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Abstract

This thesis extrapolates from a six year area study of delinquency and victimisation among Pakistani, Bangladeshi and white young people in the North of England. In focusing on inter-ethnic violence between Asian and white adolescents and young adults in a specific locality, the study was struck by both the normality of violence in everyday life and its racialisation. Racial violence occurs when young people come into contact at the symbolic boundaries which surround ‘colour coded’ territories. These boundaries and territories shift and change as a result of attempts by different ethnic groups - white and Asian - to establish, defend and extend their neighbourhoods. As a result of these processes of attempting to create safe areas through the control of territory and public space, racial violence in the area declined, in the context of an unfolding story of Asian vigilante activity to defend Asian areas against incursions by white racists. The unintended consequence however, was that areas were further racialised, and social and racial segregation between ethnic groups was compounded. Young people, in achieving a modicum of community safety on the basis of an agreed racialisation of public space, reinforced and confirmed local forms of racism. Finally, because of Asian defence of their areas, racial violence became constructed as something which mainly happens to white young people. These and other findings, problematised accepted policy and academic understandings and definitions of racism and racial violence. An alternative theoretical framework for interpreting the empirical data offered ways of conceptualising racial violence that emphasised its specificity within and between different British localities. Indeed, much of the empirical data points to the need to understand racisms in their specificity and locality rather than in terms of a monolithic understanding of ‘racism’ which reduces all different ‘race’ encounters to instances of a general and ubiquitous racism.
But the city in its corruption refused to submit to the dominion of the cartographers, changing shape at will and without warning.

(Salman Rushdie, *The Satanic Verses*, p. 327)

There are friends and enemies. And there are strangers.

(Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and Ambivalence*, p. 53)

I come from Keighley in West Yorkshire, a place where the weak die young and the strong envy them their fate.

(Conservative MP Dr. Robert Spink, *The Independent* 16th May 1992)

…it’s the way they’ve been brought up, they go by colour not personality.

(Asian young person, Keighley, West Yorkshire)

Why don’t they stay in their own areas? Why are they coming out? They’re taking over.

(White young person, Keighley, West Yorkshire)

I am not racialist but the jiggs are taking over. It’s the English people who are in the minority now. Whatever happened to us?
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PART ONE

HISTORY, THEORY AND METHOD
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION: RACIAL VIOLENCE, LOCALITY AND HISTORY

This study of racial violence among Asian and white young people living in Keighley, West Yorkshire, began in 1989. At this time, Keighley was said to have the worst public record for racial violence in the country outside London (Keighley News 27 March 1987; Keighley News 2 June 1989). The study focused on the experiences and perspectives of young people who were victims and perpetrators of violence, and on the accounts of those who worked with young people as youth workers, school teachers and police officers. It is a bottom up account of what happened in the experiences of several hundred young people over six years as they negotiated and traversed an urban landscape of shifting danger and group enmity. The study involved a four stage research strategy. First, a four year evaluation of a detached youth work project which aimed to work with perpetrators of racial violence and offer support to victims. Second, and arising from the evaluation, a four year quasi-longitudinal cohort study of seventy victims and perpetrators of racial violence and offending. Third, a self report crime survey which looked at racial and criminal victimisation and offending among 412 13-19 year old Asian and white young people, 7% of the age group living in the area.1 Fourth, an in-depth follow up study of sixty five young people.

A depressing narrative of racial violence in British localities offers ample case studies to describe the experience of victims of racial violence (see Tompson 1988; Klug 1982; CRE 1979, 1987a, 1987b, 1987c, 1992). This literature does not however, offer many clues about why, how and under what conditions racial violence occurs. What is left out of account is the relationship between victims and perpetrators, how the meanings and actions of these groups influence each other, and in particular we are told very little about the character and nature of perpetration. The commissioning of racial violence is assumed in an unproblematic way to be an extreme expression of an ubiquitous white racism. Information about perpetrators, so the argument goes, may ‘add’ to the cataloguing of incidents and, would certainly help their criminal prosecution, but contribute little to our understanding of racial violence other than confirming what is already ‘known’ - that ‘white’ people possess an in-built capacity to express their racism in violent ways. This study argues the opposite, that an understanding of the underlying causes of racial violence requires as much attention be given to documenting and analysing perpetrator’s experiences, and the relationships between perpetrators and victims, as is normally given to victim’s experiences - a task largely ignored in the research about racial violence.

History and Locality

Histories of racial violence have demonstrated the longevity of racial violence going back to medieval

---

1 The offending part of the survey was part of the International Self-Report Delinquency Study (Junger-Tas and Terlouw 1994) but this is subsidiary to the concerns of this thesis.
times (Dobson 1974, see Husband 1979). For example Jenkinson (1993:98) has argued that since the sixteenth century attacks against foreigners on a substantial scale expressed an 'expulsionist instinct' as 'an endemic characteristic of the indigenous urban resident'. The implication is one of an essential almost natural propensity for racial violence, although 'whether or not it was acted upon depended on specific circumstances and pressures'. Nevertheless, the white 'race' riots of 1919, which occurred in nine British ports, are seen as having most significance in the history of English racial violence. Jenkinson (1993:110) in analysing the riots made the important observation that the way in which victims interacted with and responded to white violence influenced the outcome:

'The position of the black community during the riots was not simply that of unwilling victims. They, too, were part of the wider feeling of social upheaval which characterised the immediate post-war period. Although well used to the inherently racist attitudes which had permeated much of British society for decades, the virulence of the attacks upon them came as something of a shock, and one to which they reacted, on occasion, with equal violence.'

Hiro (1991) has similarly emphasised the ways in which black people have resisted racial attacks through organised forms of self-defence. For example, in Notting Hill in August 1958 'widespread and vicious violence against black people and property broke out' (ibid.:39) and 'once the blacks in Notting Hill had overcome their initial alarm, shock and despondency, they tried to help themselves. They provided elaborately arranged escorts for those black London Transport employees who had to work late-night or early-morning shifts, and formed vigilante groups which patrolled the area in cars...' (ibid.:40).

The precise nature of resistance and interaction between perpetrators and victims depends on factors particular to an area, and the nature of the groups involved. Panayi (1993), in an overview of anti-immigrant riots in nineteenth and twentieth century Britain suggested that 'racial violence breaks out against the background of underlying hostility towards an outgroup, exacerbated by recent developments, and sparked off by a particular incident' (ibid.:19), so that when 'a local spark in an area of conflict appears, racial attacks have broken out, often on a large scale' (ibid.:20-21). Local factors precipitate and conjoin with underlying racial hostility based in a wider background of social anxieties and insecurity. Just as racial violence cannot be understood outside this wider context neither can it be understood only as a function of racism when other factors are involved. Solomos and Back (1996: 57)

---

2 Periodizations tend to focus on the 19th century and especially the 20th century, and on particular groups such as blacks (Fryer 1984: esp. 356-380; Hiro 1991; 38-40), the Irish (Swift and Gilley 1989) and Jews (Cesarani 1990), or the influence of modern fascism (Thurlow 1987).

3 Solomos (1993:38-39) argues that the history of immigration and racial and social processes have 'shaped the construction of "Britishness" over the past two centuries'. These background factors create a certain climate within which racial violence flourishes or is inhibited. Thus writers have looked at: how the 'problem' of black immigration has been constructed (Miles and Phizacklea 1984:33-38; Layton-Henry 1984:16-30; Miles 1993:chapter 5); the influence of local politics (Reeves 1989; Solomos and Back 1995); of local economic insecurity (Pearson 1976); skinhead youth culture (Pearson 1976:50; Clarke and Jefferson 1976:7 in Mungham & Pearson; Clarke 1975:102 in Resistance Through Rituals; Cashmore 1984:32-33; Gordon 1990:8, 1993); and the general influence of colonialism, nationalism and neo-colonialist discourse (Hesse 1993; Bhabha 1994; Miles 1989: chapter 4, 1993; Holmes 1988; Colley 1992; Samuel 1989).
suggest that 'part of the complexity of analysing the historical impact of racism is that it is often intertwined with other social phenomena, and indeed it can only be fully understood if we are able to see how it works in specific social settings.'

It was from the early 1960s onwards that black, and later Asian, victims began to organise politically against racial violence from within communities (Hiro, op cit.:41-49). Violence against Asians reached a climax and became national news during the spring of 1970 particularly as a result of skinhead attacks. 'On 3 April [1970] skinheads attacked two Asian employees of the London Chest Hospital in Bethnal Green; and the term “Paki-bashing”, came into existence' (ibid.:161). The 1970s saw a politicisation of British born and educated young Asians because of ‘...the violence perpetrated against Asians by white racists, which culminated in two sensational murders of Asians in the second half of the seventies’ (ibid.:164). There was also a growing pride among young people in Asian identity against white denigration of their culture but in ways different to their parents (ibid.:165). Asian parent cultures resisted racism and discrimination through trade union and industrial action, whereas racial violence provoked an altogether ‘rouger’ and more politicised response from a social movement of Asian youth (see Ibid.:166-168; CARF 1981:54).

