

Programme for a Peaceful City

Systematising an Experience  
2001-2006

**Lisa Cumming**

**ICPS Working Paper 6**

**(Inside cover: Copy Editor Maggie Bolton, Preface and academic support  
Professor Jenny Pearce, International Centre for Participation Studies  
<http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/icps/>).**

The purpose of a systematization is threefold. It is first and foremost a tool for self reflection and critical analysis by participants of a process. Secondly, it enables participants to adjust and plan better for the future, learning from past mistakes and problems. And finally, it informs non-participants and hopefully encourages them to get involved.

Lisa Cumming has worked with these goals in mind to produce this systematization of a six year experiment in how a University can share concerns and pool skills with local communities to help build a better place for working and living. She has been assisted by many people who have come in and out of the PPC as their time and inclination permits over the years. In the appendix we have only listed the members of our steering and now advisory committees. Many others have nurtured this process on its way and created lively and sometimes tense debates about the role of the PPC. We thank them all for their contributions.

Readers will note that this systematization is open and self critical. The PPC did not set out to solve the problems of Bradford District. Participants in our network do not have a 'solution' to take off the shelf for addressing the complex issues facing the communities of the District. These include the legacy of economic change and decline and the differential impact on the South Asian communities who came to work in the factories that have closed down, as well as problems in housing, education and employment. PPC participants see value in the partnerships to be forged through the network and the discussion of difficult topics. Above all the PPC is a commitment to building a way of talking about the divisions and differences within and between our communities, largely a legacy of our social and economic past, as a first step to finding shared solutions for the future.

On the journey, we have had many difficult moments as PPC network participants have debated and reflected on ways forward. Our systematization has tried to convey the ups and downs of this journey. We have learnt how quickly trust erodes where there is little clear leadership from the local state. We have also learnt that lack of trust makes it very difficult to challenge and open debate. Our idea of 'safe spaces' has been taken up in the District by others. But we are very aware that Bradford people are still not comfortable in talking about issues such as ethnicity, religion, gender, diversity, inequality and racism in ways which could encourage the search for shared understandings and an end to all discrimination and oppressions. It is for this reason that Bradford District's idea of building a 'Shared Future' will require, we think, much more effort to open up ways of exploring these issues which go deep into our individual lived experiences as well as that in our groups and collectivities.

One of our tasks for the future, therefore, is to deepen this effort and the challenges it implies. We all need to confront and examine our assumptions towards each other and to acknowledge the legacy of social inequality, racism and gender discrimination on people's sense of self worth. We need to recognize the power relationships amongst us all, and how we can be powerless in one relationship and use our power to dominate in other relationships. There are complex intellectual problems to be addressed, such as the unresolved debate around multiculturalism, cohesion, integration and interaction. The PPC is just one space in our District for this debate to take place. The debate is not in itself the solution to the material problems facing our many poor communities. But opening it is one way of democratizing the search for such solutions and ensuring that as many voices as possible participate in finding them.

Professor Jenny Pearce  
July 2007

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	
1. Introduction.....	4
2. Brief History of the Programme for a Peaceful City .....	6
2.1 May 2001: The PPC is established.....	6
2.2 May 2001- April 2003 : Defining the role and purpose of the PPC .....	6
2.3 PPC April 2003-2006 .....	10
2.4 PPC Structure and Administration .....	17
3. What has been debated and how? .....	18
3.1 Ouseley: Fear and Distances.....	18
3.2 Post Ouseley: Analytical Polarisations.....	19
3.3 Safe Spaces, Deliberation and Dialogue .....	22
3.4 What has been debated.....	24
4. What do people say about the PPC and what do people want from us? .....	34
4.1 Who are the PPC members?.....	36
4.2 PPC Key Achievements .....	36
5. The University and its District: The PPC Five Years On.....	38
6. Conclusions.....	41
References.....	44
Appendix A: Timeline of PPC Network Meetings .....	45
Appendix B: Strategic Vision of the Programme .....	54

## 1. Introduction

This document is a critical reflection on the five year journey (2001-06) of the Programme for a Peaceful City (PPC). The PPC is a response by Bradford University academics to the many challenges facing the District in which the University is located, and which were highlighted by the riots which took place in July 2001. It arose from the feeling that our University, which stands high on the Bradford skyline amidst some of the poorest wards in the country, should play its part in the District. This systematic look at what we have learnt over the five years is intended to help us plan better for the future.

Following this introduction, Section 2 of the document is a brief history of the PPC and documents the different moments of the journey. It has not been an easy ride. The PPC sought to open space for disagreement and debate in a safe way. However, the backcloth has been a series of dramatic international and national events, notably 11 September 2001, the invasions of Afghanistan & Iraq and the London bombings on 7 July 2005. In addition, the framework for understanding those events and the social and political logics behind them has been constant upheaval, challenge and counter-challenge. Cohesion, multiculturalism, and integration policies have failed to build a consensus regarding the best way forward for multi-ethnic Britain and opinions have polarised over the war in Iraq and many Muslims fear that their religion and culture are not welcome in Britain. At the same time, extremists who act either in the name of Islam and or in the name of a white British hegemony stir up the fears and insecurities for political goals. These international and national tensions play out in different ways in localities with strong minority ethnic communities that are, at the same time, affected by deindustrialisation and inequalities.

As we review where we are in 2007 after 6 years of activities, the difficulties of discussing social divisions around 'race', class, religion and gender, and the interactions between all of these, stand out. There are strong opinions and views expressed in magazines, newspapers and on the television and radio, but at the local level, the exchange of such opinions in public arena remains very constrained. Such issues are highly sensitive and individuals have profound personal experiences of racism, discrimination, inequality, abuse and even violence.

The PPC was set up in the wake of the Bradford District Race Review (or the Ouseley Commission, as it became known after Sir Herman Ouseley who chaired it). The Commission recognised that with the decline of the textile industry and manufacturing, the District had found it hard to redefine itself for the 21<sup>st</sup> century and had lost its 'spirit of community togetherness'. As a result, the report argued that fissures in the District along race, ethnic, religious and social class lines had opened up, and fear had grown out of the distances. Fear is present, for instance, of talking openly and honestly about problems, either within communities or across different cultural communities, because of possible repercussions, recriminations and victimisation. Overcoming such fears became one of the drivers of the PPC, and lay behind one of its key aims: the creation of 'safe spaces' for discussing the difficult issues which divide people. Safe spaces were not intended to be unchallenging spaces; on the contrary the aim was to subject all assumptions to critical scrutiny and debate, including the Ouseley Report itself and subsequent debates around cohesion, multiculturalism, integration and segregation. We have had some fascinating meetings and discussions and Section 3 gives a flavour of these.

The PPC has tried to build on the perceived 'neutrality' of the University, and the commitment of academics to evidence and argument, to bring people together across the District. Our list of activities and the numbers and range of people we have brought together, along with the diversity of the themes we have tackled, suggests we have been quite successful in that respect. We have tried to push discussion on topics where we think that there are potential or actual disagreements, and where it is difficult to reconcile strongly held beliefs. Nonetheless, this is an area we have only begun to explore. We have, rather, concentrated on building confidence and trust between the university, activists, practitioners and policy makers across the District. Some of this is done quietly through informal conversations, participation on District Committees, working groups and so forth. We have also attempted to systematise our thinking around the conditions for honest dialogue, or safe spaces. For a while this was done through dedicated hubs, which included work with organisations in the District involved in training and education, and bringing people together within the University and the District to discuss research relevant to the District. The PPC has always sought to work in partnership with others, and in that sense was able to feed into the expansion of the University's community engagement strategy with the District of Bradford. When the Programme Officer became part of the team of community associates delivering that strategy, she fed the PPC's experience of working with people in the District into that strategy.

The PPC has sometimes been happy to be a 'talking shop' and has tried to encourage listening as well as talking. But we have also tried to contribute to the District in more practical ways, over issues of tensions and threats. An example here would be having called people together across the District to discuss the potential impact of the Iraq war. Another would be our role in responding to the events of 7 July in London.

However, many debates have been very hard to move on. It can be hard to talk about tensions that exist within all communities as well as those that exist between them. The PPC is not complacent therefore about the tasks ahead. We have always worked in partnership with local people, and we think that one of our main achievements is the network of people who now regularly come together and learn from each other. Out of the trust that has been forged, the PPC has been able to influence informally, rather than directly shape, some of the efforts to deal with intra-community problems, and on certain notable occasions, such as 7 July, this has been of benefit in diffusing situations which could have exacerbated tensions. Section 3 analyses the content and context of our conversations further.

Section 4 gives a flavour of what people say about PPC meetings and events from evaluation and gives a brief description of who attends. Section 5 contextualises the PPC within new developments in the University of Bradford and the District before we reach some key conclusions in Section 6.



Discussion during lunch at PPC event.

## **2. Brief History of the Programme for a Peaceful City**

### **2.1 May 2001: The PPC is established.**

Many people assume that the PPC was established in response to the Bradford riots, when in fact the first meeting was held two months before the events, in May 2001. The PPC grew out of the participation of two Peace Studies academics in the Ouseley Commission. The Commission put forward a series of recommendations which would both tackle race and other discriminations, but would also try to arrest what was seen as the tendency of Bradfordians to live separate lives according to ethnic and class identities. The academics who participated in the Ouseley Commission felt that these recommendations should be supported by action to promote their implementation.

The PPC began with a group of academics meeting with people from the communities of the District to discuss research, propose initiatives and open debate on the problems facing Bradford District following the riots of July 2001. This space became known as the network meeting and until April 2003, when a worker was appointed, was where most PPC business was carried out. The spirit of the network was critical and honest debate based on principles developed over time for conducting the debate.

### **2.2 May 2001- April 2003: Defining the role and purpose of the PPC.**

The first PPC meeting was for interested Peace Studies academics, and explored the sorts of research needed, whilst acknowledging that this was uncharted waters for Peace Studies: a department with no track record of substantive local research. The second meeting explored big ideas – people dreamt of setting up courses, building links, facilitating dialogue, looking at equality issues, sharing information about international conflict and providing a resource centre. It is interesting to note that the early meetings were strongly influenced by the proposed idea for an International Peace Centre (IPC), which unfortunately never came to fruition, indeed at times the acronyms PPC and IPC seemed to be used interchangeably. During the second PPC meeting on 5 June 2001, a member of the Ouseley 'Race Review' team predicted the riots - which suggests that some members certainly had their finger on Bradford's pulse.

Early meetings showed a humility on the part of academics about what they could offer, but, at the same time, a strong feeling that there should be a real engagement between university and locality that is more about partnership than about positing Bradford as an 'object' of research. The first meeting was established by and for Peace Studies academics, and much thought was given as to how to involve other academics from within the School of Social and International Studies who already had more experience of local research. Applied research is valued and it would seem that the academics were extending the University's key aim of 'Making Knowledge Work' to 'Making Knowledge Work'...*for Bradford District*. One constant throughout the journey of the PPC has been the aim to share research ideas, thinking and findings, and to facilitate dialogue, particularly about some of the difficult issues facing the District. It was felt that academics should agree to a set of principles about the role of the PPC. These focused a great deal on research: the aim was to ensure that research in the locality was conducted in an ethical and responsible way which gave back to the District rather than extracted from it. The original principles were updated in 2005 by the Steering Committee (Appendix B), and it is felt that they should be regularly scrutinised and updated.

PPC Meetings developed into a space where people would share ideas and information. After a summer where Bradford saw the worst rioting on mainland Britain for 20 years – and the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington on Sept 11 – the PPC reconvened on 19 September 2001. Not much discussion is recorded on the riots but the seriousness of tensions is certainly noted.

There was much thoughtful discussion about how the PPC could 'add value' and offer something different; how it can reach out to other academics from within SSIS (not just Peace Studies); how Bradford can respond to difficult issues; and also how the PPC needs to be an umbrella for diverse opinion not an NGO with a policy prescription for the District. Indeed, the lack of consensus around the character of the District's problems amongst both academics and community activists, made the latter most unlikely!

The September meeting showed that academic and senior staff in the university were concerned about local issues and the impact they were having on both the University and people's lives. The impact of the riots on the District brought academics together: some academics voiced very personal concerns about the areas where they lived and certainly some academic interest seemed motivated by personal as much as professional interest.

Between May 2001 and the beginning of 2003, there was no paid worker for the PPC. A small group of dedicated academics and retired academics managed to organise a series of meetings over two years, including workshops, a very well attended forum on the Diversity Exchange and a seminar about Iraq (See Appendix A for full PPC Network Meeting timeline).. Some members also started working on collaborative research projects. The PPC thus combined small meetings with the larger events that were attended by members of statutory bodies, as well as community groups and activists. In the wake of the riots, 11 September and the war in Iraq, there was a lot of interest in joining a space where certain rules prevailed to discuss critical issues.

One of the first events that was organised with this in mind, aimed to build consensus for the implementation of one of Ouseley's recommendations: a Centre for Diversity, Learning and Living, which was a District-wide equality and fair treatment initiative for all public services and employers. This event, 'Towards a Diversity Exchange',

attracted over 200 people from across the District to discuss the premises for such an initiative.

The event took place alongside the idea of building a network of academics, practitioners and citizens from Bradford District committed to promoting discussion on how the District could develop better conditions for people to live together. This would follow up on the findings of the Ouseley Commission, but move beyond it by opening debate about those findings and testing their relevance and potential for the District.

This was an effort to promote the implementation of one of Ouseley's key recommendations for a Centre for Diversity and Learning. There was a feeling that the delay in implementing Ouseley was discrediting the Commission, but also that some of the recommendations were sensible and relevant to the District. The Diversity Exchange meeting was also the first event which tried to elaborate 'rules for debate'. Such rules would continue to be developed, but represent the difficulty that the organisers felt surrounded debate on difficult issues – a constant theme in the journey of the PPC.

A second notable event was the meeting to discuss the war in Iraq and its potential impact on Bradford. A march against the war was planned for Bradford. An interesting discussion took place between the police who were present and members of the PPC who requested that the police made clear before the march that they were there to facilitate it not to control it. The Chief Inspector made this clear in statements to the press, and the march went off very peacefully, linking together many communities that opposed the war. The PPC had shown that it could provide a space for discussion between agencies and citizens, where discretion was respected.

