strategic housing and community cohesion brief for Barking and Dagenham Council and Tim Parsons, Acting Head of Diversity for the City of London Police. Participants at the conference were able to attend two workshops during the day. There were seven workshops to choose from covering the following topics:

- A model of best practice in joining the statutory criminal justice agencies and voluntary sector in tackling race hate crime in London.
- Radicalisation of crimes of hate in the UK and Europe exploring the impact of political extremism.
- Hate Crime in Europe, experiences of Malta and Germany.
- The Northern Ireland experience of sectarian and race hate.
- Refugees, asylum seekers and foreign nationals' experience of race and faith-based hate.
- The response of the statutory criminal justice agencies and the impact of the 'Race for Justice Action Plan'.
- London Probation Hate Crime Offenders Manual, a toolkit for containing and changing racist attitudes in offenders.

Reports from these workshops follow the edited notes of the conference speeches.



Alan Weston
Reducing Hate Crime in Europe (RHCE) Project Manager

Edited extracts Suhail Aziz and David Scott

Alan Weston

Reducing Hate Crime in Europe
(RHCE) Project Manager

Without more ado, it gives me tremendous pleasure today to introduce Suhail Aziz, who is Chair of the London Probation Board. Suhail has been a tireless supporter of probation for a great number of years. He is a man respected in his community and the criminal justice system and will introduce our conference today.

Introduction

Suhail Aziz

Chair, London Probation Board



Ladies and gentlemen, this is indeed a very important gathering, with a lot of people here. I am immensely gratified to be able to address you. Firstly, good morning. Everyone is warmly welcomed to this event. On behalf of the London Probation Board and all of us working in London Probation, I extend to you a very warm welcome, and, in particular, a very warm welcome to our speakers: Lord Goldsmith, Attorney General; Mr Godwin, colleague and Chair of the London Criminal Justice Board (LCJB); Assistant Professor Erik Bleich, who has kindly joined us from the USA; and to all the leaders leading the various workshops.

This conference, because of the complexity of its subject matter, has been a long time in the making. It has taken a long time because the subject of hate crime, arising from prejudice and attitudinal problems, directed against people of different races and faiths, is complex. In this conference and what has happened before, we are in a learning phase; we are here to gather knowledge and experience, to network and share ideas about hate crimes. We want to learn about attitude and behaviour, their patterns, and see how, together, we may gather the expertise required to address those issues. As you know, Europe – and I am glad to say this is an EU-funded project – has expanded from 12 to 15 to 25 member countries and, in the next expansion phase, Romania and Bulgaria, followed by Turkey and others will join. Europe is expanding, and expansion means that more capability will be required in tackling multicultural issues including hate crime. We therefore feel that this particular conference is both appropriate and timely, and we want to learn and share ideas that have been thought through in order to contribute to public debate and improved policy.

This conference has brought together a diverse range of partnership organisations from across Europe. In today's gathering, we have in particular people showing interest in this programme from Northern Ireland, Germany, Malta and ourselves. Partnership is the key and we have had to learn how to work together. It is a tremendous achievement that, under the leadership of London Probation's Chief Officer, David Scott we have

been able to bring you together today.

Context for the day

David Scott

Chief Officer, London Probation

This event is a very inclusive event; it is a very significant event for London and, above all, I believe it springs from a belief in the importance, as Suhail has said, of sharing best practice, of partnership and an immense belief that not only is change possible, but it is absolutely essential. We have a programme in which, we want everyone to have the opportunity for participation and discussion.

What is AGIS?

Agis was a king of Sparta and is the name of a funding stream of a European social fund of the Director General, Justice and Home Affairs that funds the Reducing Hate Crime in Europe project.

In the spirit of partnership, let me remind you who the partners are.

- London Probation
- Bremer Institut für Kriminalpolitik
- International Initiatives for Co-operation from Bulgaria
- Mid-Dlam Ghad-Dawl in Malta
- The Northern Ireland Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NIACRO)
- European Institute of Social Services (EISS), Kent University

Aims of the project

The project's aims came from the awareness of the rise of tension in Europe. I would submit to you that there is probably not a more important issue in contemporary society both in the UK and

Europe. From that, the key aims of the project can be summarised as:

- To expand our knowledge base, particularly from a probation point of view, in terms of working with perpetrators;
- To share aspects of what works from practice in London and the UK. I cannot stress enough what a joy it is to come to an environment and an audience where people are concerned about understanding and sharing best practice;
- To raise public awareness constantly. Without this, there is no public condemnation and victims go unheard.

It is a two-year project, due to end in October 2006. It is a statutory-led project, one that has developed from working with race-hate offenders in London. There are three strands to the project:

- Voluntary sector partners in other European countries;
- A belief that constant awareness is needed to combat hate;
- A belief, to which surely we can all subscribe, that nothing is static or perfect; we can all learn.

Project deliverables

The project have an agreed definition of what hate crime means to them. It has developed a guide to best practice in tackling hate crime currently trained and delivered in London. We have developed a guide to best practice in co-operation between non-governmental (NGOs) and law enforcement agencies based on the experience of the London-wide Race Hate Crime Forum. We have a commitment to improving the knowledge and skills of

practitioners and sharing what we have found to work.

The disproportional effect of crimes of hate

Alan has also underlined the importance of the 'disproportional effect' hate crimes have on victims, their families, friends and communities. Without constantly raising awareness, we run the risk of there being no public condemnation for race or faith based hate crimes. The risk is victims will go unheard, and offenders go unpunished. If victims go unheard, how can there be justice and how can they have trust in law enforcement agencies to protect them. If justice is not seen to work, how can there be public confidence and public trust? These are issues of public confidence and public trust that are at the heart of today's event.

London Probation and prisons development

Finally, I will run through some of the ways in London we have developed this important work. London Probation has been active in training prison staff in the use of the Hate Crime Offenders Manual. London Probation, to the credit of a service that is often unsung, has trained over 80 multi-agency staff in Newham in using this approach

and is spreading the knowledge of how it works both in the UK and through the partnership.

Conclusions

I have been associated with the project for a year, and I wanted to find a quotation that captured the mood and the spirit of what the enthusiastic people I have met and with whom I have worked have been talking about. This is Socrates; I apologise for the male language, but it is a quotation with which I have not tampered, and it is Socrates the philosopher, not the Brazilian midfielder player. The quotation is: 'Let him who would move the world, first move himself.'

That is what I wanted to say by way of introduction; my job is to chair events and to introduce our speakers. The first speaker I am going to introduce is Tim Godwin. He is the Assistant Chief Commissioner of Territorial Policing in London; he is one of the country's foremost police officers. He chairs, as you have heard, the London Criminal Justice Board. Being on that board with him is a privilege, and I believe we are all responding to Tim's qualities of leadership, engagement and a concern about people.

AGIS partnership



Edited extracts – Tim Godwin OBE

Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police



Introduction

I am the Assistant Commissioner in London for the Metropolitan Police for what is known as Territorial Policing. This means I command the 32 borough operational command units in London. The Racial and Violent Crime Taskforce works for me, as do all the community safety units in each borough. I have recently taken over from Dru Sharpling, Chief Crown Prosecutor for London, as the Chair of the London Criminal Justice Board, to work with all the criminal justice agencies to move us forward on our agenda of providing better, faster and fairer justice for all the people of London.

The task ahead

For us, as Criminal Justice Agencies in London, this is a very important piece of work, as I do not have to tell delegates here. The tensions and events that are occurring daily will give rise to the opportunity for those amongst us who harbour perverse prejudicial views to use them as an excuse to increase their activity in relation to racist hate crime. We must not allow them to do that; we must ensure that we, as agencies and communities, guard all the people of London against such behaviour. We have to question ourselves in what we are doing, how we are communicating and how we are involving people in terms of our response to events.

Increasing confidence and trust

London and the Metropolitan Police Service have seen their share of tragedies over the years. I joined the Metropolitan Police Service in 1999. I joined after the Macpherson Inquiry, which unpicked the events following the racist murder of a young black man in London that was not dealt with well by the police. It found the Metropolitan Police Service and, generally, the UK Police Service guilty of institutional racism. Talking at that time with Bishop Sentamu, now Bishop of York, who was one of the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry panel members, he said, 'The most important thing, Tim, you have to realise is that we found you, the Metropolitan Police Service, guilty of failing to provide a professional police service that meets the needs of all the communities of London, which makes itself, through its activity, behaviour, engagement and communication, relevant to all of the communities of London.' If we are to tackle racist crime effectively, the first thing we have to build – which is why it is one of our objectives – is confidence in the police service and in all the criminal justice agencies from all the communities of London.

The UK 2001 census shows minority ethnic communities as 30% of London's population. The population mix is changing significantly, with new communities developing all the time, in what is a very fluid, moving and dynamic city. We have large Eastern European communities developing swiftly within London. We have constantly to review, refresh and rethink how we are going to make contact and communicate. Some communities in London have

developed through what is described as 'illegal immigration methods'. They are highly likely to become victims of crime, because they do not feel able to approach the law agencies for protection in London for fear of being returned. We have to work out what we are going to do about that.

Police Community Support Officers

How do you gain confidence and trust? This is what we have been trying to achieve in London and in the Met in particular. Do we reflect the population of London as a police service? No, we did not. The vast majority of the Metropolitan Police Service were white men. We have been carrying out a positive action programmes to try to change our profile, to encourage people from black and minority ethnic (BME) communities to join the police services. Currently, we are running at 16% of all police recruits now coming from BME communities. We have introduced a new asset to our team – Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). They are working in the communities as part of our Safer Neighbourhood Programme, where we are putting a team of Police and PCSOs in every ward in London to listen to the citizens' needs and to respond to those needs, rather than those set by central government. Currently, 35% of PCSOs are from BME communities. But it will take us a long time to reach a balance, because there are 35,500 police officers in London, to change the Police profile without some changes in legislation in terms of positive action and positive discrimination. I know Trevor Phillips from the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) has just identified this as an issue. That is

one stage in terms of what we are trying to do in increasing confidence in us from all communities in London.

Disproportionality

Stop/search powers

Another important thing is to hold ourselves accountable and answerable to all the communities of London. One of the biggest challenges we have in London is to justify or to account for our use of power. The most controversial one is our Police stop/search powers. There is a disproportionate use of stop/search powers across the UK, in relation to young black men, who are far more likely to be stopped and searched by the police in the UK than elsewhere. What have we done about that? There are lots of different reasons for these things happening, which need to be understood. There are things like street populations – and where are Police are deployed and when. One thing we have found is that it is very difficult to have a pan-London or even a national debate, because these matters are local; they affect individuals. We have now set up monitoring systems across all the boroughs to challenge our stop/search data, and for those who are using those powers to be held accountable locally by local people, through our monitoring arrangement.

Sentencing and custody

Disproportionality does not stop there. If you look at the disproportionate numbers of young people in youth offending institutions and in prisons, BME communities are disproportionately affected by those events. What about

sentencing? What about being remanded in custody? It is very difficult to get data out of Her Majesty's Court Service at present around ethnic monitoring within the wider criminal justice system. We need to do that; it is very important that we build confidence and build networks with our communities.

Responding to Hate Crime

Definition and reporting

Our response to race-hate crime is improving as we now have more people coming forward to report it. One of the things about building confidence levels and engaging more effectively with all members of the communities that we serve is to encourage people to report racist crime. If anybody thinks a crime is racist; if the victim feels that they are the victim of a race-hate crime or if anybody else thinks it is a race-hate crime, we will always investigate it as such. We have Community Safety Units in all our 32 boroughs dedicated to responding to those events and ensuring we deal with them as priority crime events. Reported racial crime, as a result, rose from 1999-2000 and again in 2000-01. We have now flatlined at about 20,000 crimes per year in London.

Identification and importance

In terms of criminal justice, we now have a premium service where all racial crimes are stamped and identified, so that they attract an increased tariff sentence when they go through the court systems. Sometimes that falls down; sometimes it does not get noted; sometimes it is not given the importance. Very often, we do not keep people informed; we do not keep victims informed of what is occurring. There is lots

we have still to do in relation to these issues.

Public attitude survey

I would finish by saying that we recently conducted a public attitude survey in London in 2005-06 to see what confidence levels were in the police by ethnic group. We found that the highest confidence levels in local policing in London are amongst the Asian community. When you think of recent events, that is a significant result. Whether it will still be the same now, after events in Newham, I do not know. I do know that a lot of contact from the systems we have put in place around critical incident management, which many of you from London will know about, assisted us in engaging quickly and explaining ourselves locally. The second group, in terms of police confidence, is the Chinese community. Third is the black community. The lowest confidence level in local policing in London is in the white community. That shows to me that we might be starting to get somewhere now, but I am also very concerned that we do not become complacent.

Conclusions

I am passionate about making London safer. I was immensely proud of the way that London, as a community, dealt with the events of 7 July, having lived through that period as many of us here did. It could have been used as an excuse for racist attacks against Islamic communities in London; it was not allowed to be used to that purpose by the communities of London. I think that we in London have a great opportunity to help set the agenda and, equally, to learn from our colleagues in Europe, and to make

Responding to racist violence in Europe and the USA

Assistant Professor Erik Bleich,
Middlebury College, Vermont, USA

Europe, as well as London, a safer place. Welcome to London. Good luck today.

David Scott

Tim, thank you very much indeed for your contribution. It is now my pleasure, to invite Erik Bleich to speak. Eric is Associate Professor of Political Science at Middlebury College in Vermont, USA. We are very privileged to have you address us, and look forward to what you have to say. Without any further ado, can I ask you to welcome Erik Bleich.



Overview

I have been working on issues of race and racism in Europe for about 10 years and, in particular, on issues of hate crimes and racist violence for about the last three or four years, in Britain, France, Germany and the US. My goal here today is to start to share with you some of the findings that I have come up with in the last three or four years. Because I am covering so many countries, with such a deep history of dealing with these issues, what you are getting here is the view from 36,000 feet – my transatlantic flight altitude – a very broad overview of the terrain, as seen from an academic's perspective, who has looked at these four countries for the past three or four years.

I want to talk about racist violence in particular, although I recognise that this is a subset of the broader category of hate crimes. There are many more aspects of hate crimes that we may want to talk about in more depth over the course of the day. At the end, I also want to point to some points for reflection and debate, in terms of talking about how the policies in these other countries inform what we may want to do in Britain or in other countries that you are from. That is the overview of where we are going with this talk.

National strategies

USA

History

The US was the first of these four countries to address contemporary problems of racist violence directly. It has done this primarily by focusing on what I call 'Congress, courts and cops'. The highest-profile actions that the US has undertaken have been in passing laws and beefing up police forces to counter racist violence. It concentrated state and federal efforts on racist violence as early as the late 1970s and the mid-1980s. The Anti-Defamation League, an organisation that many of you probably will have heard of, started the train going down this track in the late 1970s, when it began collecting its own data on anti-Semitic hate crimes. It built up a movement to pressure the Government to respond to the notion that there is a category of crimes out there that, for them and for many of us in this room, matter more than generic violent crimes. Hate crimes are things that need to be tracked more carefully and looked at specifically.