Histories of racial violence which point to the importance of local conditions and specific events, can engender the same kind of ‘events orientation’ to understanding as contemporary surveys and monitoring projects. Nevertheless it will be argued that it is at the level of locality that a causal understanding can be found. Victim-centred historical accounts reveal that victims resist violence and defend their communities and this is an important aspect of the dynamics of violent racism, and yet still leaves out of account the specific character and motivation of perpetrator groups. We are left with the sense of an unbroken historical continuity of racist sentiment and action found in particular localities. Husband’s (1982, 1989) and Pearson’s (1976) studies are distinctive in that they attempt to explain racial violence through examining its history in particular localities. Although different in approach both studies are informed by an historical methodology rather than mere narrative description of events and incidents. Husband (1982) associates the continuity and longevity of racism in the east end of London with the area’s territorial and geographical peculiarities, which led to an entrenchment of racial violence. Pearson (1976) explains racial violence in a North East Lancashire town as an aspect of a long tradition of group enmity based in the defence of ‘cotton culture’. Pearson emphasises local community discourses, and Husband territoriality, as explanations of racial violence in the localities studied. Pearson in particular rejects the notion that violent racism is explained by the existence of a fixed, unchanging and essential white racism, arguing instead that groups such as Irish people have been the object of local racial violence. Both studies assume that the violence described is racist, that is the domination of black and Asian people by white people, although Pearson’s analysis is sceptical that racism alone tells the whole story.
Husband (1982) examined east end racism from 1900 to 1980, and found geographical concentrations and continuities in racist vigilantist4 and extreme right-wing political behaviour. The east end’s notoriety for a particularly virulent racism is explained by reference to its homogeneous social-class composition, yet heterogeneous extremes of social and political culture (ibid.:3). This juxtaposition of a London-born and remarkably homogeneous, with a heterogeneous foreign-born, population living in close proximity, coupled with the fact that the former has been among the most economically deprived of the whole east end, is said to have laid the grounds for racism. Because of white out- rather than in-migration from these areas, there has remained ‘a firm territorial core of white, working-class East Enders’, over several generations characterised by a relative insularity and, during the 20th century, in confrontation with ethnic diversity (ibid.:6).5 Husband’s findings demonstrate a geographical concentration and persistence of two types of racist reaction - voting patterns and overt racial violence based in a particular type of territorialism and localism.6 This territorially based racial violence perpetrated ‘by a particular, geographically concentrated white population’ (ibid.:19), suggests ‘the existence of some form of very locally based and socially transmitted vigilantist culture whose origins go back at least to the anti-Semitic agitation that occurred at the turn of the century’ (ibid.:21). Despite the decline of the political far right racial violence persisted during the 1980s but in the form of ‘routine’ low key racial attacks, especially against Asians (Husband 1989). This more routine harassment is distinguished from politically motivated vigilantism and the more explosive relatively large scale ‘contested area’ riots and disorders of the past (ibid.:94). Contested area riots ‘involved territorial warfare and were a direct struggle between the residents of white and black areas, with the precipitating incidents coming after a period of increasing tension and minor but persistent outbursts of violence’ (ibid.:95).

One form of racial violence found in Keighley can be described as proto-communal riots, defined by Husband (1989:95-96) as ‘Racially orientated street confrontations between groups of youths of different ethnic groups are best regarded as incipient communal riots, even if they are perhaps less serious than full-scale riots’, where ‘individual racial attacks upon blacks’ property and persons have been a not infrequent sequel to such events.’ At the same time as discovering these kinds of inter-racial confrontation more characteristic of the 1960s and 1970s than the 1980s and 1990s, was found a striking yet routine everyday normality of racism and racial violence. Most striking of all about racial violence in the study area was its sequel in processes of Asian vigilante response (see Fryer 1984: 12, 377-379; Hiro 1991: 38-40). These Asian responses to persistent racial violence however were

---

4 This term is not defined but its common sense meaning is organised informal groups that patrol given areas with the threat of ‘force’ against those who transgress ‘community’ norms.
5 This perceived ‘territorial pressure’ on the area goes back to the 19th century, and represented a ‘psychological threat’ among residents of the continuing potential of in-migration, and was the basis of racial exclusionism. Husband looked at four episodes of racial exclusionism: a. Turn of century agitation against Jewish immigration 1900-1908; b. Support and activities of British Fascism 1934-38; c. Analysis of spatial distribution of support for the Mosley inspired Union Movement (UM) 1949-73; d. Distribution of support in East London for the National Front 1977-78, and geographical locations of racial attacks since 1969 upon black people in East London. 
6 Because almost all the mobility by East End working-class whites has been out of rather than into the area, there is a presumption of inter-generational continuity and loyalty creating a cultural hostility to immigrants that is focused today on hostility to black, particularly Asian, residents. (Husband in Panayi 1993:105).
Although reducing violent racism to a defensive economic logic, Pearson’s (1976) study attempts to grapple with the point of view of perpetrators by looking at sources of white racism found in local community discourses. Unlike many studies that document, expose and then condemn white racism through exemplary case histories of shocking violence within a liberal moral framework (see for example, Bethnal Green and Stepney Trades Council 1978), Pearson argues that violent racism was an intelligible, if not very intelligent, response to the decline of the cotton industry and the culture that went with it (ibid.:59-60). Local perceptions find expression in forms of ‘racial anxiety' rooted in a local lore of economic decline associated with the arrival of Pakistani migrants. White racism finds its ‘rationale’ in long standing historical memories which are a mixture of fact and myth. The collapse of the cotton industry in Britain takes place in the face of intensifying competition from low-cost cotton imports from Asia. It is this ironical development of both Asian imports backed by the use of modern machinery often supplied by the very localities undermined, and arrival of Asian migrants who are said to depress wages, which is not lost on locals. As early as the 1950s ‘cars toured the streets calling for the banning of Asian imports’ and although ‘it is difficult to say just where demands for tariff control end and racism begins’, arguments for tariff control ‘provided a sort of economic rationality to suspicion of, and hostility towards Asians’ (ibid.:60).

The conjuncture of the final collapse of the cotton industry, panics around immigration control, and the arrival of Pakistani migrant labour laid the basis and the context of the cultural response - nostalgia for a ‘golden age of working class community’. Thus general anxiety about economic and cultural change became channelled into an imaginary and ambivalent community discourse of ‘industry and prudence’ juxtaposed against contradictory stereotypes of the ‘Paki’ from the 1960s onwards. Conflict between locals and migrants centred on perceived competition in the areas of housing, women and girls, and jobs which were said to lay the grounds for ‘paki-bashing’. These economic and symbolic sources of resentment were specific to the locality and local traditions: first, of widespread owner occupation, where migrants were seen to pose a direct threat as price competitors; second of single male migrants seen to pose a threat of competition over girls and women; finally, that Pakistanis were likely to find work in those textile factories which had survived by investing in continuous running machinery. White racist violence is contextualised as ‘a primitive form of political and economic struggle’, albeit ‘an inarticulate and finally impotent attempt to act directly on the conditions of the market - whether the exchange value which is contested concerns housing, labour power or girls’, which ‘finds its specific location and rationality in the changing industrial base of the community’ (ibid.:69).

---

7 Husband argues that contested area riots are a more primitive immature stage of a contemporary surreptitious racial attack: 'a style of attack upon black people corresponding especially to a more stable residential ecology and one that has been adopted by some whites because racial attacks are far less likely to evoke a strong police response than is full-scale communal rioting' (Ibid.:96).
Conditions which encourage group enmity operated in the locality from the 1820s in relation to Irish migrant workers. Although 'Paddy-bashing' and 'Paki-bashing' evolve 'different forms of working class hooliganism', they are parallel responses to 'moments of cultural and economic dislocation' (ibid.:75). Indeed, perpetrators are perceived as 'acting in accordance with a scheme of heroism and in defence of a golden age of working class community (ibid.:77, my emphasis). These 'rough' racist responses seen in the 'the mis-directed heroism of the paki-basher' (ibid.:80) continued alongside altogether different 'respectable' racist responses seen in a common sense community discourse 'that paki-bashing was ugly, dangerous and very, very immoral' (ibid.:78). Exponents and perpetrators of 'paki-bashing', the young local heroes, no doubt revelled in their violent violation of the sanctimonious, proprietous and respectable racism of those who condemned them. Both Pearson's and Husband's studies point to racial violence being patterned differently according to its history and location.

Official Definitions and Discourses

Despite the historical longevity and entrenchment of racial violence in British localities, and plentiful evidence of the scale and seriousness of attacks against Asians in the 1960s and 1970s (see London 1973; Hiro 1991:161; Pearson 1976; Layton-Henry 1984;) official recognition of the of the problem only began in 1981 with the publication of a Home Office report on racial violence (Home Office 1981). This official endorsement began to spawn surveys and monitoring exercises which counted the prevalence of racial attacks and pointed to the inadequacy of police statistics, reporting practices and police responses to racial 'incidents' (Bowling 1993), to the extent of highlighting racial harassment by the police against black people (GLC 1984). The Home Office report on racial attacks in 1981 was followed by the Home Affairs Select Committee report on racial attacks in the following year (Home Affairs Committee, 1982). The subsequent Home Office report, Racial Attacks (Layton-Henry, 1984) provided an initial policy impetus to change in statutory agencies' attitudes to racial harassment. It revealed that Asian people were fifty times more likely to be attacked on racial grounds than white people, and Black people were thirty six times more likely to be attacked (ibid.: 14). Controversies surrounding the definition, reporting and recording of racial violence, and responses amongst policy makers to racial harassment and violence, have continued (see Bowling, 1991; Hesse, 1992). For example, the House of Commons Home Affairs Committee in its report in 1986 defines racial

---

8 The Home Office study, was structured as a national survey of racially motivated incidents reported to the police. It estimated that in any one year 7,000 incidents would be reported. Subsequent discussions have focused mainly on the size of the problem and reporting patterns. The Policy Studies Institute (Brown, 1984) found that of those who had experienced racial harassment, 60% had not reported these cases to the police. In addition the PSI suggested the incidence of racial harassment was probably 10 times that estimated in the 1981 Home Office survey. A poll commissioned by London Weekend Television in 1985 found that 25% of Asians in four London Boroughs had been racially attacked (CRE, 1987:16), while a survey undertaken by Leeds Community Relations Council during 1985-86 concluded the level of racial harassment was ten times that estimated by the Home Office's 1981 survey. Another study outside London, found that in Glasgow 44% of racial incidents were not reported to the police (Home Office, 1989). The problem of reporting was further highlighted in the Newham Crime Survey where 25% of Newham's Black and Ethnic Minority residents were victims of racial harassment in the 12 months prior to the survey; 66% of victims had been victimised on more than one occasion; only 5% of the 1,550 incidents recorded by the survey were reported to the police; and 80% of Black and Ethnic Minority victims were dissatisfied with the police handling of the case. In 1987 the Home Office carried out its second survey, since 1981, concerning racially motivated incidents reported to the police. It reported further increases in the victimisation rates for Asian and Black people, with the rate for Asians being 141 times that for whites and the rate for Black people 43 times that for whites (Seagrave, 1989).
harassment as: ‘Criminal or offensive behaviour motivated wholly or partly by racial hostility’, and the
Greater London Council’s Race and Housing Action team concluded in 1985 that harassment includes:
‘Racial name-calling, rubbish, rotten eggs, rotten tomatoes, excreta, etc. dumped in front of victims’
doors, urinating through the letterbox, door-knocking, cutting telephone wires, kicking, punching and
spitting at victims, serious physical assault, damage to property, e.g. windows being broken, doors
smashed, racist graffiti daubed on door or wall’. When agencies are able to agree on a definition, the
reporting of racial incidents, whether to police officers, teachers or youth workers, is likely to be highly
problematic to victims. The range and seriousness of behaviours which can be defined as racially
motivated present considerable problems of interpretation and definition. Smith’s (1994:1106) definition
of racial harassment best encapsulates the experiences uncovered in the empirical investigation:
‘...victims of a pattern of repeated incidents motivated by racial hostility, where many of these events on
their own do not constitute crimes, although some crimes may occur in the sequence, so that the
cumulative effect is alarming and imposes severe constraints on a person’s freedom and ability to live a
full life.’