The PPC was keen to reach out to non-academics. People in this category were not much in evidence in the organisation's early days, but those who came brought an important range of experiences and interests to the PPC. For instance, the problem of the lack of interactions between young people was raised. The community voices were able to help academics understand that this concern was being voiced by young people themselves. The polarisations of post-Sept 11 had a very important impact on the youth of the District, and there were concerns about racism and extremism regarding both the BNP (British National Party) and Hizb-ut-Tahrir (the controversial political organisation whose ideology is rooted in an interpretation of Islam). Local young Muslims expressed concern to the Programme Officer that the latter were active on the University campus.

Another big theme for PPC members at this time was the campus. The issues of racism and homophobia on the University campus and in the surrounding area were raised throughout the winter of 2001. Campus security representatives were invited to the PPC to discuss these issues. The PPC launched a staff/student survey on harassment in an attempt to get evidence about people's perceptions of their safety.

The spring of 2002 saw the nature of the PPC again under scrutiny with agreement reached in January that the PPC would not carry out research as a collective but rather that members could share research ideas and that the PPC would aim to provide 'a forum for intellectual discussion'. Principles were being established around the purpose and goals of the PPC.

There was a meeting on 23 May 2002 when the 'Breaking the Silences' report draft was shared. The idea that the PPC should enable and value critical debate was strengthened by the fruitful exchange of views which ensued. Questions were raised

about how to disseminate the eventual report and how it should be framed. This report raised again the question of the nature of the PPC. The tension between acting as an 'umbrella', promoting debate, and acting as a collective with one voice remains a point of disagreement between some members. There was also a debate about whether the report could be released as a PPC document. This was never really resolved although there was agreement eventually that the report could be framed as a 'PPC discussion paper', although not as a PPC position paper.

In the course of 2002, the idea of building '**safe spaces for debate**' became a major area of PPC work. There was a desire to experiment with different ways of achieving such discussion spaces. At this stage more ideas were put forward than there was capacity to deliver. Topics that members wanted to discuss included sentencing following the riots, policing, biraderi/clan politics and the youth parliament. There was a pattern in meetings of people making lots of suggestions without reflecting enough on the PPC's limited resources and capacity to deliver.

In Nov 02 an academic member urged the PPC to take on what was termed an advocacy role, partly in response to a gap that the member felt existed in local leadership. The discussion was more about whether the PPC could and/or should provide a lobbying role in the District. There were different views raised in response to this paper – one of which pointed out that as there are such differing views in the District, there is no collective voice from which to speak. In Nov 2002, another paper called for the PPC to take on a questioning role rather than specific positions on issues but also wanted policy papers to be produced and suggested that the PPC should avoid political interventions not backed by academic expertise.

#### **PPC: Discussion Themes 2001-2003:**

**The riots, young men, policing, sentencing, cohesion, gender, Bradford politics, youth participation Cohesion, Participation, Conflict, Citizenship Education, Safe Spaces/dialogue, International conflict such as Iraq, Segregation (or not?) in Bradford and other contexts, Identity, Inequalities, Extremism, Fascism, the Riots, Racism, Safety, Local Democracy, Leadership, Faith, Relating to Difference, Language – Words.**

In March 2003 there was a really interesting debate about whether the PPC should engage with political views that are seen by many to be extreme – after much discussion, with some members taking the 'no platform' approach and others wanting differing levels of engagement, it was agreed that the PPC should engage with the issues about why people support organisations such as the BNP and Hizb-ut-Tahrir but not with the groups themselves. This could be said to demonstrate that some members were conceptualising the PPC as an 'it' – a NGO rather than a network. The question of the Iraq forum was still undecided – how to shape this event takes months of debate.

In this early period, the tendency was to recognise that the PPC must be a pluralist and open space, rather than a place where consensus is constructed and policy formulated. The discussion was never resolved for everyone because for some the lack of clear leadership in the District meant that the PPC had to step in and play that role. However, the risks of such a position were more apparent in the course of the years as the debates raged around the various topics outlined above. Network Meetings began to be more thematic with both academic and practitioner input. Business took place in separate meetings.

### PPC Ground Rules for Debate

*These were inspired by the usual groundrules that meetings employ, such as at Chatham House, but also from conversations with local and highly experienced community workers and an organisation called Community Dialogue based in Belfast who really push the rule of 'confusion' and people only representing themselves. Our rules are slightly clumsy, as sometimes people need to speak about their 'organisation', but we try and use them so that people do not feel they have to speak either for their organisation or on behalf of 'their community'.*

**~ Speak sincerely & freely, listen to each other & be prepared to change your mind.**

Additional groundrules depending on context: -

- ~ Offer a level of respect that you would expect**
- ~ Confidentiality - Chatham House style where comments may be minuted but not attributed.**
- ~ Participants can choose to represent themselves only and/or organisations.**
- ~ Explore.**
- ~ It's OK to be confused.**
- ~ If you normally say a lot try and speak for short bursts – no speeches.**
- ~ If you don't speak, take responsibility that your opinion won't be heard.**

Later that year, a hub structure was established and members met to discuss research, education/training and 'safe spaces' or how to develop an environment where people could safely talk about difficult issues. The Safe Spaces hub contributed to other agencies in the District considering dialogue as a means to explore conflict. The aims of these hubs were to generate focused discussion between academics and members of the communities and statutory and policy bodies of the District. The PPC continued in the spring of 2003 to have meetings that covered PPC and University business, local issues, the nature of the PPC, thematic discussions and so forth. A presentation was given to the PPC from a (now retired) senior manager who wanted to see the PPC become a 'strategic programme'. At the same January meeting a PPC member raised concerns about their neighbourhood, demonstrating again that some people's motivations for involvement are more personal than others. Throughout the spring there were also some ideas suggested by practitioners about research needs but it is very unclear if these ideas were acted upon. For example, the suggestion was made to research voluntary aided schools.

**⇒ Should the PPC have done more (now as much as then) to at least engage with research needs that local practitioners, rather than academics, identify, since the latter perhaps may use the PPC to pursue their own research interests? Could the PPC have done more to facilitate discussion about research priorities? How realistic is it to hope that academics might wish to respond to locally identified areas of need, especially given all the pressures of on full-time academics to perform in the national Research Assessment Exercise?**

### 2.3 PPC 2003-2006

In November 2002, the successful securing of funding for a Programme Officer post prompted the first substantive discussion recorded about the role a Programme

Officer should play in the organisation. This was a significant turning point in the PPC history. There was the first real mention of a delivery plan which outlined what the University had agreed the PPC would deliver for the funders of the Programme Officer post (funding is from Yorkshire Forward via the Church Regional Commission). There followed a consultation with all members and from the subsequent debate, the key priorities for the work of the PPC were identified. These were defined as:

Co-ordinated, valuable research in line with ethical principles.

Space for meaningful exchanges/discussions.

Quality training relevant to the needs of the District.

Members viewed the PPC's main strengths as – ideas, debate and academic links. Its perceived weaknesses included lack of clarity about 'who and what we are' and lack of structure.

As such it was agreed that in addition to monthly network meetings with both academic and practitioner input, the PPC would focus on **research, safe spaces and education and training** through dedicated hubs or sub-groups. The PPC pressed forward its evolution, but members remained divided on whether the PPC was set up: 'to lobby or not to lobby'.

A 'Visioning' exercise was held 28 April 2003 to build agreement on the future direction of the PPC, but there remained much internal debate about the nature of the PPC and the competing needs and interests of the academic members. This tells us something about the difficulties of engaging academics in a collective enterprise. Academia is notoriously individualised, and in that sense the PPC went against the grain of an institutional culture. Some members had begun to use the PPC as a personal space to air very genuine concerns about their localities. The appointment of a Programme Officer meant that meetings would become more formal.

➤ **There was certainly something useful about having a space to air and share problems – but was this the kind of value added role that a University is best suited to providing or did the PPC fulfil this function in the absence of other agencies providing this kind of space?**

PPC Network meetings from mid 2003 began to follow the format of having both academic and practitioner input on the same or linked thematic area. The PPC heard workers from community centres raise questions about how to resolve conflicting views, such as whether or not to serve pork at a community café, alongside an account from an academic carrying out comparative studies of Bradford, Rotterdam and Glasgow. We learnt about similarities and differences of participation in Bradford and Latin America, along with expert analysis of the increasingly gloomy international situation.

➤ **This seems (backed up by evaluation comments) one area where the PPC has added value to the District's debates – bringing the global and local together and facilitating debate on this.**

The PPC also heard an analysis of regeneration from the nationally innovative Royd's Community Association with analysis of housing issues and inequalities from Dr Terry Allen of the Department of Social Science and Humanities (SSH). Dr Ian Vine presented ideas for increasing participation, whilst the PPC heard about local artists losing the Bradford Festival they had lovingly nurtured when Bradford Council decided to award the contract to the Glasgow based UZ and Brighton based ZAP. Debates were held about the role of faith communities and about dealing with our

differences. The PPC debated and continues to debate the nature of relationships in Bradford and whether communities are living 'parallel lives': for example, the July 2004 Annual Meeting on 'the Multi-Culturalism debate'. Some members argue that this is the most urgent and pressing issue for Bradford, while other members castigate the PPC for opening up this debate and see the PPC as contributing to 'a myth of self-segregation'. What is mythical and what isn't with regard to how people are living, working and playing together is hotly debated but it is worth noting that discussions on this topic always get a high attendance.

There was a sad and hopeful moment at the Annual Meeting on 7 July 2005. The PPC was set to debate Bradford five years on from the riots when news starting coming in about the London bombings. The PPC was able to contact key people in the Council and Police and offer the Annual Meeting to be converted into a reflection space. This was greatly enhanced by the Civic Network, which had been established with the support of the Anglican Bishop, to bring together a cross sector grouping to plan Bradford's conflict prevention strategy should there be an atrocity in the UK similar to the bombings at Atocha in Madrid.

The PPC had gained enough trust to bring activists, councillors, council officials, the police and residents together, despite the many critical debates we had hosted. This was very encouraging, and it meant that the PPC could use this trust together with the Civic Network to diffuse any tensions arising from the activities of a few extremists acting in the name of Islam. At the same time we have tried to ask why it was that such extremists existed amidst a community that overwhelmingly rejected such action. This event *seemed to demonstrate how the University could and should provide neutral space and that relations can be built that don't detract from the academic need to critically question*. Of course not everyone who attended would have felt that it was a safe space for them: one person e-mailed afterwards to state that too many Faith leaders attended. Another criticism voiced by a participant at the PPC Visioning Day is that the Council Officers, Leader and Faith Leaders did not enter into the spirit of the PPC and simply used the event as a platform for their own needs.

All the subjects of network meetings from Autumn 2005 were agreed at a second PPC Visioning which took place 19 July 05. The Steering Committee, which had widened to include academics and practitioners, gave direction to all the thematic content of all meetings and most events and seminars. 2005 saw more meetings which looked at the international situation and July 7, and more meetings about the 'segregation' debate, as this was identified as important to the diverse members of the Steering Committee. We also had a meeting about whether class had been forgotten, although it is interesting to note that some academics who had long been voicing the criticism that the PPC had forgotten class and socio-economic inequalities, forgot themselves to attend. Interestingly the meeting attracted more 'White older men' than usual and only one 'BME' PPC member. Who is interested in what, is something that seems worthy of research itself. Sometimes people comment that the PPC is unrepresentative of Bradford but different meetings and events attract different audiences – ***could we do more to interest people in things they might not be attracted to or is it fine that people self select from a varied menu?***



**Panel of speakers at PPC Annual Meeting 2006.**

Our Annual Meeting in 2006 was entitled, 'A Shared Future – Why Bother?' and speakers included Professor Ted Cantle and Dr Ludi Simpson along with local voices. A 'Shared Future' was at the time (this has since been subject to some degree of disagreement between different agencies) the new local language to replace 'cohesion' and we thought it important to explore this. Ted Cantle is both revered and reviled by PPC members depending on their views on whether people in Bradford are living 'parallel lives', or not. We also invited Ludi Simpson to give his views on the 'self segregation debate' as his work has been criticised by PPC academics and some local members. The attempt was made to try and get people to hear '**the other point of view**' although of course the danger with that is everyone ends up hating what you are doing.

**⇒ Would it be preferable for the PPC to just engage with members who feel people are living parallel lives and everyone could sit and share their stories of self segregation? Or should we acknowledge the diversity of views within the membership and attempt the dangerous path of genuine debate?**

Again not everyone at this event was satisfied that this was a safe space for them to share *their* views and we need to acknowledge this. The majority of people who completed evaluation forms, however, enjoyed the debate and the high numbers of people attending (99) would suggest that many people agree this is an important area to discuss.

**Programme for a Peaceful City  
Key Events 2001-2006**

**Bradford District-Wide Forum: Towards a Diversity Exchange.**

8 April 2002

**The Role of the Media**

14 May 2003

**Beyond Victimhood: British Muslims and the Challenge of Relevancy.**

Fuad Nahdi

9 May 2003

74 attended.

*Organised in partnership with Dr Philip Lewis who secured the speaker.*

**Mosque and School: Bridging separate intellectual worlds – an urgent task for the Muslim educator today.**

Dr Abdullah Sahin

27 Nov 2003

70 attended.

*Organised in partnership with Dr Philip Lewis who secured the speaker.*

**What are the Conditions that give rise to Fascism and Far Right Movements?  
What are the lessons for Bradford and the rest of England and Wales?**

Professor Jenny Pearce, Professor Roger Griffin, Shahid Malik

Geoff Robinson, Dave Stark, Professor Ken Medhurst, Wolfgang Deicke.

7 Feb 2004

70 attended.

**Islam and Democracy: What's the Problem?**

Dr Adelwahab El-Affendi

13 May 2004

100 people attended.

*Organised in partnership with Dr Philip Lewis who secured the speaker.*

**Religion, Art and Free Speech**

M Y Alam

Iain Bloomfield

Revd Canon Sam Randall

Dana Jalal

Shanaz Gulzar

40 attended, in partnership with Peace Festival.