State legislation

In 1985, Representative John Conyers, Jr, of Michigan popularised the term 'hate crime' in a congressional hearing. This is where the term comes from, and this is now the general rubric for understanding racist violence in many countries around the world. The term 'hate crime' includes violence against a wide range of groups. The Vermont state statute enhances penalties for crimes motivated by the victims' 'actual or perceived race, colour, religion, national origin, sex, ancestry, age, service in the armed forces of the US, handicap, sexual orientation

Delegate comment

"Fast moving and interesting, there was time to network which was very useful to me"

or gender identity'. This is not quite an exhaustive list of the groups that are covered, but a fairly extensive one in the context of the US. Virtually every state has some form of hate crime laws, and these laws always punish violence against people defined by race or ethnicity, although not all of them go much further than that; certainly, not all of them go as far as the state of Vermont.

I mentioned state laws; they are incredibly important because that is where violent crime is typically prosecuted in the US. Depending on what state you are in, you have different protections given the state statutes.

Federal legislation

Federal laws are also important. Starting in 1990, the federal Government began to pass laws to track and penalise racist violence. It enacted the Hate Crime Statistics Act in 1990, which is a law that mandates data protection across the US on hate crimes. It passed the Hate Crimes Sentencing Enhancement Act in 1994, which enhanced penalties for federal hate crimes. In 1996, it passed a law increasing penalties for crimes against houses of worship in the wake of a rash of arson attacks that began in 1995.

As you can see, the federal and state legislatures have passed a lot of laws against hate crimes over the course of the 1980s, 1990s and this recent decade. These laws have put courts and cops on the front lines in the fight against racist violence. State district attorneys' offices usually have a special branch set up to deal with hate crimes, and state and federal supreme courts have made many decisions that affect

the ways in which hate crime laws are applied at the judicial and at the policing levels. Public police forces in big cities like Boston, New York and LA have also developed special hate crimes units to deal with the specific problems of hate crimes in their own cities.

Britain

History

In Britain, the story is somewhat similar. This is a story that many of you know well, so I will not dwell on it too much, but it is fair to say that, if the US strategy is one of Congress, courts and cops, the traditional British story has been one of cops and courts. This means that the overall focus on law enforcement has been broadly similar in Britain as to the US, but that the timeline and the emphasis has differed slightly in Britain, as compared to the US. Britain began to deal with racist violence a little later than the US – more like the early 1980s than the late 1970s. Through the 1980s and 1990s, police forces were on the front lines, in terms of being scrutinised for their handling of cases of racist violence. This is true for cases in the 1980s; it is especially true in the 1990s with the Stephen Lawrence case, which we have heard a little about already.

The police

Police forces began tinkering with their policies in the 1980s, but it was not until the late 1990s that the Met, for example, created a full-blown Diversity Directorate to focus on the problem of hate crimes. It has about 200 police officers that work on developing policy issues related to hate crimes. It is interesting to note

that, in setting up this unit and thinking about some aspects of hate crimes, there have been a lot of connections and contacts between Britain and the US, between the Met and the New York City Police Department, for example. There has been a lot of learning across the Atlantic, in these two cases, in ways that might be a model for other countries across Europe to look at each other's policies and learn from them, as well.

The courts

Another way in which Britain echoed some US policies was in passing the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act, which created 'racially aggravated offences' and enhanced penalties for certain offences if they were deemed to be aggravated by a racial animus. In 2001, this was extended to cover religiously aggravated offences as well. Again, there is more to say about policy developments in Britain, but the basic overview of British policies, with a comparative perspective, shows that Britain has really focused on the police and the judicial system as a primary way to think about and address hate crimes.

Germany

History

If in the US and Britain the story starts in the late 1970s and early 1980s, in Germany it begins in the early 1990s. Many of you probably remember that, shortly after German reunification, there was a series of rather horrific violent attacks on asylum seekers and ethnic minorities in Germany, which made the names of cities like Hoyerswerda, Rostock, Solingen and Moelln familiar.

These led to a review by the German state of exactly what it should do to counter hate crimes. They responded in part by changing some aspects of their policing, prosecution and information-gathering services, but Germany was not Britain. In spite even of some evidence that German police may have been involved in some hate crimes, there was never a systematic nationwide review of German policing; there are no specific hate crime laws in Germany.

These are some important differences here between Germany, Britain and the US.

Identification schemes

This is not to say that Germany has not been innovative. It has been innovative in what you might call 'grants to the grassroots'. These are local projects designed to deter potential perpetrators and support victims of racist violence. They did this in two ways. In the early 1990s, there was a programme called the AGAG programme, which essentially tried to discern who the perpetrators were.

Who were the people likely to commit these acts. These programmes had debateable success. Critics said, "Are we not rewarding these people for being bad kids – taking them to sports games and trying to divert people who we know are problems." Others said, "It may not be a good idea to get all these potential perpetrators together in one room because, if there are some really bad people in that room, they now know who is likely to sympathise with them." These were some criticisms of these kinds of programmes.

Civic education

In the late 1990s and the early part of this decade, the German state changed its strategy, put about four pots of money out there, €200 million, and called on civil society groups to come and tap into that money if they were promoting anti-racist programmes. These were general anti-racist programmes designed to promote a culture of tolerance and democracy in schools, the workplace and in other ways. These programmes helped to build networks against right-wing extremism; they promoted political education in schools for a democratic culture, diversity in the workplace and advice to victims. This has been the staple of the way that Germany has dealt with hate crimes.

France

History

France was one of the earliest countries in Europe to pass comprehensive anti-racism legislation; it did so in 1972. This law did not really prevent or target racist violence per se; they were anti-discrimination laws primarily. France came to the issue of racist violence much later than its neighbours. It only started to coordinate its efforts in the early part of this decade in response to several surges of anti-Semitic violence that happened in the wake of the onset of the second intifada in the Middle East. After a slow initial reaction, the French state began to react. Again, it did some things in the area of policing: it beefed up its police forces on sensitive sites, principally synagogues, mosques and religious schools; it devoted about €15 million to this project. Again, this was not the main thing

that France did in responding to hate crimes.

Symbolisation and socialisation

It pursued a path of what I call 'symbolisation and socialisation'. I call it this because the most prominent law that France has passed, which was called the 'Lellouche Law', in 2003, was a comprehensive anti-hate-crimes law, which was hailed with much fanfare, but it has not been much enforced. That is a fundamental reason why you can think of this law as a symbolic law; it was more a statement that the country as a whole, as symbolised through its legislature, was standing up against hate crimes. It was primarily a symbolic act. There have only been a handful of cases in the system that have invoked this law whereas, in the first year of effect of the British Crime and Disorder Act, there were over 4,000 charges for racially aggravated offences, and there have been approximately 5,000-6,000 in every year since then. The effect of laws in Britain and France has been quite different.

Schools

In addition to these kinds of symbolic acts, there are policies in France that aim to socialise people to oppose racist violence. By this, I primarily mean actions in schools. Schools have been seen as a main focus for action in France in order to try to undermine hate crimes. In 2002, France sponsored a Council of Europe initiative to create a Holocaust memorial day; French schools participated in this programme on 27 January, which is the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz. In February 2003, the state also announced an action programme of 10 specific

measures, which included for example the creation of a group in each educational area that was specifically designed to monitor racist violence and anti-Semitic violence in its educational area. It scheduled meetings with textbook editors to remind them of their duty to create textbooks that were neutral, with respect to identifying certain groups by race or ethnicity in terms of their contributions to society – in other words to smooth out some of the remaining rough edges of, for example, history textbooks. It developed a guidebook for teachers, explaining concretely how to react to a racist or anti-Semitic incident in their school or classroom, which many teachers did not know how to do when they saw these things happen right in front of their eyes. The former Minister of Education, Luc Ferry, summed up the state school socialisation when he declared: “It is important to intervene over the smallest incident, even verbal, and to let nothing go without punishing or explaining.” A focus on socialisation – it is wrong, and we must all know this.

Summary of the four strategies

Evaluative matrix

This is a very brief story of the four countries. It is possible to summarise each country's strategy in the following way. The two basic questions to ask are:

- Should policy ideas and initiatives come primarily from the state or primarily from civil society?
- Should the primary goal of policy making be aimed at repressing or punishing actors once they have committed racist violence, through laws and through police work, or

should the emphasis be on diverting potential perpetrators?

I think this matrix is an accurate summary of the basic tendencies in these four countries. As I have suggested, it is too simple to capture the complexity in the widest variety of measures taken in each country, but it helps focus thinking on the relative emphasis that different countries give to different types of approaches. It also raises the question of where the emphasis should be.

Diversion

One very interesting recent development in Britain has been to move the country beyond a focus, exclusively, on repressing perpetrators, moving towards diverting potential perpetrators. There is a sense that repression is a useful and necessary tool, but there might be more that a country can do. For me, the attention to diversion raises at least two more sets of questions.

What kind of diversionary policies should be undertaken?

What precise policies are most useful when you are thinking about diversion? There seem to be a lot of interesting community-based initiatives aimed at potential perpetrators and this is clearly vital. Again, the German example suggests that there might be some danger in gathering together potential perpetrators in one place or to be seen to give special benefits to, usually youths who are perhaps not going down the right paths. Why should they get special attention? There are some questions to the ways in which that is handled that are useful to think about.

What is the role for action in schools?

This is something that is not much talked about in Britain; I know that things are happening. Why has this not been a focus, as it has been in France through state initiatives, as it has been in Germany through civil society initiatives to train mediators and peer leaders, and have curriculum units where civil society groups come in from the outside to do these things. It has been a real focus in Germany and France; although it happens in Britain, it has not been a central focus here.

The workplace

In the workplace, there are some initiatives in Britain, but there are more in Germany. Can there be some more action in this realm in Britain?

NGOs

The second set of questions has to do with the role of NGOs. In Germany, it is vital for the Germans to secure support of NGOs and their active engagement. How to harness the energies of NGOs in every country across Europe is an incredibly important topic and one that needs to be discussed more centrally within Britain itself. What are the ways in which NGOs can be structurally funded, where they can be pulled into the process of fighting racist violence and hate crimes in a way that gives them a higher profile.

Conclusions

What I have tried to do here today is to give an overview of the landscape in these four countries and also to draw out some challenges for reflection, so that people in Britain and people in

Rt. Hon. Lord Goldsmith QC

other countries can focus on what the other options might be for the future of fighting racist violence and hate crimes.

David Scott

Erik, thank you very much indeed for your view from 36,000 feet. Particular thanks goes to you for giving such a fresh presentation to us, and for giving us the benefits of comparison and a look across a number of other countries.

It is now my very considerable pleasure to introduce as our next speaker Lord Goldsmith QC, who you will know, from the information we have sent you, is the Chief Legal Advisor to the Government. We are immensely fortunate to have him with us.



Introduction

Thank you to London Probation, the AGIS programme in the EU and the London CJB for organising this conference. I am very pleased indeed to be here. First of all, it enables me to underline the commitment that the Government has to tackling hate crime and the commitment of the prosecutors to prosecuting such cases. I have been introduced as the Chief Legal Advisor to the Government; I am, but I am not really here in that capacity. I am here because I am also responsible for all the public prosecution services in this country. That is the perspective from which I speak to you today. I am also going to take the opportunity, as one of the three criminal justice ministers, to launch the report of the Race for Justice Taskforce that I established and that is published together with the Government response today.

Opportunities for all

Hate crime, crime that is targeted against people for who or what they are – whether it is women, members of BME communities, is because of sexual orientation or whatever – cannot be tolerated. We, as a government, are committed to building a society with opportunities for all. Hate crime is therefore an issue that is of real concern for everyone

working in the criminal justice system here, as I know it is in other parts of Europe. It is right to say that much has been done.

Legislative Changes

Higher penalties

We have recognised, for example, that effectively tackling hate crime often means specific legislation. We, and I can say that because it was a Labour Government at the time, outlawed offences of stirring up and inciting racial hatred in 1965 but, more recently in 1998, we created new offences of racially aggravated crime, such as assault and assault occasioning actual bodily harm, with higher penalties for those offences than for their non-racially aggravated variants. In 2001, we extended this to crimes motivated by hostility to a person's religion. We have required courts to take such aggravating features into account when they sentence.

The Pells case

For example, take one case, the case of Pells. There the defendant had seriously assaulted his victim in a racist attack. He was charged with racially aggravated assault occasioning actual bodily harm. He was given a seven-month sentence. As it happened, I thought that was not enough, particularly because he ought, in my view, to have received a separate element of that sentence for the racial aggravation. I myself appeared before the Court of Appeal using the powers I had just been given to appeal sentences for racially aggravated offences. The Court of Appeal agreed with me; they said that the sentence should have been three years, of which a separate 12 months should have been imposed

Delegate comment

“Accomplished effective speakers”

specifically for the racist element. That is very important, because it sets the message for other courts dealing with such offences. The Court had said in an earlier case, which was endorsed in the Pells decision: "Racism must not be allowed to flourish. The message must be received and understood in every corner of our society that racism is evil. Those who engage in racially aggravated crime must expect to be punished severely in order to discourage the repetition of that behaviour by them or others." There are one or two other cases I have taken to the Court of Appeal for the same reason.

The Racial and Religious Hatred Act

In just completing the list of things we have done in the legislative field, this year, after what was quite an epic parliamentary struggle, the Racial and Religious Hatred Act was passed to make it an offence to stir up hatred intentionally on the grounds of religious belief.

Changes in practice

We have not just acted in the field of legislation. Legislation is one thing; practice is also absolutely essential. My prosecutors have developed policies to deal specifically with hate crime, often in close consultation with the groups who are most affected by such crime. I welcome the work done by the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) in its policies on homophobic crime, racist crime and indeed on a number of gender-related issues. They have implemented and developed specific training as well; for example, over 16,000 prosecutors have been trained on racial and religious crime policy and

guidance. I welcome that. This year, the commitment to tackle such crime was reinforced by making performance in these areas a specific element in the performance review criteria for all CPS areas.

More to do

British Crime Survey

Nonetheless, recent examples of racist crime serve to remind us that we still have more to do to prevent racist behaviour and to change those attitudes that stop us realising our vision of a safe and inclusive society. The British Crime Survey estimated the number of racially motivated incidents at about 206,000 in 2003-04, a figure similar to the previous year. In the same period, 35,000 incidents were reported as offences, of which 59% were harassment and 25% wounding or common assault. The total number of offences was above that recorded in both 2001-02 and 2002-03. In 2003-04, only 2,500 offenders were cautioned or convicted by the courts. We can probably conclude that the level of hate crime appears to remain constant, while the number of people with sufficient confidence in the criminal justice agencies to report matters is increasing. That is good news, but there is still a long way to go.