Research into racial violence has tended to reflect these agency and policy concerns by attempts to
measure the size of the problem through local or national victim surveys, that is its prevalence and
patterning among young adults and adults, although most local surveys have been carried out in London
(Maung and Mirlees-Black 1994; Layton-Henry 1984; CRE 1987; Seagrave 1989; Saulsbury and
Bowling 1991). This survey approach has focused on: the discrepancy between self-reported and
officially reported and recorded incidents; victimisation patterns that demonstrate that some groups are
disproportionately at risk depending on where they live; and definitional problems of ‘racial
motivation’. However, this ‘random incident perspective’ (see Hesse 1992:129; Bowling 1993b), has
contributed little to our understanding of why and under what conditions racial violence occurs. As a
style of research readily associated with the modus operandi of the police and criminal justice system,
local authority housing, and school policies, it sees racial violence as essentially random, one-off
events, within a legalistic framework which emphasises that every incident has to be judged in its own
terms, and within the time frame of the criminal act itself and its immediate antecedents and
motivations (whether it was racially motivated or not). According to this view violent racism is an
individualised criminal act understood in terms of inter-personal and situational factors, rather than
there being any wider historical or social context (Husband 1989, 1993; Hesse 1995; Keith 1995;
Panayi 1993). Furthermore, the political antiracism movement mirrors this ‘official’ policy view in
encouraging a blanket labelling of all incidents in which the parties are different race as racially
motivated because all whites are seen as essentially racist (see Miles 1993; Braham et al 1992, for a
critical discussion).

9 West Yorkshire police’s victim-centred definition of a ‘racial incident’ as ‘any incident in which it appears to the reporting or
investigating officer that the complaint involves an element of racial motivation; or any incident which includes an allegation of
racial motivation made by any person’ (West Yorkshire Police, 1987), was shared by a number of agencies in the study area.
In contrast to official definitions and discourses the research presented in this thesis sees racial harassment and violence as following a discernible pattern which involves a process of relationships between victims and perpetrators. Much of the official research has ‘resulted in policy makers chasing the comparative shadows of rises in numbers of unreported incidents rather than focusing on locally identifiable patterns’ (Hesse, 1992:132). Instead this study starts from ‘a qualitative premise that victims of racial harassment are knowledgeable about the experience of victimisation’ (ibid.:132), so as to redress the balance between a statistical and qualitative approach. Official survey-based approaches have tended to ignore younger populations and areas outside of London. They are unable to capture repeat victimisation and ignores the social, political and historical contexts which explain the persistence and entrenchment of violent racism in British localities. Very little is known about younger people’s experience of violent racism, yet this population is likely to have the highest rates of victimisation and perpetration. Racism and violent racism is likely to take different forms and involve different problems in smaller provincial towns where ethnic minority populations may be more vulnerable and isolated. There has been a failure to make use of available comparative local statistics collected by the police and other agencies, which might show up variations in reporting and recording practices. Finally, a focus on those populations most likely to be victimised - Black and Asian populations - has obscured the relationship of perpetrators to their victims. This methodological, demographic and geographical narrowness has resulted in neglect of some important questions about the underlying mechanisms, processes and contexts of violent racism that might further our knowledge of why and under what conditions violent racism occurs.

It is not that studies have been unaware of these problems. Bowling (1993a) reflecting on his and Saulsbury’s local survey of racial violence in North Plaistow said ‘we lacked what seemed to be vital explanatory information - how and why racial attacks and harassment were occurring in the locality....We still knew little about what processes underpinned these incidents or what happened after they had occurred. Still obscure were the nature of the relationships between minority and majority communities and how racism and violence influenced the behaviour patterns of these communities. While racial victimization seemed to be a dynamic phenomena, the survey had reduced the process to a static and decontextualised snapshot’ (Ibid:232). Bowling went on to say that there are three requirements for the reliable study of racial violence: first, to trace processes over time as well as describing frequencies and incidence; second, providing opportunities for the research subjects to describe their experiences in their own terms; third, and most importantly, to research perpetrators (ibid.:245). It is on the basis of this advice that the current study has been carried out.

---

10 Hesse’s (1992: 156) argues that we ‘move beyond placing the whole emphasis on its [racial harassment’s] incidence measured in number of reports recorded in order to evaluate the dispersion of racial harassment across various places and locations in a bounded jurisdiction. This should also be combined with an understanding of the time period during which locations of racial harassment have developed. This can provide indications of the extent of its entrenchment in particular locales...so called random incidents of racial harassment occur more in particular locations than others, consistently over a period of time’.
The theoretical and methodological premises of this study begin from treading a path through Hesse et al's (1992) critique of Nanton and Fitzgerald’s (1990) policy orientated attempts to theorise racial violence and harassment. Meanwhile Hesse et al criticise three predominant approaches to studying racial violence which are characterised as the documentary or case history method, survey research and policy analysis. The grounds of this critique are first, that these approaches are not brought together to develop an integrated analysis; second, there is no attempt to theorise specific victim experiences in relation to a wider concept of societal racism; third, the recognition of ‘racial’ or cultural differences is minimised which makes it possible to conceptually separate harassment from racism; fourth, the seriousness of racial harassment is downplayed to that of unreported low level verbal abuse and insults; fifth, the patterned, qualitative and cumulative impact of victimization is ignored; finally, the distinctiveness of ‘race’ and white racism is denied (Hesse et al:xiv-xxiii). Hesse et al accuse Nanton and Fitzgerald in particular of having no conception of racism and of mystifying racial victimization, because of their argument that policies aimed at tackling racial harassment are unlikely to be effective as long as they treat black people in general as victims and white people en masse as potential perpetrators. For Hesse et al the problem of racial harassment is synonymous with a particular assertion of white identity or white racism. This study will problematise ‘white racism’ by arguing that Nanton and Fitzgerald are correct and that Hesse et al’s view of racism and racial harassment is too narrow. Whilst supporting Hesse et al’s notion that racism is driven by a ‘territorial logic’ (ibid.:xxvii), the nature of this logic has to be understood in its specificity and context, rather than it being reduced a priori to an expression of white racism.

Gordon (1990) has pointed to the history of police policies to racial violence as resting on the notion of ‘inter-racial incidents’ defined primarily as attacks or crimes by black people against white people. Because of this history ‘how racial attacks are defined is not therefore an academic point but one with serious practical consequences, since it is only by recognising the nature of racially-motivated attacks on black people that we can even begin to tackle the problem. To confuse such attacks with ordinary criminal attacks, or to claim, in the absence of any evidence, that attacks by black people on white people are “racial”, is to render the concept of racism quite meaningless’ (Gordon 1990, cited in Hesse et al 1992:xxv). This thesis pursues Gordon’s theme of the problem of white racism through exploring the ways in which white young people construct ‘racial violence’ in terms of their own victimisation.

The study found that what young people said about racism and racial violence posed severe problems for conventional general definitions of racism and theories of societal racism. These definitions and theories are briefly reviewed in chapter two before going on to outline a theoretical framework which better explains the kinds of racism found among the young people featured in the study. This theory of youth racism is grounded in, and draws from, the empirical findings and different perspectives of young people found in chapters five, six and eight. It brings together a range of theoretical traditions, and theoretically informed empirical studies, from urban anthropology to cultural geography and environmental criminology, so as to provide a contextually sensitive theoretical framework in which to
discuss group enmity and racial violence. Chapter three discusses the methodological weaknesses of previous studies of racial violence and describes the multiple methods used in this study that attempt to overcome those weaknesses. Not only have previous studies of racial violence been lacking in any theory but they have also been methodologically narrow. In particular they have been unable to explain why racial violence happens or why it changes in character. So as to be able to find out what causes racial violence, studies need to address the underlying processes and community contexts in which it occurs using a range of research strategies that are able to capture processes, contexts and causes. Scientific Realism was found to offer a programmatic yet coherent methodological approach that seemed to encompass these concerns, and offers compelling reasons for combining quantitative with qualitative data in empirical social science research. In treading a methodological path between statistical and ethnographic approaches without being reduced to one or the other, realism emerges with a non-empiricist model for understanding causality. In attempting to provide an empirically based example of the conduct of scientific realist research applied to racial violence, this study has a wider significance in wanting to carry forward and define a realist research agenda for criminology conceived as a multidisciplinary enterprise.

The history, economy, social and demographic structure of the study area is summarised in chapter four, where it is argued that conditions that are specific to the area are important factors in explaining the area’s prevalence of racism and violence. The prevalence of local forms of racial violence connected to criminality, and perceived in terms of place, is demonstrated in chapter five which presents the findings of the survey of young people, who were found to be severely restricted in where they could go and what they could do. Violence, crime and abuse was found to be an everyday experience among many young people and profoundly influenced their way of life, whether as victims, witnesses or offenders. The survey also shows however that young people’s perceptions and experiences of crime were structured by a highly racialised mutual suspicion and fear between Asian and white young people. This enmity between Asian and white young people had been a feature of the study area over some considerable period and had entered the local lore of young people, told and retold as a local history of events and happenings. This history is captured in chapter six where changes in the experiences of racial violence among perpetrator and victim groups were monitored by contacting groups in 1989 and periodically interviewing them until 1993. The relationship between the groups was found to have changed as some perpetrators desisted whilst others continued to be involved in racial violence. However the underlying change was based on attempts by victim groups to resist racial violence through defending their neighbourhoods from attack by white racists, and it was this resistance found in local vigilante movements that caused violence to decline.