**'The Frontier Gandhi: an Islamic contribution to peacebuilding.'**

Friday 18 November

100 people attended.

In partnership with the Council for Mosques.

**'Islam and Britain – What Does the Future Hold?'**

21 November 2005, University of Bradford.

Professor Tariq Ramadan.

400 attended.

*This event was organised by the voluntary efforts of the Bradford branch of the **Islamic Society of Britain (ISB)** as part of Islam Awareness Week 2005 in partnership with the PPC*

### **Forum on Religious (In)tolerance**

Wed 29 March 2004

85 attended.

*This aimed to explore intolerances within Judaism, Christianity and Islam and the possibilities for tolerance as part of various activities in the District to celebrate the life and work of Dietrich Bonhoeffer in partnership with Revd Canon Sam Randall.*

All of the above events were opened out to a wider audience than the PPC network via local media, organisations and networks etc. Nearly one thousand people have attended these public events, demonstrating that there is a hunger in Bradford for intellectual debate and that the PPC is meeting a particular people have to learn, reflect and debate which seems in the spirit of the University's wish to 'Making Knowledge Work.'

***There have also been many seminars and workshops that the PPC has invited people to participate it, this is not an exhaustive list but some of these include:***

❖ **Workshop with Community Dialogue, Belfast.**

**24 March 2004.**

Learning also shared from Bradford. Workshop attended by Faith workers, community workers, council officers and grassroots activists. The Initial links with Community Dialogue were made by Patricia Skeet.

❖ **Seminar in 2004 to disseminate the findings of the report, 'Fair Justice for All? The response of the Criminal Justice System to the Bradford Disturbances of July 2001', 2004 funded by JRF.**

❖ **Two Symposia in May 2005 looking at Young Men and Masculinities.**

❖ **Thinkbucket Belfast** – two creative workshops have been held with Thinkbucket Belfast, a collective who use creativity and play to explore conflict and 'difficult conversations'. The first was in 2004 and the second in March 2006. The idea is now firmly in place to create a similar creative collective in Bradford.

❖ **'Race', Cohesion and Conflict Training Day Tues 7 March 2006.** Funded by the Centre for Community Engagement and in partnership with BARP (Bradford Anti-Racist Project which includes Education Bradford, Youth Service, BYDP, BKYP, Millennium Volunteers, CVS, and the Police, the University, independent training consultants and so forth). Participants included grassroots workers from the youth voluntary sector and Youth Service along with teachers and the Police Officers.

### **The Hubs**

As has been mentioned, the PPC in 2003 structured itself to have 3 thematic areas (or hubs) of work:

- **Research**

The Research Hub provided a space for people researching Bradford to come together and share ideas, thinking and dilemmas. Due to busy workloads full time

academics have found it difficult to attend meetings (even though there were only 2 or so a year) although the more seminar style events such as the Symposia on Men and Masculinities were well attended.

- **Education and Training**

The Education and Training Hub provided a small reflection space for trainers involved in diversity, cohesion and equalities training to come together and share ideas and dilemmas. One of the most interesting issues to arise is what trainers should do with difficult issues that might arise during training.

- **Safe Spaces**

Safe Spaces at first provided a space for people to come together and share thinking about what safe spaces mean. This was to support practitioners and activists who wanted to put on their own events.

Following the Visioning exercise in 2005 instead of meeting as a hub, it was agreed for the Programme Officer to organise a series of Safe Space seminars on the following subjects:

Learning from the PPC.

Creating Safe Spaces for Young People to Explore, Think and Question (held at Bradford Youth Development Partnership (BYDP)).

Radical Disagreement.

### **Bradford Anti-Racist Project (BARP)**

The Programme Officer has kept a facilitative role with BARP from her last job. In a nutshell BARP is a multi-agency partnership which has carried out local research about young people's experiences of racism and the training needs of professionals. It has attempted to facilitate a network of various agencies, carried out and evaluated innovative training including working with the West Midlands based Rewind project, which takes a deconstructionist view of 'Race' and attempts to 'unlearn the learnt'. Pilots have been carried out with Nabwood School, Bradford and Keighley Youth Parliament (BKYP) and a cross section of professionals many of whom work at the grassroots.

### **Linkages**

The Programme Officer has represented the PPC on various strategic bodies in the District including the Diversity Exchange Advisory Group and the Community Cohesion Task Group. She also meets with the Youth Service to explore political education and global issues for workers and young people. On occasion, the PPC has also created safe spaces for professionals to come together to discuss conflict prevention issues at times of potential tension. The Programme Officer has worked closely with the Civic Network and on one occasion worked in partnership with it to facilitate a safe space discussion about African, African-Caribbean and Asian community relations following disturbances in Birmingham and in response to a request from a Black led local agency.

The PPC also facilitated a Thinktank Day on 18 Jan 2006 in Hebden Bridge in partnership with the Diversity Exchange for strategic people working in Education, Health, Voluntary Sector, BDMC and so forth. The aim was to have a facilitated discussion to identify the urgent needs for Bradford District and explore hopes for the future.

### **Bradford Bookclub**

A very small but interesting 'safe space' was created after the Tariq Ramadan lecture. A handful of Peace Studies academics and members of the Bradford branch of the

Islamic Society of Britain, met to discuss Ramadan's latest books. Meetings were informal and held very generously at the house of ISB's President. Everyone contributed and shared food. What is interesting is that the people who attended included devout Christians, Muslims and one atheist – all reading and discussing the same text. Opinions sometimes were shared, sometimes not but discussions were always honest yet respectful, courageous and full of humour. Perhaps this demonstrates that to try and have dialogue that gets to the heart of the matter, can be helped by the atmosphere which is created to allow the difficult conversations to flow along with a small group of people committed to the process.

## **2.4 PPC Structure and Administration**

The structure of the PPC has been a continuous source of debate. A small Steering Committee of four academics was appointed to give direction to the new worker in March 2003. Thus from here onwards a level of formality is agreed which could be said both to enhance and detract from the loose, informal, collective network. In 2004 the Business and Steering Committee merged and direction came from both academics and practitioners, with line management going through Peace Studies, up to the HoD of Peace Studies and the Dean of SSIS the PPC is firmly established as an SSIS initiative. This structure was complicated with the launching of the **Centre for Community Engagement (CCE)** in the University in 2005. The PPC became both part of the Centre as well as rooted in line management terms in the School of Social and International Studies (SSIS). In 2006, the PPC worker was formally appointed as Community Associate for Cohesion under the CCE and asked to no longer be focused on SSIS. The critical relationship between academics and community partners in terms of strategic vision is now maintained through two all day Visioning Days a year. The first of these was held in August 2006 and shaped the PPC activities for the next academic year.

Clearly a substantial amount of the work of the Programme Officer is administering the PPC network – answering enquiries, adding members and so forth. The Programme Officer also does a substantial amount of event organisation from organising and liaising with high profile speakers to publicising events and sorting our mundane but essential things like catering, room bookings and so forth.

### 3. What has been debated and how?

The journey of the PPC sits within a tumultuous local, regional, national and international context. Two months after the birth of the PPC, Bradford saw the worst rioting on mainland Britain for 20 years. There is no consensus within the PPC about the long and short-term causes of the riots but most members would agree the riots and the subsequent 'Operation Wheel' (police investigation into Bradford riots) had a profound impact on our District that few people not working or living here at the time would be able to grasp. As riots shook the North of England in 2001, the far right British National Party (BNP) began to make previously unheard of electoral gains despite strong trade union-led campaigns to defeat them. The Ouseley report on Bradford was a catalyst for the PPC, but was never intended to be more than that. In fact the PPC has tried to foster wide discussion on the varied interpretations of the problems facing the District as well as the competing intellectual and policy frameworks which have emerged over the last five years. The controversy surrounding Ouseley's findings nevertheless is the starting point for these debates.



Discussion at PPC event.

#### 3.1 Ouseley: Fear and Distances

The Ouseley Commission was established to address the following question:

***'Why is community fragmentation along social, cultural, ethnic and religious lines occurring in Bradford District?'***

It is interesting to note that the review was looking at the reasons for fragmentation as opposed to questioning whether such fragmentation was a reality, which is one reason why some academics felt that it had a false starting premise. Rather than duplicating previous reports such as the 1995 Commission report, Sir Herman Ouseley spoke of concentrating instead on:

***'the very worrying drift toward self-segregation, the necessity of arresting and reversing this process, and the role of education in tackling ignorance and bigotry as well as identifying excellent exemplary projects and initiatives that point the way forwards for future developments in the District.'*** (*Pride not Prejudice*).

'The Ouseley Report' (as it is referred to locally) offered a wide ranging analysis of the District following extensive conversations with local people from all cultures, ethnicities, faiths, class locations, generational and gender divisions. It particularly sought to hear from the "usually excluded" such as young people, the vulnerable and the disaffected (Ouseley 2001:9). It came up with a large number of common concerns. These included: "white" and middle class flight which was leaving behind an underclass of relatively poor white people and visible minority ethnic communities; weak political leadership with a history of deals with self appointed "community leaders" to avoid trouble; increasing self-segregation as a result of racial discrimination and fear; resentments by sections of the white community towards mono-cultural religious leaders they felt advocated segregation; Islamophobia in schools and the community, which affects how the Muslim community is regarded and treated. It also drew out concerns about deprivation and competition between deprived communities for regeneration money; persistent racism and racial discrimination in the labour market and workplace; lack of participation in decision making amongst ordinary people and minority ethnic communities in particular; the specific obstacles around participation facing some Asian women; conflicting styles of policing, and so forth. It emphasised the concerns that *young people themselves* brought to the Review Panel, such as the limited or non-existent interaction between schools and different communities denying them a fuller education in preparation for adult life in multi-cultural societies; open racial conflict and harassment in and around schools and low levels of academic achievements in too many of Bradford's schools.

### 3.2 Post Ouseley: Analytical Polarisation

Sir Herman Ouseley stressed the need to "remove the fears" and promote a sense of collective pride in Bradford District. The report also acknowledged the many material drivers behind those fears (e.g. poverty, inequality), the role of bigotry and the denigration of 'Others' (e.g. racism) and the failure of political leadership. The Commission argued that Bradford District would not progress until all these were addressed. Nevertheless, as a point of departure, it was felt that opening up discussion and broadening the debate around inclusion to embrace the complex interaction of divisions and discriminations not just around 'race', but also around class, gender, religion, and sexuality, might push forward a new political agenda. The idea of 'diversity' was a shorthand for promoting this debate.

However, for many this agenda diluted attention from the major point of fracture around race, discrimination and income inequalities in British society. In addition, many felt that the report 'put the blame' on communities themselves for increasingly living apart. This is probably a reasonable criticism, although the responsibility for 'segregation' was not directed at any one community. It was as much the responsibility of the better off, rural and mostly white communities of Bradford District as it was of the mainly poor and ethnic minority communities of the inner city. The Commission also forcefully recognised that race and class discrimination and poverty explained initial preferences to live apart amongst the Asian and white working classes of the District.

For some the problem is that social and economic history has left a legacy of stratifications in the District and it can be argued that political failure to address these has reinforced them. Far right groups, such as the NF and the BNP were actively exploiting the fears, frustrations and resentments amongst some sectors of the District's white community.

Given that the PPC was established to ensure that this very report did not gather dust on the shelf, it is understandable that some members feel that the issue of self segregation is in some senses evidenced and that the role of the PPC is to look for solutions and remedies to this 'worrying drift'. The problem is, not all PPC members accept Ouseley and some academics have not wanted to be linked to the PPC due to this early connection with *Pride Not Prejudice* and some would go so far as to say that Ouseley and the PPC have problematised Bradford unfairly. The strength of this feeling was evident in the early days of the PPC when the Programme Officer tried to encourage more non-Peace Studies academics to participate. There were fears that discussions around diversity, difference and segregation would frame the debate away from the 'real issues' of racial justice and inequalities. This was fuelled by the government's conceptual promotion of 'cohesion' following the various reports in the wake of the riots and disturbances in the northern towns. Did 'cohesion' mean anything? Was it a New Labour spin which covered up the serious cracks in British society deepened by market liberalism?

The PPC took on this question in a critical way, with numerous efforts to subject 'cohesion' to scrutiny and debate. Why did 'cohesion' seem to focus on relationships between poor communities? Did the wealthy not have some responsibility to live with poorer neighbours? Was cohesion only about ethnicity and religious divides and was not Government foreign policy deepening those divides at the same time as it promoted cohesion? Was not the problem amongst some communities that they were *too* cohesive internally, had become inward looking and more dependent on traditional and patriarchal social structures as they felt more marginalised and denigrated by other social classes and dominant white society? The PPC made a particular effort to open up the debate on segregation and to look for evidence for whether it was happening or not. Our Annual Meeting of 2006 was devoted to this topic, Dr Ludi Simpson argued that it is problematic to call an area that is 'not White' a segregated area. He asked whether 'Minority White' areas are being constructed as networks of terrorism and extremism and of people trapped in ghettos, and argued that we are racialising inner cities? Dr Simpson stated that the statistics show that movement is out of the inner city and non-racial, with rates of outward migration similar in White and Asian communities.

Recent graduate Zafer Faqir presented his research into spatial segregation in Keighley, Zafer found both evidence of natural change in Keighley with births exceeding deaths and evidence of segregation in Keighley North, South and West (as was) e.g. Zafer's own family considered moving to a predominately White estate but were deterred due to racist hostility. When using the mathematical segregation index developed by Dr Simpson, Zafer found segregation to be decreasing except for Bangladeshi communities but he questioned whether statistics would ever give a comprehensive picture. Professor Ted Cantle presented his argument that segregating processes were taking place in many parts of the UK to the point that people were living 'parallel lives'.

It seems clear that explanations for demographic change are politically as well as academically important. There is a world of difference between suggesting people are choosing to live apart and economic dynamics forcing them to do so.