Breaking the chain of hate

We do not have reliable figures for other forms of hate crime, although research from independent organisations like Stonewall indicates that there is a similar pattern for other forms of hate crime. Breaking the Chain of Hate, published by Stonewall, reported that between 1990 and 1995, one in three gay men stated

that they had been the victim of a hate crime.

Working in partnership

It is essential that we understand the motivations for and the methods for effectively dealing with all types of hate crime, both here and in other parts of Europe. We have to become effective both in dealing with the perpetrators and working with the victims of hate crime. I have looked at the list of delegates for this conference; you come from a wide variety of backgrounds and it is clear that, above all, you recognise the importance of effective partnership working, learning from best practice and the importance of support in tackling these crimes.

London's communities

I want to underline also that these issues are important for London. London of course has a strongly diverse community, of which all of us who are Londoners are very proud. However, we still see desperate incidents. We very recently witnessed the homophobic murder of Jody Dobrowski, whose killers were sentenced, less than 10 days ago, to life sentences with a minimum of 27 years to serve. We have also seen suspected racist murders of Asian shopkeepers in South London. We are making significant progress despite the length of the travel we still have to make.

Anthony Walker

Assisted by the CPS

I want to refer to one example. Although I find it hard to find any solace for the murder of a young person, the way that the criminal justice system dealt with the murder of young Anthony Walker in Liverpool demonstrates how we

can deliver good results. You will recall that on 30 July 2005, Anthony, a promising young black boy, 18 years old, was the victim of a vicious, brutal, unprovoked racist attack with an axe, from which he died. Within four months, the suspects were identified, brought back from overseas, where they had fled, interviewed, arrested, charged, convicted and sentenced. The reason that the criminal justice system was able to do that with that speed was because of the way that people worked together. I am particularly proud of the work of the CPS: within a day they had identified a senior prosecutor to work with the police, had worked right from the start in providing advice in how to build a case and how to use messages to get the suspects back from abroad; a prosecutor monitored the interviews of the two subjects and gave the interviewing officers real-time advice about how those interviews should be conducted. Those interviews were absolutely crucial to the decision to charge and to the eventual convictions. He presented the case at the first hearing and managed the case through to trial. On the first day of the trial, one of the defendants pleaded guilty; at the end of the trial, the jury convicted the other.

The sentences were very substantial – a minimum of 23 years and some months in the case of one, and the other, who was younger, received nearly 18 years. The judge made it very clear when he summed-up how the courts would deal with such matters. He described their actions as ‘racist thuggery, poisonous to civilised society’.

Communication and explanation

It was also particularly important that the CPS and the police kept in close contact with the family. I am proud, too, of the way that the family responded to the support that they received from police and prosecutors. Meetings were taking place after every court session to explain what had happened. It is particularly important in a case like that to try to explain to the court the racist element of the attack, and explain to the family how it is going to be dealt with. That is particularly the case, and again this applies to London as it does to many metropolitan areas, as often these crimes occur to and affect communities who traditionally have not had the highest of confidence in the criminal justice system to protect them. Explaining what is going on is critical. That was a result, in terms of criminal justice, which was satisfactory.

I am very pleased that we have been able to recognise one thing: Anthony wanted to be a lawyer; that was something completely denied to him by this brutal, vicious, evil attack. We have managed to establish a scholarship in his name, so that someone else from Merseyside, at least, may be able to realise the ambition that he was not able to.

Race for Justice taskforce

Race charge attrition

In 2001, the CPS commissioned an independent report from the Gus John Partnership to examine their decision-making process to see if there were signs of racial bias. Gus John’s report found no significant evidence of racial discrimination in prosecution

decision-making, which was of course good news, but he did point to a number of trends and worrying indications about the way in which racially aggravated offences were prosecuted. The report in particular raised two concerns about the handling of such crimes:

- The failure to record or identify race-hate crime at an early stage;
- The dropping of the race-hate element in these racially aggravated offences, suggesting perhaps that this was part of a plea bargain taking place. He recommended that all operators in the criminal justice system need to have their awareness raised with respect to ‘race charge attrition’, as he put it – the dropping of these elements – and the effect that that had on people’s perceptions. He particularly recommended that I, as the Attorney General, should take the lead in trying to establish an approach to these issues across the criminal justice system.

Recommendations of the Taskforce Report

Members

With the support and agreement of my criminal justice colleagues I was able, therefore, to establish a taskforce that was chaired by Mr Justice Fulford, a High Court judge, and included taskforce members from across the criminal justice system – prosecution, police, the private sector and a number of others. Today, their final report is being published. They made 21 clear and pragmatic recommendations to address the issues raised by Gus John. In summarising to you the key

elements of that report, I will draw attention to the executive summary and really to these three points.

Progress made

They were very impressed with the substantial progress that has been made over recent years in dealing with this sort of crime, and the level of commitment and hard work shown. It is right to refer to that first, because one needs to recognise, despite the reservations that they then have, the hard work and commitment that has gone forward, and the progress made.

Further work required

They then said that these areas need further work:

Cross-agency training for dealing with racist and religious crime in order to ensure a consistent and targeted approach. They referred in their report to the different levels of training that a numbers of the groups concerned have – police and prosecutors, for example – and where training was specifically missing for other groups. They want particularly to see that all criminal justice agencies are given a clear and consistent message as to what needs to be delivered, and also a set of minimum standards to work towards.

They revealed that there are various levels of performance monitoring by criminal justice agencies. They have recommended that we should do more in terms of the recording of such crimes and, again, ensure that this is done on a consistent basis.

They made specific recommendations to produce a nationwide, consistent approach

across police forces, which of course, as individual police forces, do not have precisely the same approach to certain things. They recommended that we should take these recommendations forward on a coordinated basis.

Action plan

Support

What we have done in order to do that is I have requested that the Office for Criminal Justice Reform, which is a trilateral unit that sits between my office, the Home Secretary's office and the Lord Chancellor's office, take this work forward. They have developed a clear action plan to do that, which I am announcing today. It was necessary to get support for their work from across the criminal justice system, which I am very pleased to say has been provided – support from the Home Secretary, the Lord Chancellor, NGOs, the voluntary sector and community groups.

Aims

There are a number of key strands:

- We need to define the measurable outcomes we have to achieve.
- We need to define national minimum standards for each agency.
- We need to develop new training programmes and adapt existing programmes to ensure they have a common, consistent approach to these crimes as the Race Taskforce proposed.
- We need inspection by the relevant inspectorates and we need improved systems to monitor the ethnicity of victims and perpetrators and track cases through the system.

New bodies

How are we going to do that? We are going to create two new bodies to support this work: there will be a delivery board with senior representatives from key agencies; and a group of external stakeholders to ensure that there is a victim focus throughout this work.

Timescale and scope

This is going to take some time to do; the overall work planned may take two years to complete. I am particularly anxious that the work that is done does not just relate to race crime, although that was the focus of the original report, but is pushed across so that it covers all areas of hate crime. I have asked for that to be done.

Implementation

Local delivery considerations

Although getting the policy is right, ultimately it is local delivery that makes the difference. I know the Office for Criminal Justice Reform (OCJR) race units have been working very closely, for example, with the Metropolitan Police to support the work the Met is doing to improve their delivery of service to the victims of hate crime. The role of the police is absolutely essential; they are the first line of contact for victims. All the criminal justice agencies need to be involved as well, and that is why the London CJB is critical. Like other local CJBs it has the role of ensuring delivery happens in accordance with local conditions, at the local level.

Partnership and sharing good practice

The probation service has a key role to play. Of course, as research shows, most racially

motivated offenders have an offending history and a risk/needs profile very similar to that of many other offenders. We already know about good practice that other organisations are sharing as well. We know that national and local organisations working together can make a real difference. There are many examples of good practice, which we need to share and promulgate. For example, we know about good practice in third-party reporting such as True Vision, the excellent work done by local crime and disorder reduction partnerships to join up the system; the involvement of scrutiny panels, such as the London-wide Race Hate Crime Forum (LWRHCF). The best of these need to be brought together and others need to know how they are doing such a good job.

Accountability

There will need to be minimum standards and clear lines of accountability. The Hate Crime Delivery Board, when established, will report directly to me, to the Lord Chancellor and to the Home Office Minister, Gerry Sutcliffe. I intend, as they do, to ensure that pressure is maintained and progress made.

Conclusions

Let me conclude by wishing you well for the rest of this very important conference, and generally for the work in which I know you have are all engaged. I am grateful for the opportunity to be here today to talk about this and to launch the report, as I have just done, and to assure you of the commitment of the Government to continue to work hard in the areas about which I have been talking. Thank you very much indeed.

David Scott

Lord Goldsmith, I think I can say, on behalf of this audience, how privileged we feel that you made your announcement here this morning. I can say as well, with absolute confidence, that the action plan has the complete support of this audience. If I could pick up a couple of points that struck me, one is the immense ringing power of the judge's comments about what is and is not acceptable in our society. The others are reflections on the key role of criminal justice working in a concerted way. I know the London CJB is determined that we work across the agencies to improve our practice and performance, and improve the level of confidence that the public has in our work.

At this point delegates moved into workshops before lunch.

Delegate comment

“Very useful event – information was good and the organisers were very helpful”

Comparative view of the RHCE partnership

Larry Ray, Professor of Sociology, University of Kent

Alan Weston

It is my great pleasure to introduce Linda Pizani-Williams as our Chair this afternoon.

Linda Pizani-Williams (Co-chair), Director, EISS, Kent University

Good afternoon. I am delighted to introduce the first speaker this afternoon. Professor Larry Ray is one of my colleagues from the University of Kent who has worked with the Reducing Hate Crime in Europe Project and the European Union Monitoring Centre for Racism and Xenophobia.



Outline

What I am going to do in this fairly brief presentation is to summarise some of the main conclusions in the comparative study on race and faith-based crimes that is in your conference pack. This report was largely based on the scoping exercise questionnaire that was completed by partners to the AGIS project – as you know, London, Northern Ireland, Germany, Malta and Bulgaria. I intend to summarise or highlight some of the main conclusions.

The Scoping Exercise

Overview

The scoping exercise was conducted fairly early in the project. We all recognise that this is a dynamic area that is subject

to rapid change, and so essentially represents a snapshot of the position across these European areas about a year or so ago. Information was requested in the scoping exercise regarding hate-crime legislation, demographic profile and available data on hate-crime policies and practices in the different partner countries or regions. The intention of this was to map existing knowledge or patterns of legislation as a first step towards developing common frameworks and legislation and promoting best practice of policy and intervention.

Patterns of victimisation

There are a few similarities across the five partners that are worth noting. First of all, there are quite similar patterns of victimisation. Muslims, Roma, Afro-Caribbeans, asylum seekers, Jews and South Asians feature quite prominently in all the accounts of race-based hate crime, to different extents in different places.

Under-reporting

Secondly, official figures of offending, where they exist, are always skewed by higher rates of under-reporting. Wherever there is data independent of official figures attempting to access real rates of offending these are always much higher.

Perpetrators

Thirdly, perpetrators across the different regions tend to be young men, tend to come from areas of high social deprivation, with unstable employment histories and often engage in other violent crime. There is some similarity in the nature of perpetrators. They are often not members of extreme right-wing political organisations but some may.

Differences

Anglo-American model

Despite these broad similarities, there is a very wide diversity of approaches and models of hate crime among the partners and across the EU more generally. This is one of the main conclusions of the report. At present, there is no common framework or language to describe and intervene in hate crime. To elaborate this slightly, on the one hand there is the Anglo-American model of hate crime that is understood as broadly based behaviour, where victims are selected according to characteristics of race, ethnicity, religion, age, sexuality, disability and so on. This broad-based model of hate crime has strongly influenced legislation in the UK and in Northern Ireland. Here, the predominant response tends to be criminal justice led, as Erik was saying, and has focused a lot on enhanced sentencing, such as the provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act. It has also linked up with voluntary-sector involvement, especially through police and community liaison, crime and disorder reduction partnerships and so on.

Politically motivated model

On the one hand, there is an Anglo-American model, which is legislative and criminal justice based; by contrast, there is the German approach, which focused much more on politically motivated xenophobia and neo-Nazi hate crime such as holocaust denial, desecration of holocaust memorials and so on. In Germany, again as we heard this morning, interventions tend to be funded, civil society initiatives in order to address the origins of

political extremes. The German concept is a much more politicised concept of hate crime, and rather less broadly based than what I have called the Anglo-American concept.

Historical models

Again, many countries have no specific hate-crime statutes at all, although they may criminalise racist and faith-based incitement to hatred through the Constitution or the penal code, as is the case in Bulgaria and Malta. In relation to Bulgaria, it is important to note that, as with many post-communist societies, there are all sorts of historical issues to deal with, particularly in terms of sanctioned persecution of minorities in the not-too-distant past, such as the persecution of ethnic Turks in Bulgaria.

Absence of awareness

There are countries like Malta where there are very few official responses to hate-based crime, and anti-hate activism is largely promoted by NGOs such as the Jesuit Refugee Service; the organisation From Darkness to Light is one of the AGIS partners. The scoping report for Malta concludes that hate crime awareness is utterly absent despite qualitative evidence of extensive hate-based crimes against Islamic migrants from North Africa.

Summary of different models

The first thing is you see a range of models and approaches and, in some places, very weakly developed responses. There is the Anglo-American model of a broad-based concept of hate crime with enhanced sentencing, and the German model that is based more on a politicised model of

xenophobic hate crime. The British and Northern Ireland model of enhanced sentencing for aggravated crimes has been adapted in some other member states such as Sweden, but not, so far, in Germany or Bulgaria.

Definitions of Hate Crime

Britain

Another important conclusion from the survey is that definitions of hate crime, which I have already indicated vary considerably across the partner states and across Europe more widely, exercise a critical influence on known rates of racist and faith-based hate. How you define the problem or how the problem is defined legislatively has a huge impact on what is known about it and how data is collected. For example, the UK's Macpherson definition, any racist incident is any incident that is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other person, is the most broadly based definition in the EU and, combined with police and NGO encouragement to report – multi-channel reporting and third-party reporting – generates the highest per capita rate of reporting in Europe.

Germany

By contrast, in Germany, which has the next-highest per capita rate of reporting, data is essentially confined to politically motivated right-wing criminality. The new concept of hate crime in German statistical data is subject to interpretation and implementation in 16 states. How hate crime is defined has a powerful influence on what kind of data is collected and how the problem is perceived publicly.

Northern Ireland

It is also interesting to note that, in the wake of the peace process in Northern Ireland, there has been a significant shift of focus from viewing the conflict in terms of ethno-national-political violence to the framework of sectarian hate crime, which is being actively promoted by agencies in Northern Ireland. The House of Commons Northern Ireland Affairs Committee, for example, has made a large number of recommendations for the pursuit of sectarian hate crime.

Conclusions

Difficulties in comparison

Following from what I have said, no two countries have comparable data, which makes comparison extremely difficult. Rates vary extensively between countries, and within countries as well. There are no easily comparable data between countries.