A part of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of a local crime prevention project which used detached youth work methods. An important focus of this project was to attempt to influence and reduce racial violence in the area. Chapter seven assesses how far the project was successful in reducing racial violence among the young people it contacted and within the locality as a whole. The
main themes and issues which emerged from the survey and the cohort study of victims and perpetrators began to come into focus towards the end of the study. As a way of checking the reliability and validity of these findings they were presented to a follow up group of young people who were then asked in some considerable detail about crime and racial violence in the locality. What emerged, and is presented in chapter eight, were highly differentiated responses to violence and crime and although these responses confirmed the earlier analysis, they also enabled the study to consolidate and refine what had earlier been merely patterns or hypotheses. Chapter nine draws out the implications of the findings in relation to a racialised local and national discourse about violence and crime among young Asian males. Although the 'Asian' community has hitherto been 'known' for its law-abiding behaviour, young Asian males are being repositioned from being seen as a victim group (primarily of racial attacks) to being associated with violence, crime and disorder. The study concludes that racisms are more localised and contingent in their sources and effects than general theories of racism can capture.
CHAPTER TWO

THEORY: EXPLORING RACISMS

Grounding Theory

In an obvious sense most of us would accept that when people directly experience discrimination because of 'racial' appearance or assumed biological differences, using the term 'racist' to describe the perpetrators of these acts is perfectly proper and appropriate. The situation is less straightforward when the term is used to describe prejudice acknowledged by participants and observers to arise from social differences or differences in culture or ideas between people. Here people of different colour or ethnic origin are said not to get on because they inhabit different and often mutually exclusive social and cultural worlds, and it was this type of cultural racism that was found to be most prevalent among the young people portrayed in this study. However, the expectation was that these nuances between different racisms would disappear when racist expression spilled over into abuse, harassment and violence, behaviours which leave little room for ambiguity. It might then be seen as churlish or insensitive, or even worse, aligned with the police's view of racial violence and abuse as rarely serious enough to warrant a systematic response, to ask 'why and how was the attack or abuse “racial” or “racist”?’, or to suggest that concepts like 'racial', 'racist' and 'racism' require scrutiny. To ask these questions, so the argument goes, is to either fall into a legalistic issue about whether 'racial motive' was present or not, or a purely academic one about the relation between knowledge, intention and action. Further, that these types of questions are in danger of rendering the concept of racism and its expression in racial violence so relative as to become meaningless. This conventional view of racism concludes that its most extreme expression is found in violence and that explanations for this violence be sought in societal racism. The continuation or eradication of racist violence then depends on changes in the power relationship between whites and blacks within a racially stratified society.

This view of racial violence was found to be limited because when the study asked perpetrators and victims of racial violence to relate their experiences and provide examples of what they understood by 'racial violence' and 'racism', although they referred to violence and abuse based on colour, other different race situations were said not to involve 'racism' but were about 'grudges' and 'fighting'. Often where racism was a factor it was said to be 'retaliation' for past racism towards them. The problem for the study in asking young people to relate situations they judged to involve racism or racists, was that it was not clear why one situation was considered 'racist' and another was not. Nevertheless, many young people, Asian and white, saw racism as the co-presence of two or more people and groups of people of

---

11 The police seem unable to respond to any but the most serious incidents of violence. 'Racial violence', however, is a contested concept among agencies and policy makers. There seems to be a continuum of concepts and definitions conveyed in the use of different terms from 'racial incident', 'racial harassment', 'racial violence' to 'violent racism' or 'racist violence'. This continuum is of the degree to which racial violence is contextualised within wider processes of racism within British society (see Bowling 1993).
different colour where there was individual or group enmity evidenced in derogatory abuse such as ‘white’, ‘black’ or ‘Paki’ ‘bastard’. Young people also pointed to the threat or actuality of being physically attacked, having to fight or being forced to defend themselves against an attack, and not mixing and having to stay in their own area and/or avoid going into others areas, as all evidence of racism. Young people assumed that racism was likely to be present when people of different colour came into contact, even when no overt conflict was present.

When young people were asked about violent situations that involved derogatory abuse, threat, fighting or attack in which colour or race was absent many of them revealed the extent to which they were involved in such situations, particularly the extent to which whites compared to Asians were involved in fighting and abuse with other whites. Asians said it was unusual for them to be involved in fighting except with whites, whereas whites said they often fought other whites from another area within the town or from outside the town. Here a second perspective emerged that for many white young people racial violence was on a continuum with a more general ‘fighting’ but for many Asians it was not. Asians also mentioned that whites had power and therefore whites could say what they liked to Asians but Asians could not say anything back to them, whereas for whites racism was associated with what they perceived as Asians ‘taking over’ or the possibility that they might ‘take over’ if whites let them.

As one white youngster put it ‘why are they coming out, why don’t they stay in their own area’. Both groups pointed to the unpredictability of different race encounters where anything could happen between strangers. As one Asian youngster told the study, at least in an argument or disagreement with another Asian person both parties knew who was in the wrong whereas in different race encounters there was no wrongdoing or blame, only ‘race’ or ‘colour’.

A smaller group of usually older white and Asian young people stood out in expressing more qualified views about racism and racial violence. These young adults offered a third perspective in which they emphasised their biographical experiences and local histories of racial violence and racial fighting. This was not the fighting found in the second perspective above but instead referred to fighting between Asians and whites in which territory was fought over and as a result something had changed. They told the study that Asians were less likely than in the past to put up with abuse and attacks, and that Asians would attack whites who were considered ‘racist’, whereas whites were saying that Asians were attacking them because they were white. When this perspective was tested among the wider population of young people in the study this was indeed borne out by what they told the study, at least as witnesses or observers of the local scene. This gave rise to two issues, first of separating abuse, attacks and fighting that was ‘racially motivated’ from the more general violence found in the locality, and secondly of separating Asian on white from white on Asian violence. What specific understandings could be

---

12 Whites sometimes ascribed a positive connotation to ‘blacks’ as referring to Afro-Caribbeans who were then compared favourably with ‘Pakis’. In contrast, Asians although recognizing this distinction made by whites, sometimes emphasising their own ‘black’ identity and at other times their ‘Asian’ or ‘Pakistani’ and ‘Bengali’ identity, and some saw Afro-Caribbean and Asian as synonymous with being ‘black’. In this sense the form of racism found in the study appeared to be informed by cultural rather than phenotypical stereotypes.
brought to racial violence in a local context in which other types of violence were a 'normal' part of young people's experiences? How was racial violence different to other types of violence? Could Asian on white attacks, as whites claimed, be thought of as racially motivated? Were whites to be believed when they said that in some situations they attacked Asians because they did not like Asians, whereas in other situations fighting between Asians and whites was about proving oneself through fighting? Both groups, Asian and white, said they attacked the other to retaliate against previous attacks, and were quite specific about why they were fighting - attributing a racial motive in one case, and a 'proving oneself' motive in another. It was these kinds of questions that began to problematise what 'racism' meant in the lives of local young people and therefore the analysis of 'racial' or 'racist' violence found in this study.

Finally a fourth perspective developed whereby whites having notorious local reputations as violent racists were also involved in serious assaults on whites and engaged in a range of criminal activity. Could then their behaviour be primarily explained in terms of their racism or criminality? Similarly, Asians who perpetrated 'retaliatory' attacks against whites, tended to be involved in criminality. There was also the difficulty posed by the fact that white youngsters in surprising numbers alleged to interviewers that they themselves had been the victim of abuse and violence at the hands of Asians and that this had happened they said because of their race.

These and other conundrums found in the empirical data pose intractable problems for conventional approaches to the study of racial violence reviewed in chapter one. Different groups of young people expressed racism and responded to racism differently, and indeed it was often unclear whether 'racism' was the phenomena to be explained, or whether other explanatory factors were more important. These problems led the study a somewhat reluctant journey which traversed the sociology of 'race relations'. The purpose of this journey was to seek clarity about the problem of racism in an empirical situation where racial violence could not solely be reduced to the problem of white on black victimisation, important though this was. In seeking some solutions to the problems thrown up by the empirical data the study sought an understanding of relationships between perpetrator and victim groups and how and why these relationships had changed. This meant, at least initially, rejecting the premature theoretical closure of an analytical framework that focused exclusively on racism - the domination of blacks by whites through violence - and critically rehabilitating the race relations approach - focusing on the interaction between minority and majority ethnic groups and the types of circumstances in which this interaction comes to have a dynamic changing quality. This study then is about the relations between groups of young people who construct and employ the idea of 'race' in structuring their action and reaction to each other.
Defining Racism

The particular 'racism' uncovered in this study is that of a locally based adolescent racism which promotes exclusion or actually excludes people from using public space. The question for the study was whether this racism should primarily be understood in terms of the 'race relations problematic' or in terms of 'race' and 'racism' as social scientific concepts (Miles 1982, 1989 and 1993; Banton 1987; Gilroy 1987 and 1990a). As academic definitions of 'racism' have proliferated so have contradictions between their meaning. This 'conceptual inflation' of the term 'racism' results from attempts to appropriate, aggregate and reduce disparate and complex social phenomena to functions of 'race' or 'racism' (Banton, Miles, in Cashmore 1996:308-311; Miles 1989; Cohen 1994). Banton even goes so far as to argue that racial relations can be analysed without employing the concept of racism, whereas Miles wishes to continue to employ the term, but with a specific meaning (Cashmore 1996:310). A race (or ethnic) relations approach does not presume from the beginning that racism is necessarily present, whereas despite considerable debate and disagreement about what constitutes 'racism', approaches that emphasise racism as the necessary explanatory variable seek a unitary meaning of racism. That is, seeing racism as the single over-riding factor in say the historical legacy of colonialism and subsequent reactions to ethnic migration, or the 'needs' of capitalism for a reserve or replacement underclass of super exploited workers, or deterministic ways of thinking, or group enmity based on cultural difference. Whichever the preferred topic, an a priori theory of racism seeks instances of racism to support the theory. Although theories of racism may be found to be partial and one-sided, the phenomena itself is said not to be. Racism is seen as ubiquitous and universal rather than contingent on, or constructed and conditioned by, specific circumstances and social situations. The existence of racism and its conditions are taken for granted rather than having to be demonstrated. Racism then is everywhere and wherever we might care to look we shall expect to find it in some degree or other.

The race relations approach (Banton 1967, 1991; Glass 1960; Rex 1986) was concerned with the interaction between minority and majority communities in employment, housing and other social contexts - the implication being that the objective of the approach was to study how, whether and in what ways they got along with each other, and factors that influenced, usually negatively, this interaction. Rex and Tomlinson (1979) and Rex (1983) in particular, pointed to certain structural conditions encouraging race relations situations and problems: frontier or boundary situations of conflict.

---

13 A term used by Banton (1991) to encapsulate a non-Marxist, somewhat eclectic approach to the study of racism. Also see Banton (1992) for the causal efficacy of this approach.