Alongside the arrival of 'cohesion' as a framework for addressing perceived patterns of segregated residence and their impact on schools and social interaction generally, another national debate had a strong impact on Bradford: that around multiculturalism and integration. The debate which raged in the intellectual press, starting with an article in the magazine 'Prospect' on multiculturalism and was taken up by thinkers and campaigners such as Yasmin Alibai-Brown, Kenan Malik and

Trevor Phillips has huge relevance to Bradford. The PPC's own questioning about religion and secularism, how people live together with difference, and so forth, of course predates the high profile national debates as does that of other past and present local initiatives such as Q21 – (a project that explored questions for a 21<sup>st</sup> Century Bradford based at the Interfaith Education Centre).

The PPC supplemented these fraught conceptual debates in various ways. The God and Caesar lectures (a lecture series exploring religion and secularism from the year 2000) were a public and academic forum for discussion about religion and politics. These have attracted a very diverse audience from religious and non-religious backgrounds. We have opened up discussions around the different currents in Islam and Christianity and explored the role all religions have played in fomenting violence as well as being victims of the violence of others. We have had day-long discussions on topics such as the history of fascism, to place the BNP against a background of right wing mobilisation. Our network meetings have tried to push forward the debates on particular controversial issues in the District, giving a platform to academic research on the issue as well as community experience. Our discussion on the 'pub', for example, was one of our most successful examples of tackling a source of everyday tension in the District. Views were expressed that pubs were closing down because Muslims do not drink alcohol and concerns were raised about vandalism of pubs by young men in the inner city, an experienced publican explained that community pubs are closing due to the rise of niche city centre pubs and bars.

The PPC has always aimed to inform debate but given what could be characterised as analytical polarisations, how do we as academics and practitioners/activists/citizens build our intellectual capacity? The PPC could be argued to have underestimated claims to truth. Given the need for discussion and debate on the type of Bradford we all want to live in, can the PPC do more to help factor in complexity and genuinely interrogate analytical frameworks? Ideas matter to practice – they shape funding regimes, and so forth, but is it possible to critique and explore agendas such as Community Cohesion without being seen as endorsing them? The PPC, as can be seen above, has tackled a broad range of subjects which prompts some members to comment via e-mails that we are not doing enough on what matters to *them* or that we are part of a particular agenda, for instance, endorsing the idea of parallel lives by discussing it.

We have tried to overcome the deep analytical polarisations that exist by covering a wide range of issues and having diverse views represented, such as when Ted Cantle and Ludi Simpson shared the panel at our PPC Annual Meeting in 2006. If we had had only one of these speakers we would have limited our audience and the opportunity to genuinely hear 'the other perspective'. The Programme Officer was told by one academic before the event that she should not have invited Ludi Simpson because 'he is wrong' (according to statistical analysis of demographic change) and another academic from a very different view point 'joked' that he had brought things to 'chuck at Ted'. But as one comment in an evaluation form of the Annual Meeting 2006 stated, it was *'Very interesting discussion to hear different perceptions about how to make Bradford a peaceful city'*.

➤ **The PPC will not suit people who want to have their view reinforced and validated, but it has genuinely tried to get people to at least hear 'the other' viewpoint. Our learning would suggest that academics need that opportunity just as much as anyone else, which matters not least when academics are influencing policy decisions.**

### 3.3 Safe Spaces, Deliberation and Dialogue

**‘[T]he capacity to live with difference is, in my view, the coming question of the twenty-first century’** (Stuart Hall).

The main tension in all our debates is something that a PPC member succinctly framed as **‘safety to and safety from’**. One person’s reasonable comment is another person’s offensive remark. To what extent should the PPC allow truly honest and open debate? A safe space in terms of dialogue should aim to provide safety in terms of honest expression but also safety from being hurt or offended; this is a hugely difficult balancing act. What, for example, if someone wanted to say something that others deemed racist – how do the Groundrules read in that instance and what of legal as well as moral constraints? The Race Relations Amendment Act obliges statutory agencies to promote ‘positive race relations’- how does the legislation view discussing deep, fundamental differences? What about someone perceived ‘right’ to be homophobic on the basis of religious belief? As emphasised by Professor Oliver Ramsbotham at the PPC Annual Meeting in 2004, there are very different perceptions about what the language of ‘rights’ and ‘multi-culturalism’ mean.

The PPC did aim to put ‘safe space dialogue’ on the local agenda and this certainly seems to have been achieved. Many agencies now use safe spaces in their work, for instance, Education Bradford sent out a communication asking all schools to provide a safe space to discuss the July 7 bombings. The Diversity Exchange and Bradford Vision use the language of safe spaces in their 2006 Shared Futures Report. So the PPC does seem to have helped build the idea that the risk in talking about difficult issues is sometimes worth it.

Of course academics, after getting safe spaces on the local agenda, have also, in true academic spirit, also criticised the concept. Dr Ute Kelly wrote a paper that influenced some in the PPC entitled ‘Beyond the Tyranny of Safety: Reflections on a potential alternative’ (3 Kelly, 2003) where she questioned in whose interest safe spaces function – can safety work in the interests of the powerful?

**‘In situations of conflict, for example, expressions of a need for safe spaces for discussion are not uncommon. Such spaces tend to be carefully designed, with a clear ground rules for participants. Commonly, such ground rules seek to encourage an atmosphere of mutual respect and to preclude statements that might be offensive to other participants. A concern for that kind of ‘safety’ is understandable, and to question its desirability may seem counter-intuitive. After all, the intention behind them is to create an atmosphere in which people feel free to talk and to listen to each other, to express their views and to change them in the light of other contributions. And yet, the kind of unease, the ‘growing discomfort’, and the sense of a ‘difference between private and public accounts of participatory development’ that Cooke and Kohari (2001) identified are also being expressed by people who have organised or participated in ‘safe spaces’. Perhaps most seriously, there is the feeling that the emphasis on safety discourages precisely the sort of open, honest discussion that it attempts to make possible.’** (Kelly, 2003: [page no.])

Among Kelly’s conclusions is the need for **‘conflict to be confronted, not hidden’**. The PPC imposes safe space groundrules as it would take too long to agree to a new set of rules at every meeting. It may be that our groundrules do work in the interests of those more comfortable with debate but the same could be said for any discussion. The intention of the groundrules is to try to liberate people to hear ‘the other’ and for people to feel it is ok not to have all the answers. To allow a complete free for all

during PPC discussions would be the alternative to the current approach but would that swing the balance too much towards 'safety to' and not ensure 'safety from'. Another key question is, to what extent people should be able to air their views without challenge? Should the PPC, being rooted in a University, attempt to challenge prejudices and contribute towards informed thinking? What happens if it is an academic who airs 'difficult views'?

The PPC has been honest, stating in its literature that participating in our debates will neither lead to social change nor action, and to that extent the PPC is up-front about being a 'talking shop'.

☞ **The PPC has opened up sensitive areas of discussion at times because of the lack of any other organisation facilitating safe space discussions rather than because academics have any particular expertise in doing so. The particularities of what a University can do might be to do more to build academic and practitioner capacity for debate, dialogue and deliberation. The nature of academic debate tends to be adversarial in nature and it seems important that debate thrives, however, our learning has also shown that to get to the heart of serious value-based conflict, processes of deliberation and dialogue may provide better models. Our learning would also indicate that Bradford as a District seems risk-adverse when it comes to discussing 'difference' in particular. It has been mentioned that after the Tariq Ramadan event a small group of Muslims, Christians and one atheist met to read and discuss Tariq Ramadan's book 'Western Muslims and the Future of Islam' - the large debate and discussion with Tariq Ramadan reached a diverse audience of 400 but it was in the small group where people got to know each other and shared food where the more difficult issues e.g. hell/salvation, proselytising (the practice of attempting to convert people to another religion), the nature of God etc were really thrashed out.**

**Could we be more courageous at exploring conflicting views? Even if this is needed locally, a key question to ask is whether this is a role for a University or is it for other organisations such as the Diversity Exchange to rise to this challenge?**

There is a general support in favour of debate from the majority of PPC members, but perhaps there is more we could do to make this constructive for participants – should we explore different models of dialogue and deliberation at our events? There does seem locally to be a need for greater confidence and capacity to facilitate effective inter group dialogue/deliberation. A number of practitioners from Education Bradford, Bradford Youth Service and the Diversity Exchange have suggested there is a need for education/training courses in inter group dialogue and this has been raised with the International Centre for Participation Studies and the Director of Community Engagement. A key role the PPC has played has been to help bring organisations with expertise in dialogue such as Community Dialogue, Mediation Northern Ireland, TIDES (Transformation, Interdependence, Diversity, Equity, and Sustainability), Participationworks and Thinkbucket Belfast together with local practitioners and more of this work could be developed.

**'Dialogue, as we are choosing to use the word, is a way of exploring the roots of the many crises that face humanity today. It enables inquiry into, and understanding of, the sorts of processes that fragment and interfere with real communication between individuals, nations and even different parts of the same organization. In our modern culture men and women are able to interact with one another in many ways: they can sing, dance or play together with little**

**difficulty but their ability to talk together about subjects that deeply matter to them seems invariably to lead to dispute, division and often to violence. In our view this condition points to a deep and pervasive defect in the process of human thought.'** (David Brohm 1991, from Pearson 2005: 90).

The systematisation of the learning from the PPC Safe Spaces hub indicated the following general principles were of importance:

- 🚧 A safe-space event should encourage **argument rather than opinion**.
- 🚧 People need to feel good about their personal identities. **Mutual affirmation of human dignity and worth** is one of the most essential preconditions of a fruitful exchange between individuals.
- 🚧 The principle of mutual affirmation of human dignity encourages people to **speak sincerely and honestly**.
- 🚧 **Willingness to be confused and admit ignorance** really help in opening up discussion.
- 🚧 **Willingness to change one's mind** in the course of a discussion, one of the hardest things to happen as we have discovered through the PPC events!

### 3.4 What has been debated?

The timeline of the network meetings and events (Appendix A) shows the variety of the PPC debates but what of the content? The main recurrent thematic areas include: Cohesion, Participation, Conflict, Citizenship Education, Safe Spaces/dialogue, International conflict such as Iraq, Segregation (or not?) in Bradford and other contexts, Identity, Inequalities, Extremism, Fascism, the Riots, Racism, Safety, Local Democracy, Leadership, Faith, Religion and Secularism & conflicting world views, Language – Words. What follows is an attempt to, in some way, record some of the key points raised under some of these thematic areas. The quality of debate has often been high and it is important to note that significant contributions are heard as much from the practitioner/activist members as from the academics. Below is not an attempt to capture all of the rich input from events and discussion but to highlight some recurrent thematic areas all of which intersect and intertwine with each other in a web of complexity that should not be underestimated.

***The major recurrent themes have included: -***

#### **Segregation in Bradford District**

We have had many meetings and debates exploring the original assertion of Ouseley of the aforementioned 'worrying drift into self-segregation' and the later post riots report by Cattle which voiced fears that people in the North of England were to some extent living **parallel lives**. The report written by Dr Rhys Kelly, following a learning exchange between Bradford and Northern Ireland, argues that segregation became a tool for managing conflict (e.g. policies promoting segregation in housing) but then may well have contributed towards divisions itself. We have heard from the Director of the Schools Linking project, Angie Kotler, at PPC network meetings and the 2006 Annual Meeting that 60 000 Bradford school children are going to school with people who are the same as themselves. For Kotler, the linking work can broaden perspectives, enhance curricular provision and change perceptions. One of the key challenges is that some teachers find it hard to discuss difference. Kotler has argued that her main motivation is 'not to make everyone love each other' but to help people make informed choices, not ones based on fear and ignorance. Some would argue that bringing children together does not necessarily lead to greater understanding

and others from Education Bradford would point to other educational initiatives that aim to ensure children are 'competent cultural navigators' no matter who they go to school with.

PPC meetings have also seen significant debate on whether residential self-segregation is a myth – following a paper given wide publicity in the national press post 7/7 by Dr Ludi Simpson arguing that self segregation is a myth and its subsequent rebuttal by Dr Alan Carling. Simpson argues that movement is out of the inner city and non-racial, and furthermore that rates of outward migration are similar in White and Asian communities. Using the same set of statistics Carling disagrees, the main thrust of his argument being that statistics are not in themselves enough to establish or disprove self segregation and that the reason segregation is not increasing is because two factors have cancelled each other out: *White areas are less segregated & Asian areas have become more segregated*. Carling urges the District to consider at what point segregation becomes polarisation? At the PPC Annual Meeting, Simpson interestingly switched the language to 'White Minority' rather than 'Asian majority' and asked the audience **to consider whether if it is morally wrong to judge a person by their colour, is it not also morally wrong to judge an area?**

There have been many debates about whether it is a morally acceptable strategy for people to live in comfort zones and about what motivates choice about where to live or where go to school, assuming that there is any choice at all? There has been a request from some Council Officers that academics must help policy makers factor-in complexity – that is one thing that academics, if our debates our anything to go by, can surely do. It is the complexity and different perspectives that makes PPC discussions rich as well as tricky.

A key question in meetings has been whether racism and tension can grow if people live separately. At one PPC meeting in June 04 the question was asked 'why does no-one want to be a minority'. Shahid Malik (now MP for Dewsbury) also raised this at the forum on Fascism in Feb 04 when he argued that White people don't want to be a Minority because they are aware minorities don't get a good deal.

Many argue that there are particularities to the Bradford context that may differ from elsewhere and are often not understood by London-centric policy makers:

**'What distinguishes Bradford from other centres of immigration in the UK, especially the received image of multicultural London, is however, the numerical predominance within the minority ethnic population of a group with one specific set of geographical and cultural origins, which tends to give the group a ready-made foundation for internal cohesion.'** (Carling, 2005: 10).

For some within the PPC the concept of 'self-segregation' is a frustrating one, because it puts too little emphasis on the journey things have taken to get the way they have. A character in the Bradford set novel *Kilo*, written by a University researcher and novelist sums up this frustration thus:

**'But then the Asians happened. Not that a huge hoard of them swamped the place overnight. Took decades. Little by little, house by house, the Asians moved in and the Whites moved out. The trouble with Asians, especially Pakis, is they're different. Different clothes, different language, food, skin and, of course we've got a different God. That's why the White's move out. They see these different beings, with their different ways and they don't like what they see. So what do they do? They bitch, they moan – sometimes panic – and**

then, sooner or later, they move the fuck out because that's the only thing they think they can do. After that, the only ones who'll move in are more Pakis because Whites don't want to know, not once the place has become polluted. And on and on it goes until you get these little enclaves, some would say ghettos, sprawling up all over the town. And then, when the young punks start kicking up a fuss for whatever reason, in comes some smart fucker who tells the world that a place like Bradford suffers from self segregation. No fucking shit Einstein. The whole world is segregated in a million different ways so why should Bradford be any different?' (Alam 2002: p 310).