Varying interventions

Interventions vary widely across the international spectrum. There is a wide variation between individual offender-focused interventions to legislative, local-agency-based, society-based initiatives of training, social inclusion and community cohesion to tackle origins of racism. There is a wide spectrum of interventions from offender, individually based to more societal-based interventions to different degrees, in different countries.

Pursuing prosecutions

Finally, it is also important to recognise that getting definitions, legislation, data collection and interventions in place is only the start. Another obvious feature across Europe is very low rates of

Issues for young people following 7 July 2005

Harinder Athwal, Membership and Marketing Officer,
The Federation of Black Drug and Alcohol Workers

prosecution and conviction for hate-based crime. It is important, as well as getting everything else in place, to have the willingness and the resources to pursue and prosecute.

Linda Pizani-Williams

Thank you, Larry. Our next speaker is Viv Ahmun, who is a London Probation Board member. You will see from his biography that he has been involved with young people for a long time. He has thrown us into confusion by bringing somebody else to present with him, Harinder Athwal, from the Federation of Black and Asian Alcohol Workers. I am very pleased to welcome Viv and Harinder together.



A missing voice

"What the bombers did is nothing compared to what Britain has done. I am not seen as Muslim anymore – just a terrorist." These are profound statements made by two young Muslim males when asked, "What has the impact of the 7/7 bombings been on Muslim youth in Britain?"

The events of Thursday, 7 July will always be in our memories. It will be the day we remember, as we watched the news unfold, with horror at the loss of many innocent lives. On the days following the bombings, the eyes of suspicion turned to Muslim youth. Many were speculating; what could have driven young British males to commit such horrific acts? Whilst everyone was trying to speculate and state their opinions, there was one voice missing – that of the Muslim youth.

The Impact of 7/7

Outline

What has the impact of the 7/7 bombings been on British Muslims? In answering this question, I will focus on a) the media, b) legislation and c) foreign policy, and how they have all contributed towards making Muslim youth feel both alienated and victimised.

Unjust suspicions

It is well documented young British Muslims feel strongly that the atrocities occurred were committed by only a minority, so by no means are they representative of the Muslim community as a whole. Speaking to a couple of Muslim males when researching for this presentation today, they were very keen to get across the point that, since the bombings, media and legislation have made the term 'Muslim' equate to being a terrorist. As soon as anyone says 'Muslim', automatically everyone would think, 'being a terrorist'. It is clear that all Muslims will be tarnished by what has happened by the attacks. There is also fear of backlash from the people they work with, go to school and college with and share a community with. In the light of the bombings, what is disturbing is that many British Muslim youths find living in Britain a very scary situation.

Legislation

In the wake of the bombings, the Government introduced terrorism laws aimed at protecting all of us here. Are they really going to prevent further attacks? I do not think so, but what they are capable of doing is further alienating young British Muslims. According to the Met, before 7/7, Asians were more likely to be stopped under anti-terrorism powers than their white fellow Londoners. After 7/7, this gulf grew bigger. Between 7 July and 5 September 2005, 27% of people stopped in the street by the Met were Asians; however, they only make up 12% of London's population. As well as the increase in the number of those being stopped and

searched, there is also the added fear of increased racism, islamophobia and police harassment. Met records have shown already that there has been a rise in the number of racist attacks against individuals. The Muslim Safety Forum has recorded a 500% increase in islamophobia.

I was talking to a group of males; they reported that, at one point, they were on a street waiting for their friends. The police approached them and asked them to move. When the young males asked, "Why?" the police turned around and said, "We think you may be bombers." Despite the Government portraying an image that they may be managing and dealing with anti-racism and post-7/7 issues, in reality they are probably just fuelling tensions. Legislation has only led to further alienation of Muslims.

The media

The media must also take responsibility and recognise the significant role that they have played in misrepresenting British Muslims. Again, one of the young males thinks the media are instigators of portraying, fuelling and feeding the concept that all Muslims are terrorists. It is not just non-Muslims that are in fear of further attacks; there is a vast majority of Muslims that also want to prevent future bombings, but it is not in their power to change these circumstances. Economic discrimination, poverty and Britain's policy in the occupation of Palestine and Iraq have driven a minority of Muslims down the mistaken road of committing attacks against ordinary folk.

Fear

Addressing misperceptions

Despite feeling more uncomfortable, increased islamophobia, isolation and exclusion, the perception of Islam has worsened since the London attacks, but Muslims themselves must also recognise that many misperceptions around Islam have come from within. They are willing to work hard in order to change this and communicate. It's misunderstandings of Islam that fuel its own abuse. There is an example of this in Tower Hamlets; there are groups of young people that have put together road shows and are travelling the borough in order to educate and promote awareness of what Islam really stands for.

Abuse

On the one hand, you have Muslims; on the other hand, there are non-Muslims. They are all stating they are scared of another target and are vulnerable. Muslims fear further targeting and further alienation. The vulnerable as well as the not so vulnerable experience extreme verbal and physical abuse.

Segregation

We have seen how media, legislation and the acts of others, including British foreign policy, have impacted on Muslim youth since the 7/7 bombings, and how they have all contributed towards making Muslims feel segregated from mainstream society, victimised and made to feel that they ought to be blamed for the actions of a minority. I ask, is it not time the Government acknowledges its responsibilities and recognises that its foreign policy has played a significant role

in the lead-up to the attacks instead of blaming it solely on extreme ideology? Surely, it must publicly share its responsibility and not allow the Muslim community to carry the burden on its own. Is it not up to the Government to ensure that British Muslims no longer feel isolated or fearful, but that they actually have a future in this country?

Delegate comment

**"Very useful
informative and
enlightening"**

Racial tension

Viv Ahmun, Chief Executive, In-volve
Board Member, London Probation



Disenfranchisement

No stake in society

Central Government and local authorities go through the motions of addressing racial tension in their areas; however, the root causes go unchallenged. The disenfranchised white and black communities suffer as a result of ill-conceived and poorly communicated housing policies and, all the time, there is the backdrop of national and international misinformation and propaganda. Martin Luther King, Jr, said: "There is nothing more dangerous than to build a society with a large segment of people in that society who feel that they have no stake in it, who feel that they have nothing to lose." People who have a stake in their society protect that society, but when they do not have it, they unconsciously and consciously want to destroy it.

Angered youth

Our young people feel disenfranchised. I spent 20 years working with young people and coming into contact with individuals who have given up, who feel that they are not heard, who feel that they have been abandoned, who feel that they are not worth anything and feel that they are negative, because the labels that are posited on them are negative. In order to address the hate crime that we are talking

about – and I take Larry's point about the Anglo-American definition of hate crime; when we are talking about the gang activity taking place in our communities at the moment, we are talking about postcode-driven hate crime. Individuals are so angry, so enraged, that it is sufficient for you not to live on their block or on their street for them to perpetrate a violent act against you.

Actions to take

The Los Angeles experience

There is a need for us all to play a critical part in the process of growing the young people in our communities before it is too late. I have just come back from Los Angeles; I flew in this morning. In Los Angeles, they are saying that they have already lost the battle. They went down the road of enforcement, punishment and of locking them up, but it got them nowhere; it produced more individuals who are fearless and have nothing to lose. They now operate their business from the prisons quite happily and from across the border in Mexico. So organised and controlled are they now that the police have no real means of controlling this situation. They have now decided they have to go back to listening, caring and supporting. I spoke to the Chief Officer of Probation and he said to me, "Viv, I am trying to convince my probation officers now to put down the badge and the gun and go back to social work." We want to learn the lessons now before it is too late. Understanding identity is key to this.

Providing guidance

Many of our children, black and white, have very little ongoing guidance from caring adults and

feel they have nothing worth living for. They do not have any positive guidance in their lives; they do not have any adults around them that are giving ongoing, genuine, familial attention. They feel that they are rarely heard or valued and that they are blamed for society's problems, rather than being seen as the solution. As a result, they are often receptive to whatever is made available to them – drugs, hate crime and suicides, and by that I mean them taking their own lives in increasing numbers. They are easily manipulated by all kinds of people with their own agendas. By not addressing this very obvious reality, we are creating the environment for organisations and individuals to come in and radicalise our youth.

Cultural change

I am focused, from a legislative standpoint, on ensuring the systems that are responsible for looking after our young people, including prisons, recognise them as valuable resources. That is about changing the culture. We also need to prioritise long-term investment in our youth-specific services because, over the last 20 years, they have been decimated, which is madness. We need to place greater emphasis on working effectively when they are in unstable homes, excluded from school, homeless, in social care, experiencing mental health or in jail. We need to develop more cognitive, familial services that enable them to think, plan and respond more effectively to life's challenges. These young people are doing what they are doing for a reason, and it is important we address those underlying reasons rather than just react to the symptoms. The alternative is more fear and more violence. Thank you.

Islamic perspectives

Unaiza Malik

Treasurer, Muslim Council of Britain

Linda Pizani-Williams

Thank you, Viv and Harninder. There were some very powerful messages there. Our last speaker is Mrs Unaiza Malik, who is the Treasurer for the Muslim Council of Britain (MCB).



Introduction

Good afternoon, everybody. I am a volunteer working for the MCB, which is an umbrella organisation of a number of other Muslim-affiliated organisations. The MCB works for the common good of all people of Great Britain, with particular emphasis on trying to help and support the Muslim community. I will try to concentrate on giving you a Muslim perspective on the issues of protecting the people of London. To begin with, I will give you a few statistics to set the scene. I will speak about the involvement of Muslims themselves in the various stages of the justice system then dare to suggest some ways forward, as I see them.

A Muslim's Perspective

Easily differentiated

Muslims in Britain are more likely to be victims of hate crime than any other faith group. I can see a few reasons fuelling that. Initially, there is a constant discourse in the public arena about terrorism and terrorist legislation from our

national leaders. Even at the highest level, within the media and elsewhere, there is a constant linking of the word 'Islam' with irrational criminal violence. This in itself leads to prejudice against Muslims generally, and it can manifest itself as hate crime. The second thing is, Muslims as a faith group are easily recognisable in all public spheres; we are differentiated by our beards, like Mr Chaudhry here, by our headscarves, by the dress we wear and, more generally, by our Asian or 'other' appearance, by our vocabulary and by the way we speak English. Differentiating us is not difficult.

Persecution and discrimination

A report by the Forum Against Islamophobia has indicated that Muslims are more likely to be the victims of crime, more likely to be policed heavy-handedly, more likely to be charged for higher offences by the CPS, less likely to be released on bail and more likely to receive longer custodial sentences from the courts. Moreover, until fairly recently, Muslims, not being of a single racial group, were not protected by any single legislation and, therefore, suffered further discrimination. Fortunately, that is now slowly changing. We also suffer more disadvantages than members of other religion or belief communities. The Government's Office for National Statistics (ONS) Report, drawing on the 2001 Census, suggests that 14% of working age Muslims are unemployed compared to a national average of 5%. I am sure that has deteriorated, since these statistics are from 2001; 32% of Muslims are likely to live in overcrowded accommodation compared to a national average of

7%. You can see that there is a double disadvantage here.

What can be done?

Tackle prejudice in the media

My organisation, the MCB, is concerned about hate crimes against all people, not just against Muslims. My hope is that some of the work we are doing in partnership here, with government agencies in the UK, can act as a template or a catalyst for our European partners that are present here today. The first thing we are doing is tackling the actual formation of prejudice, which is the lowest level and which some of the previous speakers have referred to. The way we do that is to tackle it in the media as much as we can, in a calm but robust fashion. We have media-watch programmes and try to tackle it anywhere where we can find it. There are talk shows and participation and discussion groups; we have a particularly vocal young gentleman, called Inayat Bunglawala, who is on television more than in his own home.

Create role models

Secondly, we work on projects that try to create role models who can be seen by younger people. I will give you one example. We have a current project called Footsteps, on which we are working alongside the Home Office. We are currently sending ordinary people – train drivers, schoolteachers, solicitors, doctors, laboratory technicians – to talk to children in schools and local authorities in general about how they can combine the best of their jobs with their faith requirements as Muslims without many compromises. With younger

children, it is important that they see these people doing ordinary, everyday jobs, and yet being Muslim, so that they see them without horns on their heads or whatever. This takes place in various schools. We hold mosque open days, and invite the public to come in to experience, for instance, foods of the Muslim world. We invite in the public for a general confidence-building exercise, because most of the time what the public sees is a bomb blowing up and then the camera panning to a minaret and Muslims at prayer. That creates the innocuous linking in the minds of Muslims being terrorists and bombers.

Cooperate with the Criminal Justice System

The second stage is where hate crime is manifested as violence by perpetrators, and where the police come into action. The role of community organisations like my own and others is necessarily limited; however, we stay in touch with the police and cooperate with them, and with the CPS authorities as much as we are able to. We hold regular meetings with them and talk to them in an advisory capacity. When the perpetrators are within the criminal justice system, this is what we are talking about. It is interesting that Larry said that most were young men from deprived areas and social backgrounds; that is exactly why it is easier for them to be mobilised by extreme political activists to become involved in political activity. We feel there are different levels of hate crime: the young offender, or the one-off offence, is separate to the hardened extreme-right agenda. We feel these extreme political groups are the ones that need to

be identified and prosecuted. Sadly, we feel it is very difficult for the police and the CPS in this area to give a qualitative service to the public, because all of their targets are quantitative, rather than qualitative. That is how they are measured. To build quality into their work is an uphill task for them.

More mediation work

The MCB would like to see more being done on mediation work with young perpetrators of hate crime. I have two or three suggestions for the way forward. We understand that free speech is a very valuable right. It would be very helpful if people in high political office and positions of responsibility do not themselves manifest prejudices in their speeches and policies. It would also be useful if those who hold office, and are in positions to be heard, do not remain silent but challenge that particular prejudice whenever and wherever they come across it. The governments and agencies need to invest real resources and work closely with those groups who are most under threat – my concern is with the minority Muslim community in particular – to project positive images of themselves. Muslims themselves need to work at it, with help from government agencies. This is true in Europe, as well. More Muslims need to be involved within services and institutions where they can contribute to decision-making and policymaking. I am talking about the police, the CPS and the judiciary.

Tackle institutional racism in recruitment

This is very difficult at the moment for Muslims to break into because they are the most socially excluded group, and so there is a lack of education, resources and access to job information; and also because there are the lingering remains of institutionalised racism in these areas, especially in the selection and recruitment processes. We do not see them as being institutionally racist as such, but we need to go forward with some of these selection procedures, and figure out that it is always easier and more comfortable to stay with the known quantity, but more difficult to relate to somebody who has a long beard or is wearing a headscarf. Even language barriers are sometimes a hindrance, rather than a help. Positive steps in those directions would help take us forward on the agenda we are discussing today.

Mrs Malik was thanked and delegates moved into their second workshop of the day

Delegate comment

“Programme was well conducted. Time well kept. Full and effective”

Panel question and answers

Questions from the audience submitted during the morning session put by Peter Herbert as Chair of Panel

Peter Herbert (Chair), London-Wide Race Hate Crime Forum



Peter Herbert

What roles can NGOs play with the limited funding that exists?