14 Miles (1989:52-61) argues that there is a conceptual inflation in the use of the term 'racism' where different writers use different concepts of racism, but also an inflation of the scope of the concept to refer to all beliefs, actions and processes that discriminate against and subordinate 'black' people. This denies that intentionality or explicit motivation are indicators of the presence or absence of racism, and by definition racism is a prerogative of 'white' people, and that society is made up by the presence of two (homogeneous) groups, 'whites' and 'blacks', where 'blacks' are totally subordinated and whites totally dominant, which is of limited analytical value. Apart from ignoring class and gender divisions and conflict, this concept of racism assumes what should be demonstrated in every particular instance (white racism). The main problem however is that defining racism as a necessary consequence of what 'white' people do obscures the complexities and distinctions between belief and action, intended and unintended consequences.

15 I will argue later, perhaps controversially, that the difference in practical use of these terms is less significant than is often thought.
over scarce resources; occupational and residential segregation; differential access to power and prestige; cultural diversity and limited group interaction; and migrant labour as an underclass fulfilling stigmatised roles in a metropolitan setting. But the precise extent that these factors were present and interacted in given situations was an empirical question that could only be answered by close study of particular localities. Despite much subsequent criticism of this approach, particularly from Marxism (Miles 1989, 1993; Gilroy 1987, Anthias 1990), it addressed the importance of symbolic and social boundaries in giving race and ethnicity meaning in particular locales, and developed studies of particular ethnic communities (see Rex and Mason 1986).

In contrast to this essentially Weberian approach which emphasised models of social action (that is, how race is used in everyday discourses as a basis for social action), Marxist critics were concerned with race and racism as an ideological effect which mask real economic (class) relationships (Miles 1984). Yet Marxist and other critics have themselves increasingly emphasised the situationally and historically specific nature of racisms, and dialectical processes of racialisation in the sense that somatic features such as 'blackness' is reflected in 'whiteness', and that these opposites are bound together, each giving meaning to the other. Miles is quite explicit that the usual binary understanding of 'black' victim and 'white' perpetrator of racism by no means exhausts the range and repertoire of racist discourse and practice (1989:75-77.6; 1993:7,9,12 and Ch4). Miles (1993:12) denies a history which sees 'blacks' as the sole and perpetual victim of white racism, and rejects 'the a priori conception of racism as a "white ideology"' (ibid.:9). Instead 'historically specific racisms' must be sought without racism then being seen as 'whatever we define it to be at any time'. The problem of racism 'requires us to map and explain a particular instance of exclusion, simultaneously in its specificity and in its articulation with a multiplicity of other forms of exclusion' (ibid.:23).

A unitary concept of 'race' found in theories of racism is a too general term to be useful (see Solomos 1993; Solomos and Back 1996) for an analysis of racial violence, whereas a critical appropriation of the 'race relations' approach was found to have more resonance with the empirical findings. Early ecological or urban anthropological perspectives in race relations from the 1920s (Park 1950) underestimated the importance of cultural forms of racism in racial conflict, and assumed a consensual and deterministic view of staged assimilation of minority to majority ethnic culture. Nevertheless, 'race relations' as a process involving change in the nature of the interaction between ethnic groups was found to be superior to those views that emphasise the fixed nature of racism as involving a one-way relationship of majority ethnic domination of minority ethnic groups. Theories that view racism as a fixed ideology of domination based on biologically rooted notions of inferiority and superiority possess less analytical power than seeing racism as a social and therefore constructed practice the outcome of which is uncertain.16 The notion of race relations and racial conflict as an outcome of processes and

16 The term 'racism' was first used by Ruth Benedict in Race and Racism which defined racism as 'the dogma that one ethnic group is condemned by nature to congenital inferiority and another group is destined to congenital superiority' (1943:97, cited in Solomos and Back 1996:4). This usage in the particular historical conjuncture of Nazism with its connotations of biological
group social contact and interaction then is a powerful and central idea to the present study (see Solomos 1993:15).

Arguably a third perspective to emerge transcends the dichotomy that on the one hand racism is ignored and on the other the specificity’s of relations between ethnic groups are ignored. Solomos and Back (1996) characterise this approach as ‘a situational model of racism’, and is representative of the type of analysis found in this thesis. An example of this approach is found in Cohen’s work who links a theoretical perspective about racisms to the specificity and historicity of racisms as well as linking race and class in a non-reductive way. In Cohen’s (1988:34) account of popular racism:17

‘...the working class “goes racist” when and wherever the presence of immigrants or ethnic minorities threatens to expose the ideological structures which it has erected to protect itself from recognising its real conditions of subordination. It is not because immigrants are actually undermining their standard of living, but because their entry into and across the local labour or housing market signifies the fact that the working class does not, in fact, own or control either jobs or neighbourhoods, that the immigrant presence is found intolerable. What the immigrant comes to unconsciously represent is a real power of capital and state which is disavowed. Racist practices fuse imaginary positions of omnipotence with real powers of social combination to support the make-believe that “we rule round here, not ‘them’”.’

This subordinate racism produces different patterns of racist response, so that on the one hand ‘There is a “rough” racism centred on territorial rivalries and the perceived threat of Jewish/Irish/Blacks invading “our” areas’, and on the other ‘a respectable racism organised around moral panics concerning “outrages to public propriety” supposedly committed by ethnic minority communities.’ The first response is ‘largely a racism of male youth’ whereas the latter ‘is predominantly a racism of women and elders’ (ibid.:34).

As has been seen the main fault line within the sociology of race is between Marxist and Weberian approaches. The former position criticised the latter because of its focus on the interactions between minority and majority communities, and argued instead for analysis of racism rather than race relations. Recent developments in the study of racisms suggest however, that the certainties of the Marxist and Weberian critiques are no longer tenable, partly because the dynamic aspects of culture and ethnicity cannot be appreciated within theoretical frameworks which assume that ‘race’ and its complex manifestations are unchanging and monolithic. According to Solomos and Back (1996) the ‘new racism’ and what are perceived to be an increasingly complex spectrum of racisms, fragment fixed notions of

\[inferiority\] will apply less today (see Miles 1993:82) or not at all, even when looking at phenomena such as inter-ethnic violence (see Bauman 1991:62-65).

17 A not dissimilar but more historical account is found in Pearson (1976) whose analysis as mentioned earlier suffers from his lack of differentiation of pattern of responses among the perpetrators and victims of racial violence found in his study. The analysis of class defensiveness is however, clear.
ethnic identity that leave both the race relations problematic and the racism problematic ill-equipped to deal with the contemporary situation. Instead it is argued that ‘different theoretical paradigms may be able to contribute their own distinctive accounts of the processes which involve the attribution of specific meanings to racial situations’, and that there is a need to contextualise racism within the specific ‘conditions surrounding the moment of its enunciation’ (ibid.:27), as well as connect these local manifestations with wider or national public discourses. This bottom-up account of racisms suggests that generalizations and theoretical propositions be sought from detailed examination of actual racist practices found in particular localities and among particular social groups. This deductive phenomenological approach sees its method as describing things - racist phenomena - themselves, and from such descriptions to gain a sense of their common characteristics and their differences, their relationship to each other and to the contexts in which they occur, building theory and explanation out of commonalities and patterns which emerge. This is not to deny the reality of racism as a motivation for abuse, conflict and violence, after all it is likely that contemporary racisms continue to attempt to fix human social groups in terms of natural properties of belonging (ibid.:27), but to study the logic of particular racisms as they operate within a particular local context.

Of course this type of approach which examines relationships between culture, community and identity (Cohen 1993; Back 1996; Keith 1993) does not exhaust the analysis of contemporary racisms and other writers have also addressed the ‘new racism’, albeit often at a very high level of abstraction, in areas like the interconnections between race and nationhood, patriotism, nationalism and forms of ‘new racism’ found in colonial and post-colonial societies (Gates 1986, 1988; Hesse 1993; Goldberg 1990, 1994; Said 1985; Bhabha; 1990, 1994; Barker 1981; CCCS 1982; Reeves 1983; Miles and Phizacklea 1984; Gilroy 1987;1990a). Here questions about race and ethnicity are seen as belonging to a new period in the history of English racism more closely associated with nationalism. Whatever the topic an overall conclusion from these debates is that ‘the presumption of a single monolithic racism is being displaced by a mapping of the multifarious historical formulations of racisms’ (Goldberg 1990, cited in Solomos 1993:32). The avoidance of uniform and homogeneous conceptualisations of racism found in these approaches have changed the terrain of debate about racism, and indirectly, have begun to influence those like the present author who although having more mundane empirical concerns, wishes to ask different questions about racism and racist social practices to those found in Marxist and Weberian structural models.

What is missing most from analysis of racisms however, is an examination of white ethnicity, and this is reflected in previous studies of racial violence which have ignored perpetrators and the relationships between perpetrators and victims. This study, in attempting to fill this gap in the literature, is hampered by the fact that there are few models which begin to offer an understanding of the nature of white racism, instead focusing on its effects among victims. Analysis of the construction of white ethnicity and ‘whiteness’ however, has the potential to open up the race relations problematic to scrutiny by looking at the impact of various racisms on the ‘white majority’ (Roediger 1991, 1994; Frankenberg
White racism is itself a symptom and expression of the problematic nature of white identity in that it racialises ‘whiteness’ as well as the ‘Other’, and this very moment of its racialisation makes it most transparent to observation and scrutiny. In carrying forward this type of approach to the study of white racism it is hoped to redress a fundamental imbalance in the sociology of race:

‘One of the fundamental criticisms of the sociology of race and ethnic relations is that it has too often focused on the victims rather than the perpetrators of racism. Prioritising whiteness as an area of critical endeavour has the potential to disrupt the sociological common sense which equates the discussion of racism with the empirical scrutiny of black communities’ (Solomos and Back 1996:23; the same point is made by Bowling in his study of racial violence, 1993b).