On the other hand, those who feel Bradford is divided argue that policy makers and political leaders need to take risks, which gets us into the debate on social engineering – are any State interventions justifiable and/or likely to make a difference? For example, does the Government-driven parental choice agenda concerning schools conflict with the cohesion agenda? At the 2006 Annual Meeting Professor Ted Cante argued that it is not negative to try to 'engineer positive social outcomes'.

Whatever the intellectual and deeply felt divisions about segregation, self-segregation and polarisation, a central question that remains perhaps unanswered is: what kind of social relationships are likely to contribute towards a peaceful Bradford? Cante argued at the PPC Annual Meeting 2006 that 'parallel lives' occur when there are layers of separateness and people are not interacting at any level e.g. work/school, home, play – he was not questioning people's right to live within communities. One of the main tensions in the PPC is that some people palpably feel that Bradford is divided on ethnic/cultural and religious lines and feel that this is simply the most pressing issue to address. Others think that the 'Cohesion' agenda and the segregation debate undermine the struggle for racial justice and/or ignore the fact that 42% of the population in Bradford is defined as living in poverty. As has already been mentioned, the PPC has not always managed to draw more common ground between apparently opposing camps. The adversarial flavour of some academic writing and debate has not always seemed helpful or constructive to the debate.

At our Annual meeting (2006) Dr Simpson suggested that instead of focusing on who lives where, problems should be named. This in some ways feels very helpful – perhaps rather than focusing on segregation, the debates could be about where people do and don't feel safe and why; whether certain groups are claiming space in certain areas; perceived behaviour and territorialism of young men; exploring structural inequalities, and so on. However, it perhaps does not deal with the issue, since for some, lack of connection between communities is in itself part of the root problem. At the 2006 AGM, one academic raised the concern that the PPC is perpetuating the 'myth of self-segregation' by debating it. This may well be a danger for those that agree with Simpson's argument but for those that hotly dispute it, the need to debate the issue remains.

It seems clear from all the varied PPC discussions, that more people feel inter-community/group interactions is an issue worthy of reflection than that feel discussing the issue is the domain of unhelpful myth making. It is also clear than people have very different relationships to living in Bradford. Some PPC members reflect on a multi-cultural idyll where people skip about swapping pakoras and Eccles cakes, whilst others almost use Huntingdon-esque 'Clash of Civilisations' language to describe relations. Most fall in between these and many feel both positive and negative, as a community worker said in the PPC Reflections Report 2003 ***'the City is like a game of snakes and ladders – one minute you feel like things are on***

***the up and then with things like the riots and the BNP – everything blows up and you're on your way back down'.***

The question of segregation is, of course, one that has been discussed in the national media, not least when Trevor Phillips questioned in his paper (9) for the CRE whether 'Britain is Sleepwalking into segregation' in 2005. One of his key questions is whether the UK could see ghettoisation of the magnitude and scale that became horribly apparent in News Orleans:

**'...as we watched the tragedy of New Orleans unfold, many people, I think – and some said this to me – consoled themselves with the thought that such a thing could never happen here...I do not mean the hurricane itself. I mean the manifest neglect of a poor and largely African American District, and the criminal disregard of citizens who did not have the resources to get out of the way of Katrina. The fact is that these people were socially, economically, culturally and psychologically marooned outside the mainstream of American society'. (Phillips, 2005).**

Some in the PPC argue that to raise questions about segregated communities is a subtext for an assimilationist conspiracy where people will be forced into some fabricated notion of Britishness. Although Phillips does go on to raise the question of what it means to be British, his primary motivation for raising the issue of the possible sleepwalk into segregation, seems to be avoiding racist economic marginalisation:

**'A democracy in which black politicians, with a few notable exceptions, represent black districts, gerrymandered in order to provide the minimum of black representation. An economy in which black businessmen sell their wares largely to a black middle class. And an education system in which most black academics are teaching at all-black colleges or in urban institutions disproportionately packed with ethnic minority students.**

**This is a segregated society, in which the one truth that is self-evident is that people cannot and never will be equal. That is why, for all of us who care about racial equality and integration, America is not our dream, but our nightmare.'** (Phillips, 2005)

Both Professor Ted Cante speaking at the Annual Meeting and Professor Tariq Ramadan speaking at a PPC partnership event with the Islamic Society of Britain in Nov 2005 urged for bridges to be built both within and across communities.

**⇒ We have learnt that some will see the PPC as endorsing the views it debates but the breadth of issues we have discussed indicate our willingness to explore a broad range of topics. It remains a struggle to get people to reflect on ideas that have become implicit, embedded and at times ideological but attendance at meetings and events from people of diverse backgrounds suggests that there is a need for informed arguments to be heard and discussed.**

### **Multi-culturalism and Living with Difference**

Linked very obviously to the above theme of segregation, the issue of living together with difference (the complex intersections of identities – individual and group and how these interact with inequalities, power and values) has been a huge issue for the PPC and one that we have returned to many times. Whilst thinkers such as Lord Parekh in the report *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain* (Runnymede Trust) and Professor Brian Barry (in for example, *Culture and Equality*, Barry 2001) have been

debating this for years, the British press seemed to get interested when David Goodhart questioned the concept of multi-culturalism in the magazine Prospect (established in 1995 which describes its aims to be "*more readable than the Economist, more relevant than the Spectator, more romantic than the New Statesman,*"). The term multi-culturalism itself is hugely contested but one helpfully concise definition given on Wikipedia states that:

**'Multiculturalism is a philosophy that is sometimes constructed as an ideology advocating that modern society should at least embrace and include distinct cultural groups with equal cultural and political status'**

(<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/multiculturalism>).

Bradford had been debating how communities/groups live together for some time: from the Rushdie book burning that led to many academics writing about the District, the 1995 Commission Report into the disturbances of that year and Graham Mahony's and Philip Lewis's papers in the appendix to the 'Ouseley Report'.

All the PPC discussions have captured the complexity of this debate. For example, terms and language are routinely interrogated – sometimes academics who come to the PPC for the first time assume that this has not been done before. One key area that comes up time and time again is *what is meant by integration* – do we mean living together, friendship, loving each other etc, what about people on the same street who don't speak or play together or an ethnically mixed school where the kids hate each other? A key question that Bradford debates keep coming back to, seen in the Shared Futures Paper, is *what is not good enough?* As we can't force everyone to get along, what behaviour is simply not good enough – violence, harassment, intimidation etc?

One thing that can happen during debates is that people can have very different interpretations of the same word. Trying to clarify what is *meant* rather than what is *heard* is something that we could do better on perhaps as it seems clear that sharing a vocabulary is not the same as having shared understanding. So for example, someone may argue there should be a greater degree of integration in Bradford – which may mean they think there should be more opportunities for interaction such as Schools Linking. Another person may hear integration and translate this to be a thinly disguised plot where minority ethnic communities are made to suppress important aspects of identity and forced into some nightmarish vision of Englishness where it is compulsory for everyone to sing God Save the Queen and down eight pints of lager on a Friday night. As such, debates often see people arguing with their own interpretation of a particular word rather than what was actually meant. One PPC member regularly points out the loaded nature of words and the limitation of language but people can also become paralysed into silence if they feel only the 'correct language' is permissible and as we have seen in the previous chapter on Dialogue – the question is who gets to decide which words are acceptable?

A key question that has arisen in debates is how to share commonalities and respect difference. Professor Ted Cattle in the Annual Meeting 2006 asked the PPC to consider whether all differences are equal. The Commission on the Future of Multi Ethnic Britain, set up by Runnymede in 2000 chaired by Parekh states that we need to learn how to negotiate difference in a multi-ethnic Britain but seems to stop short of giving much advice on quite how to do this. One of the issues the PPC has struggled with is how people in Bradford can negotiate conflicting values, where differences can be deep and even fundamental. A recent example would be whether Gerry Springer the Opera could be shown at the Alhambra theatre. The Forum we held in Nov 05 on Religion, Art and Free Speech showed whilst many values may be

shared we lack resources to know what to do when there are clashes between them, for instance, between freedom of speech and avoiding religious offence.

The issue of identity and what it means to be British has been discussed in many meetings with a question raised as to whether people are scared of exploring what it means to be British? Does it play in the hands of the far right BNP to address or ignore Britishness? Community has also been discussed – by defining a community, whom do we exclude? The debate about individualism versus communitarianism has been raging amongst many academics along with concerns that multi-culturalism essentialises culture. How people define themselves, who represents whom and whether it is possible to talk of group/community 'rights' without getting into the sticky terrain of ethnic absolutism and viewing communities as homogenous masses have all been explored at length.

A question that has been raised is if religious groups have representation on a District-wide Faiths Forum, especially if consulted on policy issues, should atheists, agnostics and humanists organise themselves accordingly? Another issue has been whether identity politics gets you resources, such as community centres, etc.? What about communities of interest such as Lesbian, Gay and Bi-sexual communities. Do you have to 'be something' to get a slice of the cake – can the cake be shared together? Has multi-culturalism failed to understand the complexity of identity and does it work in the interests of the powerful members of a group, and conversely does it often not work in the interests of, say, children or women? An activist at the 2004 Annual meeting said, **'Being called a community means you can fight for your rights but this can become a trap where you start speaking about "who my people are", but who do you really represent?'** It is interesting in PPC debates how often people are critical of 'self appointed community leaders' whilst, sometimes, in the same breath pronouncing, 'my community thinks such and such'. Certainly the lessons from organisations based in Northern Ireland, such as Community Dialogue, are to encourage people to speak only for themselves.

Professor Ramsbotham in our 2004 Annual Meeting cited Kevin Avruch's (from *Culture and Conflict Resolution*) view that culture is situational, flexible and responsive (Avruch 2004). Professor Ramsbotham argued that culture can be challenged and suggested that it is important to explore the content of the disagreement and asking '*if culture can be rethought how do we do this and who does this challenge most?*' As Professor Tariq Ramadan stated at his lecture in November 2005:

**'We must escape our intellectual ghettos. Our mind is a dangerous jail if we are only open minded with people who are like ourselves.'**



**PPC Members in conversation.**

### **Other Thematic Areas have included:**

#### **International and National Events**

One of the key questions when looking at international events from 11 September 2001 to the war with Iraq and 7 July 2005, has been whether events could lead to polarisation in Bradford. What role could extremist organisations play in exploiting violence committed by terrorist organisations and nation-states to try and create division, mistrust and conflict? A key role that members have wanted the PPC to play is to address what is sometimes seen as an unhelpful conflation of issues. Meetings have heard how significant events can feel for Muslim communities who feel victimised by the so-called 'War on Terror', policing and civil liberties issues following the 7 July London bombings, along with anger about UK foreign policy and a sense of being 'othered'. The PPC has explored legitimate grievances whilst listening to speakers, such as Fuad Nahdi and Professor Tariq Ramadan, question whether there can also be a tendency towards victimhood. Another sensitive question raised has been whether there is a degree of selectivity to the issues that give rise to feelings of solidarity.

#### **Participation**

There have been many debates exploring the wide terrain of participation, local democracy and governance. The PPC has heard examples of innovative local participatory practice such as Action for Black Community Development (ABCD) and Royds Community Association but has also heard repeated criticism of local leadership. The establishment of the International Centre for Participation Studies has been a real resource for the PPC and members of the ICPS have been very generous in sharing thinking and research.

The PPC, for example, was asked by the ICPS to consider the nature of the Government agenda on participation – has participation become about co-option, with participatory structures being created *for* not *with* people? The PPC has had the opportunity to learn about some of the differences and similarities between Latin America and the North of England. Is it possible to increase participation within the present system without such a strong culture of activism? 'How people can be re-engaged with civic life?', has been a big question. Do most people want to get involved and have a say, or, would they rather retreat into increasingly private lives?

A very famous playwright attending a PPC Annual Meeting in 2004 asked how can life be reinvigorated in the public sphere?

The ICPS Conference on Cohesion and Participation (26 Feb 04) raised the important question, what happens when participation is not cohesive? Voting for the BNP can be seen as participating but would not, most would argue, lead to a harmonious society.

### **The Riots**

The Bradford Riots of 2001 have been discussed at many of our meetings. Our Annual Meetings have been held on dates close to the anniversary of the riots and have sought to take stock of where Bradford is at. One seminar was held to disseminate a piece of research looking at the sentencing following the riots and also two symposia (roundtable discussions) billed as exploring young men and masculinities.

It was at the above symposia that it became clear that a research team commissioned by the Police, to look at why the young men rioted, had split over the findings, and it seemed apparent that there were some real differences in terms of methodologies and conclusions. It may, of course, have been preferable for the team to have felt able to openly debate their different findings but to date this has not happened. Clearly this led to some academics voicing concern that the PPC was calling for the District to have open debate, but researchers at the University were in this instance unable themselves to do this. One interesting question is whether the research team divided about the riots in the way that the PPC, and perhaps Bradford itself, seems, in a crude sense at least, to have done.

For some, during various PPC debates, the riots were all about 'out of control' young men behaving inexcusably: some have expressed the view that the young men were trying to 'ethnically cleanse' the inner city of anything 'non-Muslim' and point to pubs and clubs being attacked, such as the arson attack on the Labour Club in which many people nearly burned to death. Some have argued that the young men were defending their community against a genuinely perceived threat of the far right and others look to economic deprivation and inequalities as key causal factors. Where people are located on this spectrum of views has an obvious correlation with how they perceive the sentencing. The subject of the riots is a clear example of how the PPC would be unable to lobby for change, as there is very little consensus amongst members, which also seems true of the wider District.