Elena Noel, Southwark Hate Crime Project

It is about engaging the community and finding out and working with agencies in a constructive way that can engender empowerment. It is really important to listen to your communities; they have a lot to tell you. They live with the consequences of race hate and other forms of discrimination and have an important role to play in the strategic decision making process.

Peter Herbert

Is the shortage of resources in the voluntary sector something that is being addressed? What can they do about that?

Wendy Ahmun, London Borough of Barking and Dagenham

Most of you probably know what is happening in Barking and Dagenham with the recent election of the BNP members. A recent seminar held with BME staff included involvement of voluntary sector organisations and include them in our discussion and debate in a safe environment to understand their fears and concerns, so that we within the

council can channel that information through to represent them. As we have limited funding; there seems to be in-fighting in the voluntary sector. As we begin to review our community cohesion strategy, we need to address this issue and find out what it is that the community wants, rather than us telling them what we think they want and need, and channel our resources through our local strategic partnership to ensure they get to where they are needed.

Peter Herbert

Professor, do you have any views from the other side of the pond on what NGOs can and cannot do with the resources here?

Erik Bleich, Assistant Professor, Middlebury College, Vermont, USA

NGOs do a fair amount in the US, primarily in the ways I suggested some German NGOs do targeted programmes focusing on things like the school and the workplace and other aspects of civil society. Typically in Germany and the US NGOs are a little better funded. People here cobble together funding as best they can from a variety of sources. But in the US, there is a larger amount of foundation money that NGOs tap into with relative ease. In Germany, there is a pot of state money that NGOs can tap into. It is telling that the keynote speaker here today was a lawyer talking about laws, policing, and policies, and not somebody from a social welfare perspective or from the cabinet saying 'we are now putting out a pot of money for NGOs in the voluntary sector'. NGOs and the voluntary sector in the UK already do a lot of great work, but I would like to see them better funded. A

lot of great ideas are coming out of the voluntary sector and with more funding and a stronger focus on those issues, there might be more ideas spread around the country as a whole.

Peter Herbert

If that is right, and more money should end up going to the NGOs, then what is the role of the probation service?

David Scott

My contribution to this discussion would reflect on a number of things. Most importantly, money is always in short supply, is it not? What we have been talking about today strikes me as a relationship between the formal organisations that are involved in criminal justice and the supporting network of local communities and voluntary organisations. For me, rather than get into turf wars about why one part of the sector gets money and the other does not – and I have had discussions at this conference about the need for London Probation to have more resources to do its job – the issue becomes how we get leverage and how we work towards securing income and opportunity through setting out an agenda that is shared and one in which each can only survive with contributions from the other. I do not see it as either/or; I see it in terms of trying to find situations that I would describe as win/win.

Peter Herbert

Let me move on to the next question. This asks a series of questions. Does the decrease of reporting of fascist incidents mean that they are being conveniently reclassified as antisocial behaviour?

Tim Parsons, Acting Head of Diversity, City of London Police

The short answer is that I am not entirely sure. There may be a number of reasons for the reduction in reporting. Some of it may be to do with information and the understanding of where people can report and who they can report to. We have talked at some length today about opportunities for third-party reporting and self-reporting; those are areas of work that need to be developed further. In terms of particular categories of crime being under-reported, the reality is with hate crime generally, that there is significant under-reporting. We know there is under-reporting of race-hate crime, islamophobic crime, homophobic crime, and hate crime directed at people with disabilities – there is very little reporting of that at all. There is an impetus for all of us to push the message in all our communities about raising the seriousness of these offences and the need for people to report, not just victims

but, if people witness hate-related incidents, they should be encouraged to report as well.

Peter Herbert

Wendy, is that an issue that occurs in housing – that racial incidents are reclassified as antisocial behaviour and downgraded?

Wendy Ahmun

I think you are right. My thoughts around this issue are about getting hold of information and records for the crimes that are reported let alone the ones that are not. I would like to see a better record-keeping system locally, sub-regionally, London-wide, and nationally. Let us get the systems in place that will tell us about what is going on now and what is being reported now. Let us not get bogged down in categorisation.

Peter Herbert

Would that do the trick, Elena?

Elena Noel

Under-reporting is always an issue. Under-reporting still remains an issue in LGBT harassment and race harassment. I do not necessarily see the classification of antisocial behaviour as something bad. What more interests me is whether something is being done about it and that whichever agency that person reports to, there is a log kept so that six months down the line, a trace or some sort of record is kept so that we know, collectively as a borough, and as an agency, what incidents people are faced with and more importantly, what action is taken so that repeat victimisation does not occur. That is where I would focus. There is an important role for antisocial behaviour units at a local level and

also for multi-agency partnerships to tackle and identify problems. The decrease in reporting may not necessarily mean that something has not been taken about it. There are a number of channels that my clients and I take in terms of third-party reporting and people who they have faith and confidence in that something will be done.

Peter Herbert

Is there a way we can ensure that those convicted of racist offences are correctly tagged when they are sent for community punishment or community service orders, so they are tracked through the sentencing process?

David Scott

I wanted to have a quick word about the change in reporting, and whether the reduction in reporting is due to reclassification. That evoked in me what the Attorney General said to us about the importance of the prosecution process and there not being compromise in that process. The other point about under-reporting, from a criminal justice board point of view, is that if there is no confidence in reporting arrangements, there will not be confidence in the system as a whole and there will not be trust. If there is an issue, it is important that we surface it and know more about it.

In terms of the process through the system, from the probation point of view, it seems to me that is exactly what we are in the business of doing when working with offenders. The primary challenge for my staff and officers is to identify the reasons that brought them to court or prison in the first place, and then make

absolutely sure that we direct our resources at managing that risk and tackling that behaviour. It seems to me to be entirely consistent with the thrust of the question. Part of what we have been criticised for, and part of the leadership change I have to bring about for London Probation is that we have been seen – and this hurts – as still being too concerned about issues of welfare and rehabilitation, and not sufficiently concerned with challenging and tackling the risk people pose to individuals and communities. That is a big agenda for us, but it is one that is consistent with the thrust of the question.

Peter Herbert

Erik, is there any view you have?

Erik Bleich

Not particularly. There is some question about venue shopping and resources. If you file a complaint in one way or another, that can sometimes get you better service, worse service, more attention or less attention from different groups in the community and different aid agencies. I would agree with Elena's point; to some degree, what matters most is that that person is being appropriately dealt with. But if it turns out that filing this person in one way and not in another is done to avoid looking like you are a racist borough or police force, that can lead to further problems down the line if it is overlooked that a certain person is involved in racist activity.

Peter Herbert

That is some of our experience. Reclassification meant that a borough had a better presentation on race hate crime.

Table 3 wanted to know what the police can do to increase the confidence of victims to report crime.

Tim Parsons

There are a number of things that can be done. We need to develop a more comprehensive and deeper relationship with NGOs. This is long-term work. Too often the police turn up and show interest after something has happened, but when the focus on that starts to dissipate, we disappear because we have been drawn towards something else. It is about engaging with communities, NGOs, and prominent individuals within communities on a continuous basis, not just waiting for something to go wrong and then turning up. Obviously, people are going to start question your motives. It is about long-term engagement. The wider community has heard a lot of rhetoric, not just from the police but from public sector organisations generally. Now, they are looking for delivery; they are looking for tangible, concrete outcomes from the fine rhetoric. They are looking for actual implementation of things like positive action strategies for increasing the diversity of our workforce, the police service attaching value to language skills that members of minority groups can bring into the organisation, and a far higher level of understanding, perception and empathy with cultures that fall outside of the mainstream. The public have raised the bar of the police service, and it is for us to be able to raise our performance and demonstrate that we have done it.

Peter Herbert

How does the fall-out of what happened recently in Forest Gate effect the other side of the coin – those communities going to the police to report hate crime?

Tim Parsons

The fall-out is quite tangible. I can give you an example of that. An invitation was extended to me to speak at the Berwick Street Mosque a couple of weeks ago about what the police were doing about positive action – particularly in relation to the Muslim community – about volunteering opportunities, independent advisory groups, and how we want to build partnership in the community. As a result of the incidents the other week, the invitation was promptly withdrawn, and I understand that because people are very upset, particularly in the light of subsequent developments. That relationship has to be re-built, which is damaging for us as a service and for the community. The closer the dialogue and the deeper that relationship is, the less likely that incidents like that will pull us apart. Hopefully the closeness of our relationship will endure even when things come along that put the relationship under great strain.

Peter Herbert

The next part of that question from the same table was: why are there not more third-party reporting centres? If we have them, do they work at all? Does anybody go to third-part reporting centres, and if not, why not?

Elena Noel

Why do they not go? As someone who in Southwark had a part in trying to develop third-party reporting and make it successful,

there is something about trust, how communities report crime and where they go, and also about the responses that people hope to get when they do. In a lot of the situations I encounter at mediation centres is around what agencies would class as minor, aggravating situations – ones that could often escalate quite quickly into incidents. There is something about hate crime, the nature of hate and re-victimisation, that people prefer a person-to-person contact. They do not always want to write things on a form and place it in the police station; it is not always the place a lot of people want to go. They want someone to give them a swift and empathetic response.

Peter Herbert

Do they not have that in some of the centres?

Elena Noel

Across London, it is an issue that needs to be looked at in terms of why it is not working. It works in certain incidents in the LGBT community, but when it comes to race hate incidents, people are more reluctant to use them. There needs to be a clearly thought-out strategy about where they are placed and how you encourage agencies to use them to the best of their ability so they work as a mechanism and a tool to support the person experiencing hate crime and so the agency has data they can use to identify potential hotspots and hotspot areas. They also need to be available in other languages, and be more user-friendly. There is still some work to be done on that. People spoke this morning of True Vision, and I have certainly taken emails on the subject at work; there is still some development work to do. It might

be that, across the 32 boroughs, there are strategic differences as to why they are not working, but there are glitches that need to be overcome.

Peter Herbert

What is happening in Barking and Dagenham?

Wendy Ahmun



I am not familiar of the concept of the centres you are talking about, but I have given some thought to the question, and the workshops this morning have highlighted some issues that would make it very difficult for someone who is suffering domestic violence but also an illegal immigrant. Why would they go to one of those centres? That is one element. It is complex. In the dialogue that we have had with vulnerable groups, the community never comes to you – or hardly ever. That almost always does not result in a successful outcome. We need to go to communities. You can have all the centres and board meetings in the world, but we need to get used to going out on the streets and going to them. We need to engage with the faith communities; we need to lock in with their representatives, have meaningful dialogue, and involve them in designing such centres. You do not just do a centre and

decide that's it. Are these communities being involved in the design of these ideas? In our borough, we have increased the amount of street wardens from 20 to 40 in our environmental and enforcement section. We have changed their uniforms from fleecy jumpers to something a little more formal. These people work within the community and work very closely with the caretakers, the housing officers and so forth. Another suggestion is more about how your frontline staff can become champions of driving out race-hate crime within your region. Those are some of the issues that came to mind.

Peter Herbert

I am going to put the panel on pause, and take a comment from Table 9.

Participant, Victim Support, Northamptonshire

About five years ago, we very much wanted to embrace third-party reporting centres – not at all successfully. We have had success with third-party reporting forms. We have a pack, similar to True Vision, that brings all three areas of hate crime together. We have had this debate with the police, as they cannot measure the success of our reporting packs. Our argument is that by having that within our county, we do give victims another opportunity in terms of how they can report. It is also a tool we are using to spread the message throughout our county that there are alternatives. Although technically, from a target perspective, we would actually prefer they are not successful, we have a handful of reports compared to hundreds of reports through the police. They are valid

tools which multi-agency partnerships can engage with and they do give a valid option. My one criticism of True Vision is that the self-addressed envelopes are returned to the police. Some of our agencies and communities do not have the confidence with the police that we would like them to. We need to look at that and find an independent agency that can remove some of those barriers.

Peter Herbert

Professor, do you have a view on whether third-party reporting has worked in the US?

Erik Bleich



Third-party reporting is used in different countries but not in a thorough or systematic way. In the interests of jazzing up the conversation, I have a controversial thing to say: the British police are doing a much better job at this kind of stuff than the German, French or US police. At the risk of making anyone here complacent, it is important to think of ways to do this better but it is also important to recognise the commitment that the police across Britain have to this concern. Racist incidents recorded in Britain over the last few years have averaged around 50,000. In France, they average around 1,200. Why is this? It is not

because France is that much less racist than Britain, it is because there is no commitment on behalf of the police, politicians, and the criminal justice system to engage in this issue in the way it has been in Britain.

Peter Herbert

David, is there anything you would like to add in relation to the perspective of either third-party reporting or community confidence?

David Scott

I am not qualified to talk about third-party reporting, but I would like to return to the theme of confidence because it is so important to the Criminal Justice Board and the criminal justice service of London. I am helped by the comments about the police. The CJB stands or falls on the quality of work between agencies. People encounter a system or a range of agencies, and that experience is absolutely key. At the heart of this is a fundamental truth. One of the things we know about criminal justice is that one of the main determinants is people's experience. It should not surprise us because if we think about how we make judgements about healthcare or education or whatever, we do that, to a large extent, on the basis of what we encounter and experience. That is the emphasis I would place. If the system is experienced as being indifferent or inherently racist or obstructive, it follows that that will fracture trust and confidence. If the system is responsive and respectful, you start to get progress and change. That includes a range of problem areas, in which I would include rape.

What has to happen is the responsiveness, and then the agencies working together. It is not just a question of reporting, it is a question of what happens through prosecution and sentence, how people who report feel supportive and valued, and how victims are supported to give evidence. My perspective on this is that there has been a radical change in the past few years. Five years ago, as a Chief Officer of Probation, I would not have seen things so much in those terms. One of the things that has happened from working more closely with other agencies, is that there has been a much better appreciation of the importance of prosecution, the importance of speed through the system, and the importance of people being respected and supported. That responsiveness is linked to confidence.

Peter Herbert

That brings us nicely on to the question asked by table 15, which is topical at the moment: how can the awareness of the judiciary in race-hate crime be raised?

Erik Bleich

The issue of training is very important – consciousness-raising among the judiciary has been slower in Britain than consciousness-raising among the police. How do you make the judiciary system work better? If I had an answer to that I would be a very rich man. I am afraid I will have to leave it at that.

Delegate comment

“Excellent programme”

Peter Herbert

If you were the Lord Chancellor now and you had the responsibility to deal with their awareness of race hate crime – there are about 800 circuit judges, about 400 part-time people like myself – what would you do?