Specifically this study inquires into three dimensions of the racism that is uncovered in the empirical findings: first, the coding of racism in ways that deny that its effect is the result of racism; second, the nature of subordinate racism as a racism of adolescents and young adults; third, its conditions in ideologies of localism that allow racism to flourish and change. Taking these in turn, ‘manifestation of race are coded in a language which aims to circumvent accusations of racism. In the case of new racism, race is coded as culture’ which means ‘that a range of discourses on social differentiation may have a metonymic relationship to racism’ (Solomos and Back 1996:19). In this view ‘racism’ is a word used in a transferred sense, so that for example, another term or meaning is put like ‘culture’ instead of ‘race’ but which is related so that the effect ‘culture’ is put for the cause ‘race’. An example from the study is how the meaning of ‘racism’ comes to be inverted so white perpetrators of racial violence put ‘white victim’ for racism, thus justifying their ‘retaliation’ against their real victims. This becomes an adaptive response by perpetrators to the new circumstances they face seen in the resistance of victims to racial violence (see Ibid.:27). The second dimension involves a racism of young people found in the study which is different to other racisms, that are more associated with dominant practices of institutions, politically organised groups and post colonial discourses. Adolescent or youth racism is positioned in a subordinate way to other types of racism because it operates in situations where the

Allen (1994) shows how Catholic-Irish migrants to the United States were transformed from victims of English colonialism to Irish ‘White’ Americans, and their subsequent crucial support for Protestant slave holding and racial slavery in the context of labour competition from African Americans migrating to the North. Although no parallel study has been done in Britain (but see Swift and Gilley 1989) there is an intriguing issue that many of our Asian victims identified fourth or fifth generation ‘Irish’ families in our study area as the most notorious racists. Feagin and Vera (1995) catalogue case studies of what they claim to be a resurgence of white racism in the United States, noting the affects of civil rights and equal opportunity policies on white male perceptions of their own ‘vulnerability’ and victimization, resulting in a ‘white backlash’ (p. 146-48). White racism is portrayed as based on ‘sincere fictions’ which are both about the other and about one’s group and oneself (Ibid.:135). Frankenberg (1993) arguing that ‘Whiteness changes over time and space and is in no way a transhistorical essence’, and ‘is delimited by the relations of racism at that moment and in that place’ (p.236) suggests that it is also characterised by normalcy and privilege. Rodiger (1994) argues that the couplet ‘race and class’ plays a crucial role in American labour history and points to the importance of attacking ‘whiteness’ rather than racism in the context of ‘reverse racism’ or ‘the popular refusal among whites to face both racism and themselves’ (p.12). Much of this American literature forms an undercurrent to our present study of how whites construct themselves as victims of racism. Bennett (1993) argues that black slavery arises from the subordination of whites. Jordan (1968) examines the changing historical attitudes of whites towards blacks, and Smedley (1993) the insinuation of racial conceptions into English thought.
victim and perpetrator groups are equally powerless in their access to resources and use of public space because of their youth rather than their ethnicity. Finally, the 'situational model of racism' mentioned earlier emphasises the importance of developing an analysis of racism which is socially, historically and geographically situated, and argues that the 'The local context has important effects resulting in complex outcomes where particular racisms may be muted while others flourish' Solomos and Back (1996:20-21).\footnote{Some writers have suggested that there are dialogues taking place within multi-ethnic communities of working-class youths (Hewitt 1986; Jones 1988; Back 1996; also see Chambers 1994), a finding at odds with this study.}

Towards a Theoretical Framework for Understanding Youth Racism: Racisms, Spacism and Localism

Introduction

This section draws on a range of theoretical traditions that offer contextually sensitive discussion of group enmity found at the level of locality and 'community', and it will be argued that these traditions form a basis to account for youth racisms. Because the attitudes and behaviour of young people in the study area could not be accounted for solely in terms of racism, racial and ethnic hostility was set in the context of other forms of localised group conflict. Local manifestations of racial violence required understanding within a wider context of community safety, and yet young people's perceptions of 'community' on which their safety strategies relied were found to be based on racial and other exclusions. These notions of community are rooted in their relationship to the use of public space - uses that involve processes of drawing boundaries around territories and which are found in their most concentrated and intense form among young people. Although these processes are heightened by race or ethnicity, racism alone does not explain their occurrence and the type of racial violence uncovered is an effect not a cause of these underlying contexts and mechanisms. Racisms and violence are an effect of, or interact with, processes of 'spacism' and ideologies of 'localism', not the other way round. Spacism is a particular relationship young people have to using public space in which they feel both excluded and exclude others, both controlled and controlling in a situation where public space is seen as both an important resource and as a source of danger. Localism is an ideology of place and expresses an 'ownership' and defence of space which defines who is permitted to be in certain places and who is not at any given time. Young people express a spatially contingent relationship to their 'community' and to their immediate environment which influences their actions, behaviour and the meanings they place on this environment. The argument is built up in several stages through reviewing the relevant literature, each progressively showing that spacism and localism, in multiethnic situations, are intimately connected to racism and ethnicism. This will become clear as the argument proceeds.

Social Ecology, Territoriality and the Defended Neighbourhood
Ecological, interactionist and urban anthropological traditions as they have been applied to an understanding of group enmity, racisms and ethnicism, have a long tradition in the sociology of ‘race relations’. Ballis Lai (1986:280) points out the striking similarities between the Chicago School and recent work in urban anthropology and ethnography which conceives of urban cultures as ‘built’ in relation to physical spaces seen as social distances (Ibid:291), and that the meanings of categories of people such as racial groups, are influenced by the nature of the specific situation in which interaction occurs (ibid.:297). This notion of situated interaction is central to the work of urban anthropologists like Barth (1989), Wallman (1979) and Suttles (1967). Suttles appropriates the Chicago tradition to argue that ‘community’ is constructed through social forms of territoriality, whilst warning the reader not to equate ‘provincial conservatism’ (localism) with the ‘biological urge to territoriality’ (ibid.:3).20 Whilst he emphasises the role that the local residential community might play as a source of trust in social relationships between strangers (ibid.:268), his main theme is group enmity. This theme of the meeting or co-presence of ‘strangers’ is common throughout the urban anthropology and sociology literature and is said to produce group enmity and stereotyping. Shuttles refers to a process whereby simplified imagery reduces the complexity of the urban landscape to a range of discrete and contrastively defined stereotypic ecological labels. This imagery derives from ‘cognitive maps’ deployed by those living in urban communities which ‘show our preoccupation with personal safety’ (ibid.:4). Despite the reality of continuities and flux between areas, these cognitive maps serve to inform our everyday decisions about where to live, where to walk at night, etceteras, and can become self-fulfilling prophecies (ibid.:4). They ‘are apart of the social control apparatus of urban areas and are of special importance in regulating spatial movement to avoid conflict between antagonistic groups’, and ‘provide a set of social categories for differentiating between those people with whom one can or cannot safely associate and for defining the concrete groupings within which certain levels of social contact and social cohesion obtain’ (ibid.:22). They provide a kind of final solution to decision making where there is often no clear cut-off points or where there is an eternal state of ambiguity, and actors find that this qualitative map is a better guide than a physical map in negotiating and traversing such social ambiguity.

Whilst critical of ecological models that ignore the relationship between urban residential or territorial groups and a wider more complex society, 21 Suttles shows how people use territory, residence, distance, space, and movement to build up defensive collective representations. Here the concept of territoriality is related to the notion of the ‘defended neighbourhood’ 22 which seals itself off through the efforts of delinquent gangs by the construction of sharp territorial boundaries. Neighbourhoods become

20 Because ‘territoriality’ is such an important concept in my study, I want to make it clear at the outset that biological notions of this socially learnt behaviour found in literature such as Ardrey (1966); Lorenz (1966); Morris (1967), are in my view invalid. To biologise such behaviour is to reify social groups, ‘the community’ or residential groups. Territoriality is fundamentally a social principle of human organisation (see Suttles 1967:16-18) albeit ubiquitous and probably universal in the sense that we are surrounded across time and geography by examples of territoriality (see Sack 1986), but they need to be treated as constructed ‘social facts’ not natural givens. This is not to say however, that ethologists haven’t raised important questions for sociologists.

21 Whilst distancing himself from earlier ecological models of urban community (and ‘defended neighbourhoods’) as natural rather than cultural (see Louis Wirth 1928 The Ghetto. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Park and Burgess et al 1967 The City), there remain problems with cultural models that imply that residential segregation, ascribed on the basis of race and ethnicity, is more resistant to social change than other social solidarities (Suttles:27,46-47) (see Wilson 1987).

22 This idea is given empirical weight in Suttles slightly later (1968) study The Social Order of the Slum, which looks at four
defended by vigilante peer groups because 'The inadequacy of formal bodies of social control tended to induce local males, especially adolescent males, into the role of an informal police power' (ibid.:190). These territorially defined male vigilante gangs not only defend territory, protect property and lives but also act as moral educators of their members (ibid.:225). In relation to neighbourhoods where minority ethnic groups are present however, vigilantism can become racialised not simply in the sense of reflecting ethnic conflict and cohesion, but as an informal procedure of social control to detect and forestall urban disorder. In a functional sense 'A set of rules governing and restricting spatial movement seems a likely and highly effective means of preserving order...it segregates groups that are otherwise likely to come into conflict...restricts the range of association and decreases anonymity; it thrusts people together into a common network' (ibid.:31). Cognitive maps function as a means of maintaining order through the ethnic or colour coding of areas, and are composed of defended neighbourhoods which help 'to tell a person where his enemies and friends are and how to find them' (ibid.:32).

'Ethnic neighbourhoods' in particular are subject to a persistence of boundary drawing resulting in 'the necessity of anyone who lives within these boundaries to assume a common residential identity' (ibid.:27). This strong neighbourhood identity is set within a continuous shifting of boundaries which itself induces a foci of concern with external influences and threats expressed through shared knowledge based in gossip, rumour and collective myths the surest markers of which is the separation of insiders from outsiders. These 'local half-truths' (ibid.:36) generate an egocentric to sociocentric frame of reference of 'my/our neighbourhood'. The staunchest carriers of these 'local half-truths' though are most likely to be young people and children because 'they are so restricted to the neighbourhood or its immediate vicinity, [and therefore] children may be the major producers and carriers of neighbourhood life; its local stereotypes, its named boundaries, its known hangouts, its assumed dangers, and its informed groupings' (ibid.:38). Further, most groups to which children and young people can belong remain territorially defined which greatly narrows the range of their movement and association compared to the parent culture which can remain atomized compared to their youth who persistently organise to defend a local territory.23

Although this relationship between youth and the defended neighbourhood, it might be argued, is predicated on, and is more typical of, an American urban context where residential ethnic concentration and segregation continues to be of importance compared with segregation in most other areas of life (see Wilson 1987), there is evidence of similar patterns, if not the same concentration, of ethnic residential segregation in Britain (Smith 1989). Residential desegregation is shared not only among children and young people, but by extension among adults as a way of assuring that children will have 'safe associates', and where interracial relations are seen as a source of conflict and danger' (ibid.:39).

adjacent ethnic neighbourhoods in Chicago during 1962-65.
23 Suttles suggests that childhood development requires this territorial configuration of smaller and more nearly closed framework of social relations, so as to avoid unnecessary role conflict and too much segmentalization and ambiguity in public encounters: 'By allowing for close proximity among those who handle youth (parents, school teachers, store owners, youth officers, the parents of peers), the defended neighbourhood acts as a sort of container which helps keep together an informational
Women in particular are said to share considerable investment in the defence of a neighbourhood and seek a clear view of its internal structure so as to transmit and defend its traditions, informal relations, and distinct identity, mostly because of concerns with personal safety - both their own and their children’s (see Stanko 1990; Campbell 1993, for contemporary versions of this argument).