### **Religion and Secularism**

Some of the most well attended events have been when the speakers have addressed issues relating to religion and secularism. Reading back over the discussions it is interesting to note how many of the speakers from an Islamic perspective argue for integration, Fuad Nahdi, former editor of Q News, argued strongly that tolerance, understanding and respect are not the same as assimilation: he wants Britain to accept cultural migration and Muslims to accept British culture. Nahdi also suggested that both the media and Muslims themselves share responsibility for the demonisation of Islam. Many of the speakers from an Islamic perspective (Sahin, Nahdi, Ramadan) spoke of the need to engage with 'the other'. A key question for some of the speakers, and throughout PPC discussions, has been how young Muslims can relate both to Islam and to a religious and secular plurality.

Debates on religion have not been without controversy, when the educationalist Dr Sahin was questioning Mosque education there was a question from an academic about whether young Muslims would be supported if a more exploratory approach to

learn about Islam led them away from it. Dr Sahin did not think this would be a positive outcome: exploration, for Dr Sahin, is fine if it leads children to Islam. The debate highlights a very definite potential disagreement about how children explore, learn and understand belief systems. At the same meeting a male member of the audience proclaimed, 'Muslims must not become like the secular world where they have 10 girlfriends, fornicate and take drugs.' Could the PPC do more to undertake what Professor Ramsbotham has suggested in various seminars and explore the content of some of these disagreements?

Issues of religious offence and freedom of speech have also been explored. Should art do what Fellow in Theatre, Iain Bloomfield, suggested at our 2005 Forum, and provoke people to question, take us out of comfort zones and lead to social change? If we have boundaries who decides? Are there fundamental disagreements between those that take a liberal view on freedom of speech and those that seek to protect 'the sacred'? Would art that could cause offence in Bradford be censored? One of the most moving contributions on this subject was from an Iraqi Kurd who had made his home in Bradford after seeking asylum in the UK. Coming from a context where his father had been murdered for being a writer, he felt the Bradford audience was in a position of privilege to even have such a debate and felt that **'Art is seen as dangerous because it awakens minds'** (Dana Jalal, PPC Forum Nov 2005).

The right to multiple identities has been raised by many speakers, as Professor Tariq Ramadan eloquently described himself in the lecture he gave in Nov 2005:

**'Muslim by religion, Swiss by nationality, European by culture, Egyptian by memory and universality by principle.'**



**Professor Tariq Ramadan speaking at an event organised by PPC and the Islamic Society of Britain.**

**Photography by Camera Crew for the Centre of Community Engagement at the University of Bradford.**

Other speakers have suggested the need to confront and explore violence within sacred texts. Dr Edward Kessler speaking in 2006 at the a Forum on Religious (In)tolerance spoke of the multi-layered, and often contradictory, nature of sacred texts and Professor Ramadan is famed for his call to apply text to context in the case of the Qur'an.

An important question was raised by Professor Iftikhar Malik at the Forum on (In)tolerance which may require further exploration, is whether the effort to convert causes proselytising faiths to view others as inferior and at times lead to violence? Does this need thinking about in the Bradford context of having large communities of two proselytising faiths?

➤ **This section certainly shows the breadth and depth of PPC debates and discussion in its five year history: not enough for some and too much for others. There is nothing unusual or particular about a University hosting debates. What seems more particular is that for five years the PPC has held discussions between academics and practitioners that try to relate the national/global to the local. So rather than discussing the war in Iraq, which many Universities might do we held a meeting to discuss the impact it could have on our District. There is perhaps also something less typical about working in partnership with organisations and agencies so, for example, working with the local branch of the Islamic Society of Britain to bring Professor Tariq Ramadan and Professor John Esposito to Bradford ensures a diversity in terms of audience. Our regular network meetings also allow space for people to build some knowledge of each other and a space that PPC members at Visioning Meetings have argued strongly to keep. There is something distinctive that the content of our meetings and events are collectively agreed in Visioning Meetings that include both academics and practitioners. Rather than the more typical model of knowledge transfer, the PPC has been committed to a genuine attempt at knowledge exchange. It can also be said that relationships that have developed between academics (with centres such as the ICPS) and practitioners has led to co-production of knowledge in terms of research. Some PPC members won't be satisfied unless the PPC takes positions and lobbies for policy change, but this systemisation provides evidence of such diversity of views within the PPC that to even agree the problem never mind the solution would be problematic if not impossible. But perhaps one step towards moving debate on, at least for ourselves, could be to collectively decide a thematic area of discussion for one year and to organise discussions and events around that theme to allow the conversation to grow and develop. Through partnership work we can also do more to inform policy makers about the content of our conversations. A key question remains how academics can engage with their locality and retain enough distance to critically question?**

#### 4. What do people say about the PPC and what do people want from us?

##### Learning from evaluation.

The PPC asks people attending its larger events to complete an evaluation form and also has consulted with Members in variety of Visioning Meetings, however there often is a lack of time and space to reflect on people's comments. The majority of evaluations, therefore, come from our more formal events where there is normally a panel of speakers followed by discussion – bear in mind that only a minority of people complete evaluation forms. With that in mind, here (unedited) are some of the common things people like and dislike about our events and then some ideas for future discussion, which gives an indication of what people would like from the PPC:

##### Positives

- ❖ *PPC has provided an opportunity to attend interesting thought provoking and enjoyable events on neutral grounds that aim to bring the people of Bradford together by helping individuals learn about themselves and 'the other' and society in general.*
- ❖ *PPC encourages and facilitates debate in a safe but open environment. Most of all it challenges people to drop preconceived ideas and think out of the box.*
- ❖ *I wanted to say thanks, I found the safe spaces event at BYDP particularly useful. I met some new people and I felt many of the issues raised were relevant to my new project in xxxxx.*
- ❖ *I found the network meeting very informative and it made me rethink some issues about person centred care, diversity and particularly social groups within communities.*
- ❖ *Interesting, ongoing debate was a good opportunity for people to voice opinions.*
- ❖ *Good opportunity to meet people & exchange views.*
- ❖ *Thought provoking as usual*
- ❖ *Very interesting discussion to hear different perceptions about how to make Bradford a peaceful city.*
- ❖ *It was a very helpful event. It seemed to meet the aims of pushing on our thinking.*
- ❖ *New to University – was great to have input from quality speakers and no small group stuff which can be really scary.*
- ❖ *Audience was diverse. Speakers were all knowledgeable and fascinating.*
- ❖ *Am not an academic & am so pleased that I could keep up (mostly) & really engage with the issues discussed.*
- ❖ *A very interesting and worthwhile day – friendly & welcoming atmosphere – many useful contacts.*
- ❖ *As an activist I will be using the lessons learned for local campaigns e.g. need to engage more with people's fears and concerns. Good to have real input not just workshops.*
- ❖ *I didn't know academics could be so entertaining!*
- ❖ *Excellent speaker & chairing.*
- ❖ *Good learning opportunity.*
- ❖ *Very interesting & useful for an educator in Bradford.*
- ❖ *Different backgrounds and emphases of the panel and mixture of academic input and real life examples.*
- ❖ *Sophisticated questioning and reflection of the issues (huge relief to be part of this even though there are no answers).*

## Negatives

- ❖ *Make a more relaxed environment for people who are less confident.*
- ❖ *It would be useful to define some goals.*
- ❖ *More focussed discussion – smaller range of issues?*
- ❖ *Was expecting something to open up discussion/be more controversial/stimulate thought. A lot of PPC events seem the same.*
- ❖ *Smaller spaces for group discussion, some voices overshadow others.*
- ❖ *Break up proceedings, more participation or keep to time. Start on time. I found it hard to stay awake in the afternoon during three consecutive talks from members of the panel.*
- ❖ *...the lack of a short handout covering definitions, and a bit of relevant history for younger listeners especially, was a great pity.*
- ❖ *I found some of what XXXX said offensive and arrogant. At times it came close to violating safe space rules, in... contentious, even contemptuous, throw-away dismissals of Ouseley, Denham...*
- ❖ *As to the forum's overall format, I guess there's no way for any but the most high-powered gatherings to get top outside speakers to stay for a whole day. But it is frustrating when discussion time is also short, so few people can speak from the floor, and then only very briefly. This becomes acute when the programme is so broad, and nothing can get followed up in much depth.*
- ❖ *While a room like the JSB is good for listening to a speaker's talk and for short questions, its spatial structure elevates the speaker's status in a way, which undermines equality in two-way discursive dialogues.*
- ❖ *I disagree with his solutions as he is a secular person, I call for a radical solution where there is no room for integration into a democratic/secular society. We reject Western values.*

## And a little in between...

- ❖ *Interesting from an academic point of view, largely irrelevant in tackling potential issues.*
- ❖ *Possibly too many speakers – particularly in the afternoon? Not quite enough time to draw out fully what Bradford can and should be doing, but a very interesting day.*

## Suggestions for the future

- ❖ *A number of potential issues are cited such as – Intermarriage between ethnic groups.*
- ❖ *It would be worth exploring whether we could organise similar events on broad themes to live beyond the 'God & Caesar'/religious issues.*
- ❖ *Discussion groups for smaller numbers to think more in depth.*
- ❖ *A little bit of honesty would be nice.*
- ❖ *We could do with a collected publication of the presentations and ensuing debate.*
- ❖ *It's imperative 'the theme' (in this instance religious (in)tolerance) is followed through.*
- ❖ *Sessions where individuals share their own experiences.*
- ❖ *We need a lot more of this kind of input in Bradford, possibly create space for meaningful interaction.*
- ❖ *Exploring different world views in Bradford.*
- ❖ *Looking into Bradford's future, comparing Bradford with other cities.*
- ❖ *Weekend seminars.*
- ❖ *Exploring impact of religion/humanism etc on values.*
- ❖ *Which disagreements amongst groups of Bradfordians will count as radical ones e.g. beyond resolution through dialogue?*

❖ *Invite students and teachers – get schools more involved in cohesion issues – a lecture for schools?*

These are just a collection of some of the most repeated type of comments. There are some common threads in what people like and dislike. Most people enjoy academic informed input and many enjoy relating it to practice/reality – primarily the Bradford context. Many people feel we can pack our programmes with too many speakers and not enough time for reflection, some people (often the practitioners) enjoy input and others (often the academics interestingly enough) want small group discussion. Perhaps this is indicative of people wanting what they have less experience of. Certainly everyone gets frustrated when events start late and speakers do not keep, or are not kept, to time.

There are a few comments that show offence has been felt and that some feel we are not getting to the heart of the matter – which takes us right back to the questions of how to strike the balance between ‘safety *to* and safety *from*.’

#### **4.1 Who are the PPC Members?**

The PPC is a network of people who register to join – it includes academics and some students from the University of Bradford including the School of Lifelong Education and Development (SLED), the School of Social and International Studies (SSIS) and the School of Health Studies. We also have academics from other Universities and colleges as members and a number of retired academics. The non-academic members include faith workers, members of the clergy, teachers, police officers, youth workers, community activists, trade unionists, health professionals, social workers, probation officers, community & voluntary sector workers and local Government officers. We have members who also define themselves as local citizens. To date 125 people have registered to join the PPC network and 72 have asked to join an information only e-mail list. One of the unique aspects to the PPC is people with such a wide diversity of beliefs come together to discuss issues of ethics, values and belief systems – our network includes Sikhs, Hindus, Anglicans, Catholics, Adventists, Atheists, Humanists, Agnostics, Pagans, Sunni and Shi'a Muslims, Methodists, Jews, Buddhists and those who exercise the right not to be labelled. This diversity is as much a strength as it is a challenge.

#### **4.2 Achievements**

##### ***PPC Key Achievements***

- 43 plus Network Meetings tackling subjects such as whether Bradford is segregated, the BNP and local democracy.
- Over 10 events with high profile speakers e.g. Professor Tariq Ramadan 2005 and Professor John Esposito in 2006 with over 400 people attending each event, organised in partnership with a local Muslim organisation another example would be our Annual Meeting 2006 attended by Professor Ted Cantle.
- Number of innovative workshops including Thinkbucket Belfast, Community Dialogue and ‘Race’, Cohesion and Conflict Training. The links made with Community Dialogue in 2003/4 are continuing to impact on Bradford District in 2007 with the Diversity Exchange developing a training programme for dialogue facilitators in partnership with Community Dialogue.
- University seminars organised by academics in the International Centre for Participation Studies and Social Sciences and Humanities opened up to external partners as part of the drive to ensure research is shared.

- A network of over 100 academics and practitioners/activists sustained and developed.
- Sharing of good practice – organising a meeting in January 2007 to share post riots learning between Bradford, Oldham and Burnley, with key recommendations being submitted to the Commission for Integration and Cohesion.
- Contributing to various important new initiatives such as Peacejam.
- Consistently superseded all funding targets e.g. Yorkshire Forward, HEIF.

#### **Added value of PPC to the University**

- Creating a sustained space where there is a genuine exchange of different types of knowledge e.g. academics researching Conflict can hear genuine examples of disagreements on religious and secular clashes. There is a richness in bringing together global and local experience.
- Staff and students have been able to attend seminars with high profile speakers such as Professor John Esposito, one of the world's leading thinkers on Islam and the West. This also creates a space where, for example, international & national students are able to debate with members of the local community which can help foster inter cultural/group awareness and understanding.
- Contacts have been made between academics and local people with regard to research, e.g. PPC connections led to a number of local people being trained as community researchers and participating in an ICPS research project in 2006.
- The University is felt to be contributing to the District by many of our partners, such as the Diversity Exchange, Bradford Youth Service, Cohesion Team of Education Bradford and smaller grassroots organisations such as the Congolese refugee led Centre for Resolution Conflict.

#### **Added Value of PPC to District**

- Bringing the global to the local, including connections with organisations such as Community Dialogue in Northern Ireland.
- Valuing and where possible systematising practitioner knowledge e.g. Safe Space systemisation following hub meetings.
- Providing a 'time out' space where practitioners can reflect on local and national issues and agendas, practice and challenges.
- A network discussing values and ethics which has diverse religious and non-religious members.
- Providing a 'safe space' a key moments such as 7 July 2005.
- Sharing research and providing space to reflect and explore academic findings.
- Proving a space for practitioners from different sectors to explore shared concerns and good practice.