Elena Noel

I would put them in a bus and take them all down to Southwark to begin with. People do not necessarily have direct contact with the communities they make decisions about. They sometimes need to have the experience with those who are directly affected. In the work that I do, I hear the most tragic and sad stories, but I also hear the most empowering stories about how peoples' lives have changed. Every day I do my job it has a profound impact about how people can empower themselves. There is a lot to be learned by both sides. Often, clients who use our services and those of others in the borough say, "We do not know why our case did not go to court. I would like some feedback". I know that the people I encounter would love to meet those who meet the decisions about their lives. There is a lot of information that can be mutually beneficial to be gained from having an understanding of what those processes are. There is

something about person to person contact; that is really important. There is also a role to play for judges and people in strategic institutions to actually visit those forums, tenants and residents associations, and those community councils. They need to visit where local people go, where decisions are made, and they need to hear the impact of some of those decisions. That can only benefit the judicial process, the crime and disorder processes, mediation processes, and a whole load of processes that will bring about a change in people's lives. That is something to be encouraged. Often there are people at the top, and people at the bottom; there could be this wonderful playground in the middle.

Peter Herbert

What if you are told that they did this from 1991-95? They went all over the country putting judges with local communities, and are a whole lot better than they used to be. What if the judges say "I drive through Brixton on my way to Surrey, I watch The Bill, I've prosecuted a few Asian and black people, my wife is Muslim, so what is your problem?" How do you deal with that lot?

Tim Parsons

The message is, and Gus John made this very clear in his report, that there should be more joint training between the police, the CPS and the judiciary. We have been given a very strong direction from government in terms of the police service and training officers in these issues. I would like to think we have made some progress. You will be aware of the reports by David Calvert Smith last year on behalf of the CRE and Sir

Bill Morris' inquiry into the Metropolitan Police Service where they questioned whether the money and resources invested have produced any positive outcome. That is a legitimate question to ask, but what is the alternative? Do you stop doing it? I think that we keep going to get people out into the community and understand other people's daily lives. Get the community involved in training; get the NGOs involved in the training. Get the community to train the judiciary.

Peter Herbert

Would you be happy to sit down with your local resident judges and do some training?

David Scott

Not only would we be happy to, but we would do it. I start from the premise that judges have a difficult job and it is easy to be critical. Sitting in judgment, making decisions is a tough business. More investment in training, and joint training, strikes me as sensible. I suspect it will probably cost me my job, but there is quite an issue in selection and opening up the basis and the funnel in which people progress to be judges. That is something that I know is of concern in minority communities. You can often see that by looking at the profile of judges and it is important to people.

Exposure is key; exposure to the kind of issues we have been talking about today, with a 'but'. The 'but' is, like everybody else in the room, judges are extremely busy and extremely hard-pressed. You have to find your ways and opportunities for working with them and assisting them in this journey. From a London Probation

point of view, we have incredible support from our judges; we have judge members on the board; we have an advisory panel to the main board. Those judges would be very open to some of the discussions we have had today. From a CJB view, I think we have similar channels of communication. It is another area in which it is clear we are looking for progress and improvement. If we can encourage contact with front-line experience, that would be immensely constructive.

Peter Herbert

Table 8 ask the question: If stop and search monitoring continues to serve disproportionality on grounds of race, how can this be used to change policy and practice?

Wendy Ahmun

The only option I have is to go back to the 1980s when I was living in Tottenham and tell you what it resulted in then, which was riots.

Tim Parsons

In my force, because of the interventionist counter-terrorism strategy, we do a lot of stop and search – a huge amount. We are conscious of the potential of stop and search to alienate the people whose support we need, which is the community at large. Last year, we asked the London Metropolitan University to carry out a piece of independent research on our stop and search activity. They were asked to go out, observe what we do, survey the street population, come to the command team briefings where the strategic direction on stop and search is given, interview the officers who are doing the stop and search, and ask them of their

understanding of what it is they have been asked to do. They compiled a large report. That report concluded that there is no statistically significant disproportionality in our stop and search practice. That is just a snapshot piece of research. But we have done it twice now – in 2003 and 2005 – and the conclusions have been the same. Stop and search does not have to be used in a disproportionate way; if it is, then we have the technology available that allows us to interrogate our stop and search database, right down to activity of a particular officer.

Peter Herbert

Has it gone away?

Elena Noel

Stop and search disproportionality? That is not the experience people tell me. There is something here about public perception that needs to be addressed. Research does not always prove all the answers, and sometimes statistics are open to interpretation. About public perception, we have all been talking about trust and engaging communities in a positive way. If we are working in a way that undermines that, we also have to deal with the consequences. What that will mean is heightened tensions in communities and fragmented communities. Another thing to remember, in terms of the police, is that trained PCSOs and I hear that there is a larger input of people from BME backgrounds becoming PCSOs will have a ripple effect that we need to think about. If an officer has been identified as continually stopping and searching disproportionately, then there a re-training issue. There is an attitudinal issue and,

subsequent to that, a retraining issue that needs to be addressed – individually and collectively.

Peter Herbert

In relation to the probation service, and the explanations that sometimes people give when they are fed through the system, is that your experience?

David Scott

This is incredibly difficult. My staff's experience is to be very aware of that ripple effect. In responding to this, I was struck that I have never been stopped and searched. About two years ago, I attended the National CJB, the board that sits above the 42 area boards. I remember it for two reasons. I had expected to be there as an observer and it had not been going on long when I was asked a question by the Home Secretary. The other thing I remember more than that was the discussion about stop and search figures and a real debate at the centre of Government and policy-making in terms of whether anything had changed in 15 years and what needed to be done. I remember the integrity of the debate. I do not have answers. The two words themselves are so evocative and contentious; I think the crucial thing is what we have heard from the police in terms of their application and their scrutiny of local experience and local reaction. Again, it speaks to the heart of getting people to have confidence and trust in criminal justice. Having worked in this sector for a long time is that we get caught up in the need for training and processes, but this is about people's lives. This is the reality of their day-to-day existence. It is not just judges who need reminding of that – we all do.

Closing remarks

David Scott

Chief Officer, London Probation

What really brought this home to me was the recent judgment on the sex conviction, when one of the victims said "I am not that judge's daughter". It is fine when it is happening to someone else, but we have to remind ourselves that these are people's real lives.

Peter Herbert

That is a good point on which to end. Can I thank all members of the panel for their contributions?

Delegate comment

"Very good and stimulating and well put together... the balance was just right"

You have worked extremely hard today, and I want to do justice to what has happened. I want to acknowledge that this conference has been a year-plus in the making. I am struck by the weight of the issues and the heaviness of the matters that we have talked about. The subject matter in which we have been engaged is hate, and looking at the side of our society that is either hidden or causes immense damage and worry to all of us. There is always a tension between hate and destruction, and optimism and thinking well about the future.

I have been struck by the quality of the dialogue and engagement today. I have called in on workshops and it seems to me that, in the world we are in, 'dialogue' is an important word. Very often, we are in environments where we either shout, are

shouted at, or are instructed to do things. Actually, what often brings about change is the quality of dialogue and understanding. I have also been encouraged by the fact that the Attorney chose this environment and this audience to launch his action plan. That gives us significance in looking ahead to the future and gives me, as your Chair, optimism.

Thank you all very much for coming. We have had a superb contribution from speakers, workshop leaders and discussion chairs. A great range of you has contributed to making the day happen. Workshop leaders, speakers, all of you, thank you. I think this has been a landmark event and I am confident about where we go from here. Thank you for your preparedness to engage. Thank you for your contributions to what has been a special day.



Workshop reports



Protecting victims by challenging perpetrators attitudes

Workshop Facilitators; Liz Dixon, Hate Crime Coordinator, London Probation, David Court, Probation Officer, London Probation, seconded to the Greenwich Hate Crime Project



This workshop was aimed at practitioners working with perpetrators. We -

- set out the objectives of current London Probation interventions
- looked at issues of assessment
- gave participants a variety of case studies to demonstrate the challenges involved
- described the assessment tools we have designed to assist us in assessment
- explored the importance of multi agency working with this area of crime
- explored specific race hate issues.

Objectives of London Probation Interventions

We carry out a multi-agency focused risk assessment. We seek to ensure that the impact on the victim is fully reflected in court and parole reports. We work with victim's agencies to gain consent regarding non-contact conditions and exclusion zones. We confront the offender with the impact of their behaviour on victim/s. We highlight the immediate and long-term harm to victims and communities. Materials address

minimisation and denial in offending behaviour and expose the 'motivation of offending.'

Assessment

The aim is to accurately assess the depth of offender's prejudice and animosity towards the target victim or the target group and the likelihood of harm to general public/or specific individuals or communities. We

assess the most effective proportional response, to mark the offence and reduce re-victimisation. We assess the impact of the offence on the immediate community. We consider the community dynamics by engaging with multi-agency partnerships. Even low-level public order incidents when seen to be racist or homophobic 'sew suspicion and fear, dividing the most harmonious of communities.' (Punishing Hate Lawrence 1999). We explore offender's history of antisocial behaviour using partnerships e.g. housing, schools, Community Safety Units and prisons. We assess the potency of the prejudice using specialised assessment tools, Crimepics, OASys (Offender Assessment System) and selected materials from the Hate Crime Offender Manual.

Reducing the risk of reoffending – objectives

Changing attitudes; Identifying offending attitudes and developing new attitudes. Managing prejudice; exploring roots of prejudice and influential socialisation process which trigger offending behaviour.

Interventions geared at developing victim awareness. Modifying behaviour; to show how attitudes and thinking inform offending. To develop safety plans. We monitor behaviour and utilise links with multi-agency re risk management in this endeavour.

Case studies.

We looked a range of cases and asked participants;-

- 1 What information do you need to carry out an initial assessment?
- 2 What other agencies should you contact?
- 3 What are the risk indicators?

Good discussion ensured highlighting different types of offending and motivation and risk which required different interventions.

We ended workshop by focusing on the positive evaluation we have from the Greenwich Hate Crime Project and summarised some of key issues in work with perpetrators such as:

- the challenge of looking at what are 'hot' issues in cold interview rooms – the difficulty in getting offenders to dialogue the issues
- the importance of managing the risk and alerting relevant staff
- the need for staff to enable offenders to develop strategies to manage the risk or reduce the risk
- raising victim awareness – staff need to be innovative and responsive – visits to local victim support agencies, trips to community projects, videos, stories...

The session was very interactive and well attended. Packs of 'handouts' were distributed

Models of effective working between the Criminal Justice System and voluntary sector

Workshop facilitator; Bennett Obong, Forum Project Manager, and Julian Seal, MPS representative, from the London-Wide Race Hate Crime Forum

Bennett introduced the Forum, which is a multi-agency body aimed at reducing and preventing race hate crime, improving confidence and satisfaction of victims in reporting race hate crime, promoting consistent service across London and identifying and promoting good practice.

Bennett outlined the Forum's current project of requesting London boroughs; police and

council, to present their work on race hate crime. In addition he spoke of the importance of involving members of the community, especially victims, when formulating strategies to tackle race hate crime.

Questions and topics were explored around supporting victims and the importance of working with, and involving, young people.

Hannah Mason-Bish ended the workshop by presenting the findings of a report on the importance of the borough presentations, especially when combined with contributions from a victim's perspective.

Delegate comment

"Good opportunity to meet others with similar interests"



Questions and comments from workshops

Questions and comments from the first workshop session:

Suggestion of supporting victims by bringing them together. (This is not an specific area of work in which the Forum would embark but may be an area voluntary groups may chose to explore as part of supporting victims of hate crime. The role of the Forum must be understood to be a strategic body that seeks to establish a London wide policy in relation to dealing effectively with hate crime [race and faith], where statutory bodies take action and are compliant with legislation. (This comment suggests that the role of the Forum was not understood).

What about voluntary groups and victims? The presentation went on to explain how the victim perspective is included as part of the borough presentation process.

What about MPS Officers who are victims of hate crime? MPS Officers are individuals first and Officers second and therefore any reporting of hate crime should be dealt with in accordance with a clear and consistent procedures.

Why not extend CPS project into courts? This followed the sharing of a CPS project, which looked at consistency in the numbers and types of hate crime offences taken through the court process. This was a CPS generated project, which was useful in identifying if there were any inconsistency in charging of race or faith based hate crime.

What about young people? The Forum is aware young people have not been part of a specific focus of its work. The MPA is currently exploring through

consultation with young people, their experiences of policing and will seek to ensure their experiences assist in developing and improving performance on the ground.

What about the use of civil powers when there is not enough evidence for criminal proceedings? The Forum is working with boroughs to explore the use of civil powers as options to deal with anti-social and other forms of discriminatory behaviour. This is to ensure a clear message is sent to the community about what is acceptable and unacceptable behaviour and be seen to respond swiftly and appropriately.

Questions and comments from the second workshop session

What about funding for voluntary sector organisations? The Forum is not a body that can fund other organisations. It would however lend its support to those organisations demonstrating good practice as recommendation of good/effective work where an organisation is seeking support for funding. The Forum is in the process of establishing good practice criteria and so where this is exhibited, the Forum would lend its support, which may assist organisations in securing funding.

How are we working with youth? (already responded to in first session)

How are you working with youth regularly? (already responded to)

Definition of race-hate crime when there is no evidence? The definition of race hate crime is that used by MPS/ACPO and linked to

the McPherson definition of perception.

Difference between incidents and crimes? There was some lack of awareness around this issue and an explanation was presented to illustrate the difference. Also this was linked to how the police and local authority can respond in certain crime and non-crime situations.

What are aggravated crimes? An explanation was given linked to the CPS definition of aggravated crime.

How can we encourage individuals with mental health issues to report hate crime? The Primary Care Trust will be part of the linking with the work of the Forum. This is yet to be formalised but it is hope this will be part of the Forum good practice monitoring.

Delegate comment

“Good variation of workshops”

Refugees as victims of hate crime

Workshop facilitator; Vaughan Jones, Director of Praxis

Praxis, a community organisation with 23 years of experience working with refugees, runs the Refugee Probation Advisory Service.

Refugees already begin with an experience of violence. Hate crime, often in its most extreme forms of genocide, gender-based war-crimes, repression and torture give rise to flight to safety and protection. The journey into exile can also be a violent and disturbing experience in which refugees are vulnerable to exploitation and abuse.

People bring with them the memories of traumatic experiences and the painful process of bereavement, often multiple including loss of many family members, home, language, and status. Arrival is often accompanied by culture shock and whole new set of issues, many practical to address.

It should not be surprising, therefore, that communities who have survived become very self-protective, supporting each other within circles of trust. This is both positive and negative.

Refugees are here as a result of a binding international agreement – the 1951 UN Convention on Refugees. Protection must mean more than a stamp in a passport. It has to be safety from further persecution and violence in the country of refuge.

The prevailing climate in this country does not provide a guarantee that this will happen.



The media has consistently been hostile. The “asylum seeker” question has become inter-related with other race agendas and there has been a steady, insidious and erroneous linkage between asylum and crime. This has fuelled a “hate” agenda in the wider population and provoked extremism on the part of right wing groups.