Although Suttles’ themes and concerns have been refined and developed by other more recent writers his distinctive contribution has been to have demonstrated the central community role that young people play in the ‘policing’ and reproduction of defended public space seen in the twin concepts of territoriality and the defended neighbourhood. The implications of this analysis will be outlined for the study of local forms of racist violence by focusing on the relationships, drawn out by Suttles, between territoriality, aggressive displays and social distancing. Whilst avoiding the naturalising of these relationships, aggressive displays, although unsustainable in the long run, are an important aspect of territoriality so that ‘groups with territorial identity tend to adopt a rhetoric of struggle which emphasises the mutual exclusiveness of their interests and the omnipresence of force’ (ibid.:171).

Territoriality and aggressive displays as a solution to the problem of security and safety, however, are on the extreme end of a continuum of responses to anticipated danger which are devices used in social ‘distancing’ (see Goffman 1967, 1963). Aggressive displays are more associated with territoriality in its classic form - total segregation aimed at the elimination of social contacts, whereas distancing found in gestures, speech and other devices merely anticipate victimisation, conflict and danger, as a type of ‘early warning system’ which alerts people to ‘whom it is safe to associate’ (Suttles 1967:158, 161). These ‘distancing vocabularies’ were found to be extensive among young people in the study in the form of racial abuse and avoidance. Territoriality, fighting and attack were the most drastic distancing expressions. Where the potential for conflict between minority and majority groups was greatest such as parks, the town centre and on estates adjoining Asian areas, then aggressive territoriality was the outcome, and where potential conflict was least such as school the result was distancing. In a functional sense territoriality and distancing operate together to serve different but complementary purposes of on the one hand minimising the potential of physical harm and negative judgements, whilst on the other sorting people into groups which can get along with one another: ‘Both territoriality and distancing are

---

24 In linking aggression and territoriality found in the theses empirical study, by ‘aggression’ is meant an instinctual potential in human beings that can be triggered by specific and identifiable social and psychological conditions and contexts. Aggression or submission is displayed in situation-specific ways. Suttles discussion (1967:152-155) argues that human aggression is structured and organised differently to animal aggression, and specifically that human unlike animal groups belong to several dominance hierarchies and the relationship between two individuals cannot be expressed uniformly in terms of superiors and inferiors; and that in any case unlike among animals, the possibility of retaliation and/or escalation is all too real as the empirical case study shows, and retaliation always requires social organisation. A recent and contrasting account by Dickens (1990:174-176) sympathetic to ethology and evolutionary biology argues that there is a close relationship between the territorial imperative and aggressive instincts that human beings share with animals (ibid.:57; see 59-64). Once ‘race’ is introduced into this type of argument similarities with nineteenth century biological racism become immediately apparent. My study offers a social explanation which connects territoriality to the importance of face to face interaction in socially constructed localities.

25 According to Goffman (1963, 1967) there are a variety of spatial signals which indicate gradations of interaction - distancing - between individuals in social proximity. These spatial signals carry strong meaning in interaction contexts that are more or less problematic and treacherous. The prospects of failure and deviance (violations of social norms) are ever present in face-to-face interaction for ‘Spatial propinquity or mere co-presence alone make people available to insult or injury’ (Suttles 1967:156). Goffman (1963) demonstrates that actors operate within para-linguistic modes of communication (eye movement, gesture, stance, walk) which help sort people according to the actors own concerns with safety and success.
responses to common systematic problems: the apprehension of failure and harm’ (ibid.: 182). They help designate the range of associations which an individual may consider trustworthy; they help to impose the sorts of social control necessary to insure relatively peaceable social relations; they impose a mutually exclusive character to themselves which ensures continued participation and thus loyalty and accountability (ibid.: 162). They ensure continued membership of territorial groups and reinforce an exclusive localism. Finally, territorial groups through the telling and retelling of local lore construct for themselves a ‘primordial solidarity’ and nostalgia for the past. When this is then racialized in terms of a myth of origin and lived in remembered perceptions of local decline then in multi-racial situations territorial groups can become an important source of racist violence associated with the creation of ‘defended boundaries’ (ibid.: 240-245).

Although Suttles’ themes and concerns strongly resonate with the Keighley findings, basic problems remain unresolved in Suttles’ account. First, he refuses to discuss racisms, instead preferring a view of the defended neighbourhood as only a reflection of ethnic conflict and cohesion. Secondly, the approach is premised on there being ethnically homogeneous areas that are defended against, or come into conflict with, other assumed ethnically homogeneous areas or territories. This ignores the heterogeneous and changing nature of neighbourhoods, and their internal social differentiation and responses to neighbourhood conflicts. Thirdly, although the functional merits of defended neighbourhoods for community safety and informal controls are emphasised, the symbolic importance of territoriality for meaning and identity is untheorised. Fourthly, although implying that organised defensive measures and action may themselves create territorial groupings, we are left with the impression that such groupings are in some way ‘natural’, pre-existing and cohesive groupings which simply ‘respond’ to the functional ‘need’ of defending areas. Finally, we are not told about the mechanisms through which territories are identified, bounded and reproduced - that is, we are not told about the boundary problem, an understanding of which is central to an understanding of territoriality, ‘ethnic conflict’ and local forms of racism and racist violence. These gaps are now addressed through reviewing the recent literature on territoriality, community and the boundary problem in relation to ethnicity and local racisms.

White Territorialism

Significantly, the most telling absence from Suttles’ account of territoriality is an examination of power - which groups are defending what areas and to what effect? For Suttles power is plural and diffuse so that ethnic conflict is viewed as group enmity rather than involving wider relations of subordination and domination. Jackson and Smith have attempted to link the spatial element of human interaction with wider social structure so as to show: ‘how space mediates between social interaction and social structure’ (1984:194, cited in Hesse 1992:167). The wider question of how space is mediated by power associated with social structure is captured in Hesse et al.’s (1992:168) study of racial violence in Walthamstow where,
‘...the local ethnoscape which characterises a neighbourhood or different regions of a city, consists of variously segmented population gatherings which “landmark” a sense of “place” both in relation to defining where “we” are and to whom “we” are...It is here that people see “who” is around and “who” surrounds them, here that people reflect (on) who they are and see reflections of themselves or their social “differences”. This is the lived “spacing” of “community” where social encounters may reinforce or challenge ethno-margins and ethno-centres in the social landscape, where the power to dominate and the domination of power is variously expressed through the “authority” of race, gender, sexuality, class and so on.’

The capturing of how multiethnic neighbourhoods are ‘seen’ by their members in the term ‘ethnoscape’ links comprehension of personal safety with awareness of their positions of power (i.e. race, gender, sexuality). Stanko (1990) in her study of violence against women demonstrated that women devise routine precautionary strategies to limit the everyday possibility of violence, and anticipate male harassment and violence that actively involves them in the negotiation of their own security: ‘We gather experiences of safety and danger and come to perceive situations as safe or dangerous through our own accumulated experience. We also come to understand our own effectiveness in assessing likely peril’ (ibid.:6). Our capacity to ‘negotiate danger’ depends on our ‘negotiating power’ both locally and in the wider society. The Keighley study suggests interethnic fighting was about gaining, maintaining or reversing ‘equivalencies’ in power positions, and indeed territoriality is ‘the attempt by an individual or group to affect, influence, or control people, phenomena and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area [territory]’ (Sack 1986:19). Hesse et al (1992:172) similarly define territoriality as ‘a spacial strategy to effect, influence, or control resources and people, by controlling area’. Hesse et al explain the racialisation of territoriality through the presence of a white racist repertoire the origin of which lies in Britain’s imperial and colonial past, and which produces a particular dominant form of territoriality - an aggressive white territorialism:26

‘The linkage between territoriality, the assertion of an imperial white identity and racial harassment is a complex one, yet it is possible to argue that it is mediated by customary social behaviour among various individuals and groups in white communities who regard themselves in racial or cultural terms to be defending their space against change and transformation. This persistently victimizes Asian and Black people, insofar as their cultures, demands, values and life styles are perceived as a threat to the exclusive dominance of white identities in the local ethnoscape or the social environment. It is only against this background that the complexity of racial victimization itself can be mapped.’ (ibid.:173)

26 Hesse et al conflate ‘white racism’ as a generic racism based in a certain type of English nationalism with contingent and local forms of ‘white territorialism’ or racially contested space which generates racial harassment. This is not demonstrated with data about perpetrators and in any case assumes that only Asian and black people are persistent victims, whereas our data suggests an interaction often but not always based on retaliation and vigilante neighbourhood defence by black people. Racial violence is separated from other forms of violence and criminality but again it is not demonstrated why this should be. These remarks are not meant to refute all Hesse et al’s assertions, but to make them more conditional on data that requires explanation. For example, Stanko (1990) found there to be a continuum of male harassment of women with other forms of violent behaviour.
Smith's (1989:162) study of residential racial segregation and Bonnerjea and Lawton's study (1988:23) of racial harassment lend support to this view about the centrality of a specifically white territoriality to understanding racial violence where 'it is white people's concept of territory which seems to be the problem', and 'where such violence is particularly localised and intense, it may also be read as an expression of territoriality - as a popular means of asserting social identity, of defending material resources and of preserving social status. Racial attacks is (sic), from this perspective, a segregationist as well as an exclusionary practice, effected to keep or force black people out of particular urban neighbourhoods.' However, this leaves out of account different responses to violence, and the interaction effects of these responses by black and Asian communities.