## 5. The University and its District: The PPC Five Years On

Within the University the current context is that the Centre for Community Engagement was established in 2005. Despite all targets being met, changes to the way HEFCE funds Universities has seen a reduction in the team of Community Associates. The PPC still has a worker as a resource with Lisa Cumming having been appointed as Community Associate with the thematic area of Cohesion (defined, according to CRE guidelines, as concerning Equality, Participation and Interaction) until September 2008, along with two other Community Associates – Katharine Wyatt (Sustainable Development) and Cathy O'Neill (Well Being). The CCE has, therefore, redefined its role, focus and management structure under the new direction of Nadira Mirza, Deputy Dean of SLED. The Metrics project which has been qualitatively and quantitatively evaluating the work of the CCE (including the PPC) will be making some solid recommendations to the University about the way forward:

**“This unique Bradford approach is based on a commitment to generating mutual benefits to University and community organisations (Reciprocity); external benefits to the District of Bradford as a whole (Externalities); encouraging those change agents in the communities in Bradford District to access the University and its resources (Access); and ultimately to stronger partnerships between ‘town and gown’, aimed at deep and sustainable collaborations to improve the quality of life of all who work, live and study in the District (Partnerships). This ethical and reciprocal approach is called REAP. The sum of the components will, we believe, generate more plentiful harvests each year as trust and respect between the University and community evolves.”** (‘The Ivory Tower and beyond: Bradford University at the heart of its communities’).

There are other important initiatives at the University that the PPC needs to build partnerships with also, such as the Centre for Equality and Diversity based at the School of Health with Professor Uduak Archibong and the International Centre for Participation Studies (ICPS) based in Peace Studies which is carrying out research that has real relevance to our District as is the new Research Unit on Men and Masculinities based in Social Sciences and Humanities – just to name a few of many relevant research centres.

In terms of Bradford District, there are also changes afoot. Bradford Vision have written a paper entitled ‘Building a Shared Future for the Bradford District’ (Hanney, Hardisty 2006). The paper states that the District’s diversity is both a strength and a challenge (Hanney, Hardisty 2006 p: 2) and argues that:

**‘We are going to have to have real courage and honesty in facing some of difficult issues and change some of the behaviours that have led in the past to some people in our District feeling they are treated unfairly because of where they live, their family background, their ethnicity or their beliefs. Respecting and valuing diversity is an essential part of building a successful, integrated society. But respect for diversity must take place within a framework of rights that are recognised, appreciated and understood by all’.** (Hanney, Hardisty 2006 p: 2)

The paper calls for Bradford to explore what we have in common and what values and behaviours are needed for all communities to thrive. Priorities for this agenda are:

- ~ **A District where there are opportunities for people to meet with or connect with people from different communities: people recognise their common aspirations and identity.**
- ~ **Services, policies and practice that build a Shared Future for the District.**
- ~ **Inappropriate behaviour is consistently and effectively challenged.**
- ~ **Community tensions are dealt with appropriately.**
- ~ **Funding and resource allocation processes are transparent and fair.**
- ~ **All residents and all communities across the District have a mechanism through which they can be heard and contribute to the shared future debate.**
- ~ **All young people can contribute to our Shared Future.**
- ~ **There is strong leadership which can articulate our aspirations for our Shared Future, lead on this work and challenge behaviours and beliefs which undermine it.**

At the time this report was being written the Shared Futures/Cohesion agenda was to be delivered by a range of partners including Bradford Vision Board, Community Safety Delivery Group, Safer Stronger Communities Executive, Community Safety Task Group and the Diversity Exchange but the lead will come from Bradford Metropolitan Council. The PPC has had strong links with the Diversity Exchange and it is important to note that the Diversity Exchange has left Bradford Vision and become an independent organisation in the Voluntary/Community Sector. A key role of the Diversity Exchange will be to provide a mechanism to develop stronger relationships between communities, along with working alongside partners to build the Shared Futures/Cohesion agenda and raise awareness of the issues and challenges facing the District. It may be, therefore, that the Diversity Exchange is able to take on some of the issues that PPC members have felt were being ignored, allowing the PPC to concentrate on what a University based network can offer the District. A question that remains for some PPC members is the extent to which senior officers and political leaders value research and evidence in their decision making?

Joseph Rowntrees Foundation (JRF) are playing an increasingly active role in the District and are in the process of funding action research and projects under preset thematic areas – they have half a million to spend on new action research every year for a ten year period. Before embarking on this work, although after their thematic areas were set, JRF commissioned a team from Leeds Metropolitan University to carry out a 'Review of Social Research in Bradford' (Darlow *et.al.*: 2005,). The Review highlights the range of research on Bradford but also identifies some key gaps for what is calls 'A future research agenda' which include:

- ~ **A need for more comparative work: between areas and groups in Bradford; with other areas in the subregion; and with other areas with similar characteristics in the UK and overseas.**
- ~ **More attention to gender related issues, particularly in terms of the position and role of Muslim women.**
- ~ **Questions about the accessibility of services by key groups within the community, particularly where there are language and cultural barriers...**
- ~ **More investigation of the link between deprivation and other aspects of the review such as health, economic status...**
- ~ **Consideration of the broad range of geographical differences...**
- ~ **Studies of the effect of poverty and deprivation where they converge within particular concentrated geographical areas.**

In relation to Community Cohesion the Review calls for research that:

- ~ Research that contributes to an understanding of the socio-economic and ethno-cultural circumstances of other communities in Bradford District.
- ~ A more in-depth understanding of factors that contribute to racism in the city and wider District, and whether or not local initiatives have had any impact on reducing the incidence of intercommunity violence.
- ~ Collection of robust empirical data on excluded communities in the city and wider District.
- ~ Research examining the rich history of community action within Bradford District, its relationship with the state, and how this can be used to inform contemporary efforts at community engagement.

JRF may well, therefore, be funding research to fill the gaps the Review has identified. PPC members may of course have their own views on what is and isn't known. It does seem important that PPC members are aware of what research JRF is commissioning and how it will be disseminated. It is also important to note that JRF along with Joseph Rowntrees Charitable Trust have also held at least one discussion meeting to explore a 'sensitive' subject.

⇒ With other organisations as the Diversity Exchange and JRF (and new academic centres at the University) developing their focus in new ways, the PPC needs to ensure a level of communication that tries to prevent unnecessary duplication and maximises how research can be shared and used by the District and what kind of safe space dialogue the University is best able to contribute. The local context the PPC is working within has changed and we need to respond accordingly which means concentrating on the particularities of what a University can offer and working more in partnership with other agencies.



Discussion at PPC event.

## 6. Conclusions

This systematisation has helped us to clarify where the PPC has made a contribution, where its limitations and weaknesses lie, and therefore to think through our future direction. We present these conclusions in the two boxes below:

### What we've got right

- Critical reflection is useful and valued.
- Ideas matter, they influence policy and practice.
- Diverse network (religious and non-religious) discussing values and ethics.
- Wide range of meetings, events & workshops.
- Bringing the global/national to the local.
- Getting people to have the chance hear 'the other' e.g. diverse panel of speakers, programmes etc.
- Acted with sincerity.

### What we've struggled with

- Underestimated academic claims to truth.
- Misjudged how 'Ouseley' would be perceived.
- Complexity of issues e.g. 'equality/cohesion' polarisation.
- Confusion and disagreement about role and aim of the PPC.
- Local context e.g. lack of trust within and between communities, lack of leadership on Cohesion agenda.
- Getting the balance right between engagement and independence – being seen as an 'actor' doesn't always help academics do the things they are good at e.g. critical reflection.
- Hard to get people to hear views they disagree with.
- Lack of time people have to contribute especially academics.
- Funding insecurities.



Tree of Ideas from PPC Visioning Day May 07.

The systematisation and these conclusions were presented for discussion at the PPC visioning on 9 May 2007 which included academics and practitioners. We also asked our participants to consider whether they thought there is still a role for the PPC. All participants felt there was and that the Bradford context continues to offer grounds for both optimism and serious concern. *The following concerns were expressed in particular:*

- ❖ The sense of victimisation felt by many in the Muslim community resulting from the response of society to the actions a few extremists have carried out in the name of Islam International and national events highlight intra-community differences that can be seen as the business of only some. Concerns were also raised about how to discuss fears about the possibilities of more acts of violence without stigmatising communities and also about the vulnerabilities of the District and its ability to withstand locally the local impact of national and international events. There was a general sense of fear about who can discuss what.
- ❖ Education issues – the need to celebrate positive success stories whilst not ignoring difficult issues that parents and children face about where to go to school and how schools can broaden the social experience of young people. There were also views raised that education must be more about quality of experience than league tables.
- ❖ Uncertainty about leadership on cohesion in Bradford or where the agenda is going.
- ❖ The importance of opening up to regional north and national voices and debates on the issues.
- ❖ The BNP being the only party leafleting certain areas in the District.
- ❖ Divisions between communities were felt strongly by some and less by others. However, everyone felt it was important to reflect on levels of trust within and between communities and organisations and how mistrust can be overcome.

The PPC concludes that although it continues to have a role in the district, it needs to develop and change in order to continue to be relevant, innovative and responsive. It also has to bear in mind that the Programme Officer also works as a Community Associate within the REAP framework, which stresses the importance of Reciprocity where aims and objectives are shared and of mutual benefit to the University and our partners.

**In the light of this discussion, the PPC is setting itself some goals for the next five years:**

1. To deepen our knowledge and understanding of how to talk and dialogue on difficult issues, including especially where there are 'radical disagreements'.
2. To strengthen thinking in the District and in the northern region, working in partnership with organisations who have a commitment to open and critical reflection and bridge building between ideas and practice.
3. To build strong partnerships in the University with other academics and academic centres who share our goals building creative interfaces between academics and practitioners.

We have also clarified our aim:

#### KEY AIM OF THE PPC

The PPC is a network of academics and practitioners who share thinking, research and ideas about how people participate and interact together in Bradford District and beyond. The PPC aims to work with partner organisations to develop shared discussion spaces and support critical reflection. We aim to develop thinking and practice on how to facilitate honest encounters challenging ourselves to hear 'the other'.

*'In truly public conversations, we talk with others who might not share our opinions. Risk in this context, is not necessarily threatening: it is the challenge of being open and exposing your opinions and attitudes to scrutiny. This process is difficult but, at the same time, it is necessary if we are to live together equitably, democratically and cooperatively.'* (Talk Us Into It, Demos).



Audience at PPC/ISB Event.

## **References**

- Alam, M Y *Kilo* Route Publishing (2002)
- Avruch, K (1998) *Culture and Conflict Resolution*, USIP Press Books.
- Barry, B. (2001) *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bühler U, Carling A, Nias P et al *Bradford One Year On: Breaking the Silences*. 2002.
- Cantle, T 'Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team', Home Office Dec 2001.
- Carling, A, 'What Myth? Racial and Ethnic Segregation, the Index Wars and the Future of Bradford'. 2006
- Carling, Davies, Fernandes-Bakshi, 'Fair Justice for All? The response of the Criminal Justice System to the Bradford Disturbances of July 2001', 2004 funded by JRF.
- Darlow, Bickerstaffe, Burden, Green, Jassi, Johnson, Kelsey, Purcell, South, Watson 'Review of Social Research in Bradford' ('Researching Bradford') 2005.
- Goodhart, D, 'Is Britain becoming too diverse to sustain the mutual obligations behind a good society and the welfare state?', Feb 04  
[http://www.prospect-magazine.co.uk/article\\_details.php?id=5835](http://www.prospect-magazine.co.uk/article_details.php?id=5835)
- Hanney L, Hardisty P, 'Building a Shared Future for the Bradford District', 2006 (Bradford Vision).
- Jones, S, 'Talk Us Into It: Putting Conversation at the heart of the public realm', 2006.  
<http://www.demos.co.uk/publications/talkusintoit>
- Kelly, U 'Beyond 'The Tyranny of Safety': Reflections on a potential alternative', Paper prepared for the Conference 'Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation?' Manchester, 27/8 Feb 2003.
- Kelly, R & Philpot S, 'Community Cohesion – Moving Bradford Forward'. *Lessons from Northern Ireland*, 2002.
- Ouseley, H. (2001) *Community Pride not Prejudice: Making Diversity Work in Bradford [The Ouseley Report]*. Bradford: Bradford Vision.
- Parekh, B. (2000) *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Houndmills: Palgrave.
- Parekh, B (2002) *The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report*. The Runnymede Trust. London: Profile Books.
- Pearce J, Pearson M, Cameron S (2007).  
 'The Ivory Tower and beyond: Bradford University at the heart of its communities'. Bradford University's REAP approach to measuring its Community Engagement.

Pearson, M *'Making Knowledge Work': The Promise of Dialogue*. Dissertation for Master in Conflict Resolution, Postgraduate School of Peace Studies, 2005

Phillips, T. (2005) *'After 7/7: Sleepwalking to segregation'*. Speech given to the Manchester Council for Community Relations, 22 September.

Simpson, L *'Statistics of Racial Segregation, Measures, Evidence and Policy'*, Occasional Paper No 24, Centre for Census and Survey Research, University of Manchester, 2003.