Coupled to this has been a heavy-handed approach by the state toward the most vulnerable groups. As targets for deportations are based on numbers rather than risk, the easiest groups of people have been singled out. This has meant a general suspicion of authorities.

Not surprisingly the outcome has been under-reported hate crime. This has taken place within neighbourhoods, in schools, and some communities, such as the Somalis feel, with some cause that they are being particularly singled out.

The workshop identified the important role of faith groups and community-based initiatives, many

refugee led and of the role of the voluntary sector. The response is not just about the empowerment of victims but also the empowerment of communities.

It should also be recognised that best practice will have some important components - accessible information, the empowerment of community leadership, interpreters (properly trained), recognition of earlier trauma, and employing refugees in statutory bodies.

The workshop urged serious investment in a positive approach at community level and the establishment of new partnerships.

Tackling hate-motivated extremism and radicalisation

Workshop facilitator; Matthew Collins, Director of Operation Wedge at Searchlight Information Services

One of the challenges of this workshop on race hate was to pinpoint its origins and how it is used to radicalise people.

Few race attacks in the UK are carried out by members of race hate groups. Very few people even come into contact with the specific organisations that overtly encourage racial hatred and violence against people based on their race or ethnicity.

What we try to show is a lineage and the drip-down effect that may begin with larger organisations that create a sense of victimisation in the potential victimisers and a use of language and/or a corruption of cultural identities and history. Although the organised groups would dispute it, the workshop showed the way individuals can be swayed by powerful messages, often associated with delivery through popular media such as music and sport.

The workshop covered a wide range of symbols and words that may have been relatively familiar

and dissected their meanings and show how they can be misappropriated by hate organisations.

A large amount of time was given to discussions concerning the legitimate use of identity based symbols. There was a healthy discussion around those issues, particularly as it was during the World Cup and the country had seen an explosion in the numbers of flags.



Race Hate Crime – Learning from the experience in Northern Ireland

Workshop facilitators;
Pat Conway, Director NIACRO
and Barry McMullan, NIACRO

Northern Ireland has a population of 1.6m – 55% unionist/protestant and 44% nationalist/ catholic. 0.85% of the population comes from minority ethnic backgrounds with 59 identified ethnic groups living in Northern Ireland.

The audience at both the morning and afternoon workshops heard that race and faith-based hate crime is a relatively new phenomena to the Northern Ireland psyche. The political/ sectarian conflict had masked other prejudicial attitudes and actions and it wasn't until 2004 with the Criminal Justice (NI) Order legislation was passed which directly dealt with offences aggravated by hostility based on membership of a racial group; a religious group; sexual orientation or disability.

Case studies on the Sikh community (showing the lack of cohesion and contact between the different classes and professions) and the Chinese community (to show the embedded prejudice inherent in Northern Ireland society towards having a Chinese boss) were presented.

Clearly there is a lot of progress to be made to challenge stereotypical prejudices of minority ethnic communities and it was suggested that change can be effected on four fronts;



- Politically – address lack of convergence
- Legislatively – harmonise legislation
- Structurally – all sectors (government, statutory bodies. Private sector and NGO's) to mobilise on issue at a local, regional and national level
- Attitudinally – education combined with robust unequivocal policing and judicial practice.

An overview of NIACRO's engagement with hate issues was given focussing on projects it manages and organisational policies to make staff feel welcome, valued, and safe.

The example of the 'Healing Through Remembering Project' was cited as an ongoing model which attempts to bring healing and reconciliation between the two main communities in Northern Ireland.

The concept and practice of Restorative Justice was discussed in the context of a 'policing vacuum' within republican and working class loyalist areas.

The notion of police accountability and acceptance especially following the police response in the raid on the house of the two Muslim men in Forest Green generated healthy discussion during both workshops. The audiences expressed a keen interest in the current political situation in Northern Ireland and felt that lessons could be learned from post conflict models of good practice at reconciliation. As always, time intervened and some of the audience expressed an interest in attending the Northern Ireland AGIS event scheduled for 6th September 2006 in Belfast.

What we can learn from the experiences of our European partners – Malta, Bulgaria and Germany

Workshop facilitators; Dr Mark Montebello, Director of Mid-Dlam Ghad-Dawl, Malta and Judy Korn and Ullrich Dovermann of the Xenos Project, Germany; Chaired by Linda Pizani-Williams
This workshop consisted of two presentations.

judicial system will offer any protection or recognition of the racial motivation.

The second presentation was given by Ullrich Dovermann and Judy Korn from Germany. Ullrich described the purpose and objectives of his organisation,

completed the programme, only two have re-offended, but neither of them committed a racist or politically motivated crime.

The participants at both workshops commented on the difference between the two countries, both in terms of the historical background and judicial response to racially motivated crime. The similarity between the rise of xenophobia in Malta and other European countries also caused concern.

The participants were impressed with the success of the German programme, and wondered whether the model could be transferred to other types of offender, such as perpetrators of domestic violence.

It was unfortunate that time constraints limited the discussion following the presentations, as all the participants were clearly interested in all aspects of the issue in the different countries presented.



The first presentation was given by Rev. Dr. Mark Montebello from Malta, describing the demographic history of Malta and recent events which have increased racial prejudice and tension. The most significant catalyst has been the huge increase in illegal immigrants from the North African countries, creating unsustainable demands on the Maltese Government. Crimes motivated by hate are not recognised by the judicial system in Malta, although there is relevant legislation. There is growing support for right wing xenophobic politicians and an increase in racially motivated attacks. These are rarely reported because the victims are often illegal immigrants who fear deportation, or because the victim does not believe the

Xenos, which works with young people to promote citizenship and respect. Part of their activities includes encouraging young people to take responsibility for tackling extremist views. Five years ago Xenos realised that they needed to work with young adults who had been imprisoned for racist crimes, as the prisons themselves became a breeding ground for extreme right-wing attitudes. Judy described the programme they have developed, working with groups of young prisoners who were motivated to change their behaviour. The programme takes place within the last 6 months of sentence, and includes working with their families and post-release support. Of the 150 young men who have

Criminal Justice responses to crimes of hate in London

Workshop facilitators; Sam Rust, London Criminal Justice Board, Mike Ainsworth, Race Unit, Daksha Mistry, Violent Crimes Unit, Yasmin Rehman, Jim Blair and Sue Jacobs, Metropolitan Police Service

Objective – to seek to define the key priorities for the criminal justice agencies nationally and locally for handling hate crime.

To engage discussion the facilitators set out the priorities for their organisations and then asked for responses, comments and contributions from the workshop delegates.

The key issues raised in the two workshop sessions were:

- Realistic partnership working which gained the confidence of communities is key.
- There is a need for support for practitioners dealing with a hate crime cases – suggestions included guidance, examples of good practice and contacts in agencies who could provide advice.
- There needs to be more information on the programmes available to address this type of offending behaviour.
- Ensuring there is sufficient information for the charge to be made and all agencies are clear that the offence cannot be plea bargained.
- A need for assistance and not intervention, for example in schools whether there are challenges with hate crime – one suggestion was for a mobile advisory team.
- There needs to be a realistic view of how hate is impacting on organisations rather than 'reputation management'.
- There needs to be better developed links between the police, CPS and probation.
- Linking with practitioners wider than the CJS, for example, mental health, Job Centre Plus, Social Services, education, Victim Support.
- More thought needs to be given to how CDRPs and local authorities can be involved in addressing hate crime as part of the CJS response.
- Is the criminal justice system creating victims with no legal redress because of immigration law



Agency	CJS	Home Office	MPS	CPS	London CJB
Priorities	Holistic approach	Increased reporting	Identify perpetrators	Victims and witness at heart of the system	Bring agencies together
	Common definitions	Preventative work	Effective interventions	Voice of victims heard	Multi-Agency responses
	Minimum standards	More effective CJS	Link to violent behaviour	Integrity of data	Community involvement
	Case tracking	More offences brought to justice	Service to victims	Ethnicity of victims and perpetrators	Public confidence
	Training for judiciary	Better intelligence	Decrease murder	Workforce representation	
		Better data	Accurate recording	Identifying cases	
			Linkage to ASBOs	Interagency training on hate crime issues	
			Training	Internal systems to respond to internal	
				Flagging and monitoring cases	
				Partnerships	
				Working with communities	
				Successful prosecutions	

Speaker and partner biographies



Speaker and partner biographies

Suhail Aziz Chair, London Probation Board

Suhail is an international management consultant with a record of achievement in the fields of organisation, management, economics and community relations. Trained at the Royal Naval College, Dartmouth, he served in the Pakistani Navy before returning to England. His private sector experience includes companies such as Ford Motors, the Mars Group and PA Consulting.

He served as council member of the Home Secretary's standing conference on race relations and Director of the Commission for Racial Equality. His most recent positions were as Chair of Lambeth Healthcare Trust and Chair of the South London Healthcare Trust.



David Scott Chief Officer, London Probation

David Scott started as the Chief Officer for London Probation in April 2005. David was previously Chief Officer for the Hampshire Area where he chaired the Hampshire and Isle of Wight Criminal Justice Board. Before that, he was Chief Officer for West Sussex Probation Area.

David Scott served as a member of the Parole Board for six years. Formerly, he was the Lead Chief Officer for the South East Region Training Consortium and one of the Employer's Advisers to the National Negotiating Committee.

Qualified as a Probation Officer in the early 1970s, David has a background in staff and organisational development, and completed an MBA with the Open Business School in the mid 1990s.



Tim Godwin Assistant Commissioner, Metropolitan Police Service

Tim Godwin is the Chair of the London CJB and will be leading the Board over the next two years.

He credits team work by criminal justice agencies for the significant improvements that have been made to London's criminal justice service since 2003. Achievements include a reduction in recorded crime by 7.6% and an increase of 33.3% in the number of offences brought to justice.

Tim's aim is to build on this progress by continuing to strengthen the collaborative links between the agencies and organisations represented on the Board and supporting the 28 borough criminal justice groups that implement the London CJB plans on a local level.

"As Chair I will continue to strive to provide London with the very best of criminal justice services by strengthening existing ways of working together and developing new approaches."



Tim is the Assistant Commissioner in charge of Territorial Policing, having joined the Metropolitan Service as a Commander in 1999. He was appointed to Deputy Assistant Commissioner in Territorial Policing in 2001. He was instrumental in reducing street crime in London through Operation Safer Streets and is the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) lead on mobile phones.

Erik Bleich Associate Professor

Erik Bleich is Associate Professor of Political Science at Middlebury College in Vermont, USA. His interests lie in the fields of race, ethnicity, and policymaking in developed democracies. He is the author of *Race Politics in Britain and France: Ideas and Policymaking since the 1960s* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), and he has published articles on related topics in leading academic journals. His article 'Responding to Racist Violence in Western Europe' is forthcoming in the *American Behavioural Scientist* and is part of his larger on-going project on state responses to racist violence in Britain, France, Germany, and the United States.



Rt. Hon. Lord Goldsmith QC Attorney General

Lord Goldsmith QC was appointed on 11 June 2001 as Her Majesty's Attorney General. The Attorney General, assisted by the Solicitor General, is the Chief Legal Adviser to the Government. The Attorney General has overall responsibility for the Treasury Solicitor's Department, superintends the Director of Public Prosecution as Head of the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS), the Director of the Serious Fraud Office (SFO) and the Director of Public Prosecutions in Northern Ireland. The Law Officers answer for these departments in parliament. The Attorney General has public interest functions in which his responsibility is as guardian of the public interest.



Peter Goldsmith was born and brought up in Liverpool. He went to Quarry Bank High School/Comprehensive there before reading law at Gonville and Caius College Cambridge taking a double first class honours degree. After a Master's Degree at University College London, he was called to the Bar, Gray's Inn in 1972. He then practised from Fountain Court Chambers in London. He was appointed Queen's Counsel in 1987. He has judicial experience, sitting as a Crown Court Recorder since 1987 and a Deputy High Court Judge since 1994. He was created a Life Peer in 1999, and a Privy Counsellor in 2002.

In 1995 he was Chairman of the Bar of England and Wales. He has also held a number of posts in international legal organisations including Council Member of the International Bar Association and the Union Internationale des Avocats. From 1998 until his appointment as Attorney General he was co-Chairman of the IBA's Human Rights Institute. Between 1997 and 2000 he was Chairman of the Financial Reporting Review Panel, an independent public body responsible for enforcing

financial reporting standards. In 1997 he was elected to membership of the American Law Institute and made a member of the Paris Bar.

In 1996 he founded the Bar Pro Bono Unit of which he was Chairman until 2000 and remains President. He was the Prime Minister's Personal Representative to the Convention for the European Charter of Fundamental Rights.

Professor Larry Ray Professor of Sociology, University of Kent

Prof. Larry Ray's main research interests are sociological theory, globalisation, race and ethnicity, and violence. For some years he has been researching the crisis and transformation of post-communist societies and its implications for understanding social theory.

In 2005 he published *Social Theory and Post-communism* (Blackwell) with William Outhwaite at Sussex University. During 1998-2000 he had an ESRC funded project with Prof. David Smith (Lancaster University) on racially motivated violence in Greater Manchester and its relationship to community dislocation. This was part of the ESRC's Violence Research Programme and examines the complexity of racism and the conditions in which racist violence occurs. This developed further into examination of 'hate crime' legislation and its effectiveness in tackling racist violence, which has involved work with the probation service, Home Office and other public sector bodies.

Between 2001-02 he conducted research with Kate Reed into needs and identities amongst ethnic minority communities in East Kent. This included examination of patterns of transnational identity and global networks. He is currently working on a book on globalisation (Routledge) and developing a project on the emergence of Jewish identities in post-communist Europe.



Viv Ahmun London Probation Board Member

Viv is Chief Executive of In-volve, a national charity for disaffected members of society, which particularly targets young people. He is also an accomplished businessman who believes in community empowerment. In 1992, Viv established the first young people's drugs service in the country. His organisation continues to pioneer work in this area, and currently runs the biggest young people's drug service in Britain. Viv takes a very hands-on approach to facilitating youth empowerment, and personally works with a minimum of 10 young people at any point in time.



Unaiza Malik Treasurer, Muslim Council of Britain

Unaiza Malik is Treasurer of the Muslim Council of Britain. Previously served for four years as Assistant General Secretary of MCB. From 1999 to 2002, Mrs Malik was President of the Muslim Women's Association, the oldest women's Muslim charity in Britain.

Mrs Unaiza Malik took her BSc (Hons) in Economics at the University of Karachi, Pakistan. She moved to England in 1976 with her pilot husband and young family. She worked in the IT industry for 30 years and, retired in 2004 as director of software development with an international telecommunications company. From 1993 to 1997, at the invitation of the Department of Education she served as an Executive Director of the National Council for Education and Technology.



Chitra Karve Director of Equality and Diversity, London Probation

Chitra Karve is Director of Equality and Diversity at London Probation and is a qualified solicitor. She has a strong interest in human rights issues and formerly worked for the Council for Racial Equality.