### Appendix A: Timeline of PPC Network Meetings 2001-2006

Issues/themes discussed	Who	Numbers attending	Date
Research ideas.	Peace Studies	8	24 May 2001
Ideas for programme.	Peace	11	11 June 2001
Riots/disturbances predicted.			
Info share and how to broaden out to whole of School of International & Social Studies (SSIS).	Peace	8	27 June 2001
SSIS Linkages.	Peace	Not recorded –	19 September 2001
Tension.	SSIS – SSH, BCID.	at least 13.	
Umbrella nature of PPC.	Central – Equality, HR.		
Collaboration. Ethical Principles.	SAGE –		
How PPC can be value added.	Environmental Sciences. Senior Management.		
Nature of PPC.	Not recorded –	Not recorded	15 October 2001
Sept 11 attacks on New York & Washington.	included Peace, SSH, Youth Voluntary Sector.		
Bradford – perspective from youth Voluntary and Community Sector worker.	Not recorded	Not recorded	29 October 2001.
Sept 11 Seminar idea.	Peace, SSH, Voluntary and Community Sector.		
PPC Business – funding for Programme Officer.			
Members report on activities.	Not recorded	Not recorded	12 Nov 2001
Sept 11 –inconclusive discussion about seminar idea.	Peace.		
God and Caesar Lecture Series mentioned.			
Activities.	Peace.	10	26 Nov 2001
Concerns.	Equality.		
Info Sharing.	HR.		
Agreement made to look at impact of Sept 11 on Bradford.	Retired SSH		
Collaborative post riots			

report suggested. Post Ouseley. Campus Issues. Presentation Keighley Voluntary Services. Seminar ideas. Research Ideas. Activities update. SSH Research idea.	Peace. Equality. HR. Retired SSH. Dean of Students. Security. Peace. SSH. Retired SSH. BDMC – Officer.	Not recorded      14	14 Jan 2001       28 Jan 2002
Research Ideas (subgroups formed). Discussion - Diversity Exchange, BNP. Activities update. Activities e.g. Campus harassment survey. Research. Bradford Issues – BNP. Ideas e.g. Diversity Exchange Forum. Presentation on young people & participation, voluntary sector youth worker.	Not recorded Peace. Voluntary and Community Sector. Retired SSH. Peace. Students Union. Equality. Retired SSH. Voluntary and Community Sector. Peace activist.	Not recorded      12	22 Feb 2002.       25 March 2002
Activities/info share – Diversity Exchange Forum. Business. Discussion to separate business and thematic discussions. Key issue discussed – homophobia on campus. Questioned why PPC not attracting academics from outside of Peace Studies. Activities – harassment survey (suggests problems on campus). Diversity Exchange Forum Day held (8 April 02) – no discussion of this minuted. PPC Business.	Peace. Equality. Student Union. Retired SSH. BDMC – Officer. Voluntary and Community Sector. Peace Activist.	12	25 March 2002
Activities – harassment survey (suggests problems on campus). Diversity Exchange Forum Day held (8 April 02) – no discussion of this minuted. PPC Business.	SSH. Peace. Retired SSH. Voluntary and Community Sector.	6	1 May 2002
Nias/Carling report draft presented – substantial discussion on content. Diversity Exchange Forum discussed. Info Share. Local issues discussed – ban of peace march.	School of Management. Equality. SSH. Peace. Research Office. Retired SSH. Education. BDMC – Officer.	15	23 May 2002

<p>Research – discussion whether Carling/Nias Report should go out under name of PPC, nature of PPC again debated. Activities.</p> <p>Anniversary of riots – PPC could share research to open up debate.</p> <p>Local issues – Diversity Exchange.</p> <p>God and Caesar launched not seen as PPC at this point.</p>	<p>Peace.</p> <p>Voluntary and Community Sector</p> <p>Equality School of Management.</p> <p>Retired SSH.</p>	8	12 June 2002
<p>Research – again discussion on how to bill Carling/Nias report, agreed to publish as PPC discussion document.</p> <p>Discussion theme – food management.</p> <p>Info Share.</p>	<p>Peace.</p> <p>Equality.</p> <p>Retired SSH.</p> <p>Voluntary Sector.</p>	7	17 June 2002
<p>First PPC Annual Meeting. ‘Breaking the Silences’ – discussion and debate.</p> <p>Ute Kelly writes discussion notes.</p>	<p>Not recorded.</p>	Not recorded.	3 July 02.
<p>Principles agreed.</p> <p>Info Share.</p> <p>Activities.</p> <p>Business – funding secured by Professor Jenny Pearce and Patricia Skeet for Programme Officer Post.</p>	<p>Peace.</p> <p>SSH.</p> <p>Retired SSH.</p> <p>Voluntary and Community Sector.</p> <p>College.</p> <p>Manningham SRB.</p>	15	28 October 2002
<p>Discussion – should PPC take an advocacy role (proposed by PPC member)? Discussion centred more on whether PPC should lobby for change.</p> <p>Unresolved.</p> <p>Research ideas shared e.g. sentencing research idea.</p>	<p>Peace.</p> <p>Retired SSH.</p> <p>Voluntary and Community Sector.</p> <p>College.</p> <p>BDMC – Officer.</p>	15	11 Nov 2002
<p>Business – PO post advertised. Paper introduced (Alan Carling), calling for PPC to inform University and central gov and provide a ‘questioning role’.</p> <p>Definition of PPC – Carling present</p>	<p>Peace.</p> <p>SSH.</p> <p>Research Office.</p> <p>Retired SSH.</p> <p>BDMC.</p> <p>Education.</p> <p>Voluntary and Community Sector.</p>	14	25 Nov 2002

Activities/info share – SSH seminar.

Presentation – BDMC Cohesion Strategy and Education Bradford on citizenship education. Discussed seminar to debate proposed bombing of Iraq.

Info Share. Diversity Exchange discussed and need for safe spaces e.g. sentencing.	Peace. Research Office. Retired SSH. Voluntary and Community Sector.	16	2 Dec 2002
Business – Heather Blakey is paid to organise seminar on Iraq (first paid worker for PPC). Programme Officer (PO) job description agreed. Steering Committee decided. Seminar/meeting (with decision makers to be invited) agreed to explore impact on Bradford of pending attack on Iraq.	Peace. Retired SSH. Faith. Peace activist. College. Trade Council.	17	17 Dec 2002
Business – presentation from senior management re. future of PPC. PO post. Info share includes personal problems from where one member lives.	Peace. Research Office. SSH. Retired SSH. Voluntary and Community Sector. Trades Council Faith. College.	21	27 Jan 2003
Business – PO appointed. Discussion What Orientation should the PPC take to extreme groups e.g. BNP and Hizb-ut-Tahrir?	Peace. Retired SSH. Voluntary and Community Sector. Trades Council. Education. Faith. College.	21	24 Feb 2003
Activities/info share. Review of media forum.	Peace. SSH. Retired SSH. Voluntary and Community Sector. Trades Council.	15	10 March 2003
Local info share e.g. Peoples Opera, Communityspeak,	Peace. SSH. Retired SSH.	17	28 April 2003

Dispelling the Myths training. Business – structure and aims of PPC. Agreement reached based on consultation with members and debate.	Faith. Gov Office. ABCD. Voluntary and Community Sector.		
Discussion – Presentation of Report ‘Community Cohesion – Moving Bradford Forward. Lesson from Northern Ireland’ Dr Rhys Kelly.	Peace. Archaeology. Retired SSH. Local citizens. Education. College. Tenants and Residents Association. Bradford and Keighley Youth Parliament – MYP. Social Services.	26	2 June 2003
Presentation on the role of BNP, Paul Meszaros Bradford Trades Council anti-fascist convenor.  (First network meeting where PPC presents an academic and practitioner/activist input). PPC Annual Meeting: - ‘What are the problems facing Bradford two years after the riots? What are the obstacles preventing Bradford move forward?  Panellists contribute short inputs followed by structured debate.	Peace. SSH. BCID. Retired SSH. College. Faith. BKYP. Citizens. Faith. Voluntary and Community Sector. BDMC – Officers. Trades Council. Gov Office. Voluntary and Community Sector. Pensioner activists. (Half academic, half practitioner/activist – balanced ethnic, class and generational mix).	36	7 July 2003
Info Share. Discussion on Participation – ABCD structure (Macmillan Serrant and Karl Oxford) and participation in Latin America (Professor Jenny Pearce).	Peace. SSH. Research Office. Retired SSH. Education. Social Services. Voluntary and Community Sector. Faith.	22	1 Sept 03

Presentations on Hutson Street Community Association and World Café – Joy Atherton and Volunteer. & Professor Ken Medhurst on a comparative study of Bradford, Rotterdam and Glasgow.	Peace. Research Office. Retired SSH. Student Union. Voluntary and Community Sector. Citizen. Artist. BDMC – community workers. Artist. College. Trades Council.	25	6 Oct 2003
Theme – Regeneration. Royds Community Association – Barry Schofield and Peter Eccles. & Terry Allen SSH.	Peace. SSH. Retired SSH. Environmental Science. Research Office. Faith. Bradford Vision. Voluntary and Community Sector. Trades Council	20	3 Nov 2003
Theme – Local Democracy – Dr Ian Vine and Dusty Rhodes (formerly of Bradford Festival).	Peace. Research Office. Retired SSH. College. Voluntary and Community Sector. Vision. BDMC. Trades Council. Activists.	18	1 Dec 2003
Theme Participation and Cohesion – ICPS Launch, Conference on Cohesion and Participation in the North of England, Heather Blakey and Professor Jenny Pearce & Faith Forum – David Fitch.	Student Union. Peace. Retired SSH. Faith. Trades Council. Voluntary and Community Sector. Citizen. Activist. Business. Horton Grange Project.	23	1 March 2003
Theme Faith – Active Faith Communities, Faith Cohesion Programme, Ian Owers and Dominic Mughal & Dr Marie Macey 'Faith in urban regeneration?'	Peace. SSH. Retired SSH. Education. Citizen. Voluntary Sector. Peace activist.	19	10 May 2004



<p>internationally of the London Bombings' Professor Paul Rogers, Dr Philip Lewis and Ratna Lachman (The Monitoring Group).</p>	<p>Project. Retired SSH. Faith. Voluntary and Community Sector. Education. Police. Health. Artist. Centre for Community Engagement (CCE). Leeds University. BDMC – Comm Dev.</p>		
<p>PPC Annual Meeting – this was going to be on Bradford five years on from the riots, instead we converted it (in partnership with the civic network and BDMC) into a reflection space on the London Bombings, a statement was subsequently issued that no community should be blamed for what happened and that Bradford should unite in condemnation of all acts of violence.</p>	<p>Senior BDMC Officers and Members including the Deputy Leader. Senior Police Officers. Faith Leaders. &amp; PPC members.</p>	60	7 July 05
<p>A reflection space, therefore, was created in response to national events. Theme – Exploring 'Parallel Lives' in Bradford and Lebanon, Mohammed Ajeeb and Dr Karen Abi-Ezzi.</p>	<p>Peace. BCID. Retired SSH. Independent researcher. Voluntary and Community Sector. Horton Grange Project. Education. Citizen. Faith. Social Services. Business. Health. Indep Researcher.</p>	23	5 Dec 2005
<p>Theme – Has Class Been Forgotten? Barry Pavier &amp; Mike</p>	<p>Peace. BCID. SLED</p>		

Quiggan.	Retired SSH. Independent researcher. Voluntary and Community Sector. Education. Citizen. Faith. Social Services. Education. Indep Researcher. Pensioner Activist.		
Theme – Participation Structures within South Asian Communities - Hearing the Voices of Minorities within Minorities’ ICPS JRF funded research. Professor Jenny Pearce, Heather Blakey & Community Researcher Naweed Hussain.	Peace. SLED. School of Health. Retired SSH. Visiting academics including from Nigeria. Education. Artist. Trades Council. Citizen. Health.	25	3 April 2006
PPC Annual Meeting – ‘A Shared Future, Why Bother?’ Professor Ted Cantle, Dr Ludi Simpson, Liz Hanney, Salima Hafajee, Angie Kotler, Zafer Faqir. Plus Thinkbucket Belfast exercise.	Peace. School of Health. SSH. SLED. BDMC – Officers. Education. Voluntary and Community Sector. Citizens. Activists. Artists. Good academic/practitioner balance and good balance re. ethnicity and age.  The PPC was disappointed that key strategic people were at Vision Board awayday despite having organised this in consultation with Bradford Vision to ensure there were no clashes.	99	28 June 2006
BDMC = Bradford and District Metropolitan Council. SSH – Social Science and Humanities. SSIS – School of Social and International Studies.			

*Some people identify themselves as local citizens or activists rather than belonging to any profession.*

## **Appendix B: Strategic Vision of the Programme**

To build an interface between the University and the District of Bradford through a focussed programme of academic research, education and training, social initiatives and 'safe space' discussions;

To develop a practical and intellectual agenda for addressing issues of diversity, equality and cohesion within the Bradford District;

To influence University, local and national policy agendas through research findings, training and action, wherever the Bradford experience offers opportunities for learning and improved practice;

To encourage the dissemination of research and learning about Bradford to relevant constituencies.

### **Aims and Principles**

The Programme aims:

to build bridges between theory and practice and between academics and practitioners;

to coordinate efforts so as to avoid duplication of research, training or other activities and to build a consistent and coherent understanding of issues facing the District; for inclusivity, flexibility and the raising of critical awareness in all of its activities;

to build safe spaces for open dialogue, which work towards shared understandings of difficult issues;

to develop an appropriate vocabulary within which to discuss issues of 'race' and ethnicity and to address cultural or social diversity and division;

to demonstrate the value of collective learning through reflection on practice;

to support individuals and groups in contributing to the development of the communities in which they live and work.

Research carried out under the aegis of the Programme should observe ethical principles through:

respect for confidentiality;

sensitivity to social differences and to the tensions within the District;

offering feedback to research participants.

However the PPC does not endorse nor initiate research, normal professional guidelines for research publication apply.

The activities of the Programme should contribute towards dialogue and learning in Bradford through:

the sharing of information, research proposals and findings;

the offer of support where possible to initiatives for change in the fields under study.

### **Organisational Structure**

The Programme aims to accomplish its objectives by way of:

Regularly-held general Network meetings at which current issues concerning the District are discussed in a safe space;

Three focussed 'discussion' groups also operating according to safe space principles:

*The Research Hub* in which participants share research intentions and findings on Bradford, and develop shared understandings of research agendas and principles;

*The Education and Training Hub* in which participants discuss current programmes of education and training in Bradford, developing shared understandings of best practice;

*The Safe Spaces Hub* in which the principles of open dialogue are explored as a practice, drawing on Bradford experience, and contributing to social change agendas; Regularly-maintained network lists for its different areas of activity;

Events such as One-day Workshops and Conferences;

Special initiatives such as multi-agency meetings that bring together those working on difficult issues in the District, designed to build trust between agencies and to explore mutual understandings;

Support for agencies initiating change and making a positive difference in the District.

The Programme is coordinated by a Steering Committee and has its own co-ordinator.

*Steering Committee: March 2005*