Alan Weston AGIS Projects Manager, London Probation

Alan Weston is the AGIS project manager on behalf of London Probation and manages the existing project.

UK Criminal Justice experience

In November 1989, he left Hertfordshire on promotion to Senior Probation Officer/Warden at Westbourne House a 43 bed probation and bail hostel he managed for four years before moving to manage the East Ham probation team. In 1994, he moved to Stratford Office to manage two probation teams, one which specialised in Magistrates Court work and one in community punishment and prison through and aftercare. Since 2001, he has held a number of roles that have evidenced his strong project management skills and is currently Diversity and Confidence Projects Implementation Manager for London Probation. He works closely with the London Criminal Justice Board on improving BME confidence, a key concern post 7/7.

Hate crime experience

As above, he has worked and managed projects and teams focused on working with high risk offenders. He also chaired the Newham Racial Harassment multi agency partnership project Diverse City for six of its seven year life. He has been working with the Greenwich Racially Motivated Offender Project to develop and expand the Diversity



Awareness Program (DAP) a London-wide approach to working with Racially Motivated Offending now shared with EU partners in RHCE1.

Project management

He has a vast experience of project management and delivery both as a worker and manager in the criminal justice system and with voluntary and minority ethnic communities, tackling the issues and impact of crime. In the last year, he has managed and co-ordinated 45 street-crime based projects in 15 London Boroughs. These have included work to reduce islamaphobia in Croydon; the delivery together with Diverse City and the Newham Race Equality Council (REIN) of London's first minority ethnic communities street crime conference at Docklands Excel Center (May 2003).

Linda Pizani Williams MBA Director of EISS at Kent University

Currently Director of the European Institute of Social Services, within the School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research at the University of Kent at Canterbury. Linda is a highly professional and experienced Public Sector manager who has been at the leading edge of policy and practice developments in the field of criminal justice and social inclusion. A keen understanding of the current political and social environment affecting public services, particularly in the Criminal Justice System, research and practice in relation to offenders and effective models of intervention.



Over the past 12 years, Linda has established an enviable reputation, managing complex transnational projects and working to influence decision makers at a European level. She is able to recognise and respond to the needs of different interest groups, and is familiar with planning and negotiating at a strategic level. Linda thrives on challenge and change, creates opportunities from threats, achieving ambitious targets without compromising professional integrity or the fundamental principle of equality of justice.

Pat Conway Director of Services, NIACRO

Pat is currently Director of Services for the Northern Ireland Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NIACRO). He trained as a Social Worker and practised in the London Borough of Enfield and North and West Belfast Social Services Trust, primarily in child protection but also generically and in community development.

In 1990, he was seconded from Social Services to NIACRO to set up the BASE 2 project which focused on providing services for those under threat from paramilitary organisations. He later went on to manage NIACRO's Employment Services and took up his current post as Director in 2000. Pat is currently responsible for NIACRO's adult services (namely areas in Training and Employment and Resettlement) and also has responsibility for communication and research. Pat also has a keen



interest in community based restorative justice programmes as well as developing truth recovery processes in respect of the conflict in and about Northern Ireland.

Barry McMullan NIACRO

Barry McMullan has worked for the Northern Ireland Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders (NIACRO) since 1996. His background is in welfare rights having previously worked for Citizens Advice for six years. As a member of NIACRO's Resettlement Services team, he works with serving prisoners, prisoners' families and released prisoners within the context of addressing social welfare needs and the barriers to successful resettlement and reintegration.



Rev. Dr Mark Montebello O.P. Director, Mid-Dlam Ghad-Dawl Malta

Mark is a founder member of this and other projects established by the Daritama Foundation in Malta. Mark is a well-known author in Malta, where he makes regular television appearances, speaking on race crime issues. Among his main projects has been the creation of a prison visiting service and victim support for the people of Malta. His project works extensively with foreign national prisoners.



Juergen Hillmer Bremen Institut für Kriminalpolitik , University of Bremen

Juergen has more than twenty years of professional experience in programmes focused on the vocational training and resettlement of ex-offenders in different NGO's. He has been in charge of the coordination of European projects since 1997 at the Institute für Criminal Policy for the University Bremen while also at the regional Ministry of Justice in Bremen (Senator für Justiz und Verfassung Bremen). His responsibilities include elaboration, direction and follow up of programmes for the labour and vocational training of offenders.



Delegate comment

**“Enjoyable and
informative –
more please!”**

Delegate list

Title	First Name	Last Name	Company Name
Mrs	Rosemary	Abernethy	London Probation
Mr	Viv	Ahmun	London Wide Race Hate Crime Forum
Ms	Wendy	Ahmun	London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
Ms	Joan	Ainsworth	Specialist Mediation in Lancashire East
Mr	Mike	Ainsworth	CJS Race Unit
Ms	Grace	Ajayi	London Probation
Mr	Assan	Ali	London Borough of Southwark
Mr	Issah	Ali	London Probation
Mr	Omer	Altaf	Southwark Council
Mr	G. A. Lux	Anandarajah	Bexley Council for Racial Equality
Ms	Pauline	Anderson	NAPO
Mr	Jamie	Angus	Searchlight Magazine
Mr	Suhail	Aziz	London Probation
Mr	Kuldip	Bajwa	London Action Trust
Mr	Albert	Barnes	London Probation
Mr	Emmanuel	Basaba	African Community Involvement Association
Ms	Caroline	Bates	Metropolitan Police Service
Ms	Elva	Beaton	Millpond TRA
Mr	Eric	Beckford	London Probation
Ms	Barabara	Bennett	West Yorkshire Probation Service
Ms	Mark	Blake	London Wide Race Hate Crime Forum
Ms	Jennifer	Blake	Eternal Life Support Centre (ELSC)
Professor	Erik	Bleich	Middlebury College
Ms	Carleen	Bollers	Victim Support Southwark
Mr	Kieron	Brady	Show Racism the Red Card
Miss	Laura	Braithwaite	London Probation
Ms	Linda	Brookbands	Lewisham Council
Ms	Valerie	Brown	Race Equality in Newham
Mr	Jomo	Browne	London Probation
Mrs	George	Busillus	From Darkness to Light
Ms	Angela	Byres	Redditch Borough Council
Mrs	Jennifer	Caney	London Probation
Mr	Desmond	Carr	London Probation
Mr	Bashir	Chaudhry MBE	League Of British Muslims UK
Ms	Farah	Chaudry	Ilford Community Centre
Ms	Bridget	Chohan	CPS
Mr	David	Clark	City of London Police
Miss	Sharon	Clarke	London Probation
Ms	Brigette	Coles	London Probation
Ms	Matthew	Collins	Searchlight Information Services
Ms	Pat	Conway	NIACRO
Ms	Lucy	Cottell	Devon and Cornwall Criminal Justice Board
Mr	David	Court	London Probation
Mr	Tony	Crampton	City of London Police
Mr	Paul	Crane	Lemos and Crane
Ms	Susan	Crane	London Probation
Ms	Jenny	Daly	Praxis
Mr	Mike	Diss	Victim Support Newham
Ms	Liz	Dixon	London Probation
Mr	Ulrich	Doverman	Xenos Project
Ms	Kamalita	Easwaran	PRESET Charitable Trust

Mr	Charlie	Edwards	London Probation
Mr	Stefan	Emiljanowicz	CRI (Camden Drug Intervention Programme)
Mr	Carl	Ferguson	London Probation
Ms	Jolena	Flett	Northern Ireland Council for Ethnic Minorities
Ms	Gerry	Gable	Searchlight Information Services
Miss	Laura	Gaga	London Probation
Ms	Elizabeth	George	London Probation
Mr	Tim	Godwin	Metropolitan Police
Lord		Goldsmith	Attorney General
Dr	Anthony	Goodman	Middlesex University
Mrs	Jenny	Goodman	Victim Support Bedfordshire
Mrs	Francoise	Grant	London Probation
Mr	Mark	Green	London Borough of Hounslow
Ms	Pauline	Green	National Probation Service
Ms	Michelle	Grimwood	Victim Support Northamptonshire
Mr	Steve	Hale	British Transport Police
Dr	Mariam	Hall	National Probation Service Humberside
Mrs	Nick	Hammond	London Probation
Ms	Angela	Hands	North Wales Probation Service
Ms	Yvonne	Harding	London Probation
Ms	Tirion	Havard	London Probation
Mrs	Margaret	Headland	London Probation
Ms	Olga	Heaven	Hibiscus
Mr	Peter	Herbert	MPA
Miss	Sarah	Hibberd	London Probation
Ms	Jurgen	Hilmer	Uni-Bremen
Mrs	Beverley	Houghton	Redditch Borough Council
Mr	Brian	Howatt	British Transport Police
Ms	Samantha	Hughes	HMP Belmarsh
Mrs	Maeve	Hunnisett	London Probation
Miss	Sultana	Hussain	London Borough of Newham
Mr	Herman	Irish	The Paralegal Charity
Mr	Nazrul	Islam	Bangladeshi Association of Merton
Ms	Sue	Jacobs	Crown Prosecution Service
Mr	Jai	Jayaraman	Lambeth Mediation Service
Mr	Terence	Jolley	Care Services/ Volunteering
Rev	Vaughan	Jones	Praxis Community Projects
Mr	Freddy	Kabongo	Ministry of Power in the Name of Jesus Christ
Ms	Elizabeth	Kayembe	African Women Welfare Association
Ms	Lillian	Kitusa	ASPA
Ms	Christine Mary	Knotts CBE	Home Office
Miss	Rekha	Kodikara	Crown Prosecution Service
Ms	Judy	Korn	Xenos Project
Mr	Neil	Lauchlan	Belmarsh Prison
Mr	Steve	Lee	LB Hillingdon
Mrs	John	Leetouche	N/A
Mrs	Yvonne	Leetouche	N/A
Miss	Tanya	Legister	London Probation
Mr	John	Lewis	Probation Service
Ms	Tanuka	Loha	The 1990 Trust
Mr	Pradip	Lotlecar	L A A C C
Mr	Leith	Lovell	London Probation

54 Delegate list

Dr	Graham	Macklin	Searchlight Magazine
Ms	Yvonne	MacNamara	Brent Irish Advisory Service (BIAS)
Mrs	Unaiza	Malik	Muslim Council of Britain
Miss	Saima	Malik	London Probation
Ms	Alveena	Malik	Commission for Racial Equality
Mr	Sikander	Malik	London Borough of Hounslow
Miss	Casey	Marie	Victim Support Newham
D.I.	John	Marriott	Metropolitan Police
Ms	Hannah	Mason-Bish	University of Essex
Ms	Kaunchita	Maudhub	London Borough of Enfield
Ms	Mary	McFeely	London Probation
Ms	Sonia	Mcleod	London Probation
Mr	Barry	McMullan	NIACRO
Mr	Fahad	Mohamed	Somali Family Support Group
Mrs	Fran	Monk	Specialist Mediation in Lancashire East
Mr	Adam	Monsell	London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
Dr	Mark	Montebello	London Probation
Miss	Sarah	Moore	London Probation
Mrs	Teresa	Munro	London Borough of Barking and Dagenham
Mr	Claude	Murray	Eternal Life Support Centre (ELSC)
Mr	Abdalla	Nagib-Ali	Thames Valley Probation Area
Mr	Osman	Nazir	London Probation
Ms	Marie	Neale	NPS Humberside and Humberside LCJB
Ms	Wilma	Nelson	Millpond Tenants and Residents Association (TRA)
Ms	Elenor	Noel	Southwark Mediation Centre
Mr	David	Obaze	National Coalition For Black Volunteering
Ms	Bennett	Obong	London Wide Race Hate Crime Forum
Mr	Kingsley	Odoemelam	Probation
Mr	Manny	Oke	Thames Valley Probation Area
Miss	Yvonne	Okiyo	Lambeth Crime Prevention Trust
Miss	Yeliz	Osman	Probation
Dr	Nazima	Osman	Asian Women's Advisory Service Ltd
Mr	Abdullahi	Osman	
Mr	Ian	Outerson	London Probation
Mr	Ben	Owusu	Greenwich Action Campaign Against Racist Attacks
Mrs	Jane	Papafio	Thames Reach Bondway
Mr	Tim	Parsons	City of London Police
Miss	Kruti	Patel	Home Office
Ms	Linda	Pizani-Williams	EISS
Mr	Larry	Ray	University of Kent
Ms	Yasmin	Rehman	Metropolitan Police
Miss	Nadine	Reid	London Probation
Reverend	Neil	Richardson	Holy Cross Church
Mrs	Susan	Rocke	Hillingdon Council
Miss	Samantha	Rust	London Criminal Justice Board
Ms	Shereen	Samara	Croydon and Sutton Law Centre
Ms	David	Scott	London Probation
Mr	Jayendrakumar	Shah	Sangam - Association of Asian Women
Mrs	Terri	Shipston	Metropolitan Police
Mr	Dinker	Shukla	Barnet Asian Old People's Association
Mr	Gurjit	Singh	Redbridge REC
Miss	Karen	Smith	London Probation

Miss	Joanne	Sojinu	London Criminal Justice Board
Ms	Christina	Sosanya	The Hackney Society
Ms	Sue	Staff-Lonie	Thames Valley Probation Area
Ms	Min	Styles	Essex Probation Area
Mr	Ben	Tarekegn	London Probation Board
Ms	Helen	Taylor	Independent Community Delegate
Ms	Gaby	Teme	Bremen University
Ms	Barbara M	Thomas	London Probation
Mr	Chris	Thompson	West Yorkshire Police
Ms	Ruby	Thompson	London Probation
Mr	Robert	Thompson	Southwark Council
Mrs	Lesley	Took	London Probation
Mrs	Maryt	Traves	Portsmouth Mediation Service
Mr	Thomas	Trevorrow	London Probation
P.C .	Doug	Turland	West Mercia Constabulary
Mrs	Shaminder	Ubhi	Ashina
Mr	Nasir	Uddin	Probation Service
Ms	Edna	Udovich	London Probation
Ms	Rose	Waites	Her Centre
Mr	David	Walker	Southwark Mediation Centre
Ms	Charlotte	Walker	London Probation
Ms	Paulette	Wallace	Avon and Somerset Probation Service
Ms	Gillian	Walters-Strachan	Southwark Mediation Centre
Miss	Laura	Webb	London Probation
Ms	Esther	Webb	Thames Valley Probation Area
Mrs	Lisa	West-Beal	London Probation
Mr	Alan	Weston	London Probation
Mrs	Maureen	Weston	Independent Community Delegate
Mr	Shane	White	London Probation
Mr	Ian	Whitehouse	West Yorkshire Police
Ms	Yvette	Williams	Crown Prosecution Service
Mr	Kevin	Williams	Thames Valley Probation Area
Miss	Robyn	Williams	Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary
Mr	Gareth	Williams	Metropolitan Police
Mr	Arik	Yacobi	London Probation
Ms	Aisha	Yassin	Ealing Racial Equality Council