Ethnicity and Boundary Processes

The existence of exclusionary practices associated with racial violence lead to a consideration of the meanings and mechanisms whereby territoriality is maintained and reproduced in the construction of 'symbolic boundaries' by community members. Boundaries are not physical but carry symbolic meaning, and cannot be understood as merely functional (in Suttles' sense), because 'community' and its boundaries play a symbolic role in generating and sustaining people's sense of belonging and are a referent of their identity (Cohen 1985:14,118). Boundaries help people identify those with whom similarities are shared and those who are different, between 'insiders' and 'outsiders', who are distinguished by their difference and consequent exclusion. Sibley (1995) takes this further, emphasising the consequences of boundaries for exclusion in the home, the locality and at the national level. Fear for the boundaries of the self - the place-related self - generates stereotypes of 'the other' who are seen as defiling space and as 'in place' or 'out of place'. Social and spatial boundaries erected by groups and individuals, whilst providing security and constraining others also offer the thrill of transgression associated with the crossing of boundaries and the exploitation of liminal27 zones creating spaces of ambiguity and discontinuity. Spatial boundaries are also in part moral boundaries because mixing carries the threat of contamination and undermines purity and stability (Douglas 1966) generating moral panics associated with notions of 'no-go areas' or 'violent, crime-ridden areas' (Keith 1993). Moral panics bring boundaries into focus by accentuating the differences between the 'agitated guardians of mainstream values and excluded others' and articulate beliefs about belonging and not belonging, about the sanctity of territory and the fear of transgression (Sibley 1995:43). The outside (and sometimes the 'inside' of communities - see Campbell 1993) is felt to be populated by people who threaten disorder, so it is important to keep them at a distance. This imagery of defilement, which locates people on the margins or in residual spaces and categories, is in modern societies, more likely to be applied to 'imperfect people' (Sibley 1995: 69): 'Feelings of insecurity about territory, status and power where material rewards are unevenly distributed and continually shifting over space encourage boundary

27 Sibley (1995) and Back (1996) use this term to emphasise that the construction of territoriality and community involves thinking processes at the limits of being conscious.
erection and the rejection of threatening difference. The nature of that difference varies, but the imagery employed in the construction of geographies of exclusion is remarkably constant.

Boundary processes in relation to the formation of ethnicity are a central concern of urban anthropologists such as Barth (1959, 1969) and Wallman (1979, 1978a, 1978b, 1983) who emphasise the importance of cultural and social boundaries as enduring features in ethnically plural contexts, and that social actors who move across boundaries retain their cultural identity. These writers, in contrast with the Chicago tradition of Suttles, are less concerned with relationships within or between discrete cultural areas, but with social activity at the boundary of their meeting, so that it is boundary activity that socially constructs ethnic groups as categories of ascription and identification (see Solomos and Back 1996:124). However, Barth like Suttles ignores power, and exaggerates the relative homogeneity of ethnic groups (Rex 1986a: 89) and under emphasises the dynamic, changing and interdependent quality of ethnicity. These processes of ethnic formation and identity are caught by Wallman (1979a:3) who argues that ‘Ethnicity is the process by which “their” difference is used to enhance the sense of “us” for purposes of organisation or identification...Because it takes two, ethnicity can only happen at the boundary of “us”, in contact or confrontation or by contrast with “them”. And as the sense of “us” changes, so the boundary between “us” and “them” shifts. Not only does the boundary shift, but the criteria which mark it changes.’ And because ‘it takes two’ in processes of ethnic formation, then it is the dependent and changing relationship between minority and majority groups that is important. In summarising the model Solomos and Back (1996:126) infer that ‘ethnicities cannot exist without an ethnically, or racially defined, opposite number. Here the sense of “us” and “them” is locked into a functional relationship. Simply put, the definition of others is the product of the classifier’s “ethnicity”.’

Social boundary processes are both historical and situational (local) and are a function of the various permutations of relationship between ethnic identify and the point of contact, the ‘interface’ between ethnic groups on either side of the boundary. The social boundary then happens at the line of difference, the interface between ethnic groups and that difference is used by either side to define itself, or to establish its identity in opposition to the ‘other’ (Wallman 1978a:209). But if the balance of power between the sides is uneven, then one side may dominate the other by exclusion or encapsulation. Alternatively or concurrently, the smaller or weaker minority ethnic group may mark a boundary to defend itself against incursion or homogenisation from the outside. But whichever of these happen - domination or defence - the racist associations of this informal order means that the minority group of non-whites remain boxed into categories of ‘otherness’ which bear no relation to the

28 Boundaries are reproduced both at the level of action where the social relationships bounded are on the basis of territoriality, and at the level of meaning where these relationships are imbued with symbolic identifications and particular value indices such as phenotype, language and culture, which serve as ready markers of exclusion from or inclusion in systems which may objectively be defined by quite other criteria (1978a:205). A social boundary is the point of interface between two systems of activity and meaning, between inside and outside, and an identity between ‘us’ and ‘them’, so it is a likely point of ambiguity and of danger. Methodologically, the nature of any changes that occur in the criteria of inclusion/exclusion are most likely to be discovered at
minorities’ own sense of identity or boundary (ibid.:211-210). The response of the minority group is to defend or differentiate itself by strengthening boundaries that do have meaning for it; this in turn strengthens ethnic solidarity and turns the majority’s mis-classification of it from a liability into an asset as it begins to redefine its ethnic resources (ibid.:211). These processes of redrawing boundaries are paralleled in this study where Asians were found to have inverted whites vilification of them into a resistant British Muslim ethnic repertoire (they began to act as if they were more like each other than any were like the whites), whereas the reality is that by internal Asian criteria they belong to quite different social and cultural systems of clan, language and geography. An alternative strategy was transgressing boundaries through involvement in multiethnic drug use and criminality, and yet another was crossing boundaries to challenge where and on what terms the boundary lies through Asian vigilante ‘border crossings’ into ‘white areas’. These redefinitions, transgressions and crossings produce real dissonance because inside and outside do not differentiate themselves by logically opposite criteria (black victim/white perpetrator), nor do they put the line of difference between them in the same place or use characteristics with which the other can identify. In this situation the boundary becomes a ‘Siegfried line across which any but the crudest communication is impossible. And, in effect, it isolates some number of people in a no-man’s land, neither claimed by nor identifying with either side’ (ibid.:212), or alternatively placed ‘in a position to use their “nowhere” status variously and creatively’ (ibid.:214). This is close to what happened in the study area.

This type of discussion may be seen by critics as privileging a ‘subjective’ view of ‘ethnicity’ and ethnic conflict over an ‘objective’ view of racism and racial violence. A counter to this that Wallman (1978b:306, 307; 1978a:215), along with Back (1996) and Solomos and Back (1996) argue that we need to know in which situations a particular difference is relevant, in what way, and to whom. In other words both ‘race’ and ‘ethnic’ relations are dependent on the context in which difference is perceived, on who is perceiving it, and on the use to which it can be put: whom will it include/exclude. For Wallman whether or not a situation can best be described as involving ethnic or racial conflict is secondary to consideration of the primary mechanism of the conflict: ‘It seems to me useful to set the racially/ethnic quibble to one side and to consider simply how social boundaries are marked, how they are maintained and how they shift’ (1978a:205). At a more practical level many of the white young people in the Keighley study as in other studies (Back 1996) routinely distinguish ‘black’ or Afro-Caribbean peers who are positively evaluated from ‘Asians’ who are invariable negatively evaluated and unfavourably compared. The suggestion here is that negatively evaluated ‘ethnic’ or ‘cultural’ ascriptions or attributes are more important than so-called ‘racial’ ones. Nevertheless, as Hesse et al (op cit.) and others have argued, who has the power to instigate classifications of the ‘other’ is all the point of interface or contact of the groups on either side of the boundary - it is at the boundary where the significance of that change and its expression by the participants on either side is likely to be found.  

28 Despite her critics (Jenkins 1986: 175; Rex 1986: 97), this focus on the criteria of boundary definition rather than ‘race’ or ‘ethnic conflict’ in themselves allows for a more complex and dynamic model of local racisms. The argument is put rhetorically by Wallman (1978b:308):'If discrimination is practised by white Englishmen against black West Indians, it is because of their colour. They are unable to be like “us”, so we exclude them. But discrimination against, say, Pakistanis, is on the basis of their different habits, their culture - their refusal to be like “us”. They keep themselves apart, so they exclude us. The non-white
important and the statement that the definition of others is the product of the classifier's ethnicity must shift the focus of analysis from minority to majority ethnic populations. After all 'it is English ethnicity which determines the boundary of "them" and determines its significance’ (Wallman 1978b:308). The concept of social refraction shows how whites initially identify and construct minorities in a distorting way, through which the boundary between 'them' and 'us' is policed by young whites. However the study will also show through the perspective borrowed here which emphasises boundary systems, that inter-ethnic hostility arises from all actors, both classifiers and classified, involved in the production of racial and ethnic definitions (see Solomos and Back 1996:127; Back 1996).

The problems and criticisms that are associated with an urban anthropology approach that emphasises the primary role of boundary processes in inter-ethnic conflict, have been summarised by Solomos and Back (1996:127-132) as: the tendency to define the markers of ethnicity in a stable or static way and underestimate the ways in which the cultural expression of ethnicity changes through time. Secondly, the lack of articulation of the micro structure of the boundary system with the macro context of class and gender divided situations. Thirdly, urban anthropology assumes that individuals utilise their ethnic identity in a unitary, constant and strategic manner. Back (1991, 1993) suggests that these approaches do not sufficiently discuss the nature of majority identities, and consequently, the question of 'majority identity' is left unexplored because it is assumed to be somehow less problematic and by implication homogeneous. Despite urban anthropology's insistence on the changing and permeable nature of ethnic boundary formation, other writers have pointed to the dangers of 'ethnic absolutism' or 'The absolutist view of black and white cultures, as fixed, mutually impermeable expressions of racial and national identity, is an ubiquitous theme in racial "common sense”' (Gilroy 1987: 61, see Ibid:59). Solomos and Back (1996:155) have similarly warned of the simplicities of racial or cultural essences. Hewitt (1986), Jones (1988), Rampton (1989), Back (1991, 1993, 1996) have pointed to the significance of the cultural creativity of young people who reside in multi-racial areas, where cultural meanings are said to be in a constant state of negotiation and evolution within a wider context of political, ideological and historical change. However although Back's empirical evidence points to the possibilities of non-racialised cultural exchange between whites and Afro-Caribbeans in some localities, this consistently excludes consideration of cultural exchanges between Asian youth culture and whites (see Carter et al 1993; Sanghera 1994; Joly 1995).

Racism, Spacism and Localism

The term 'local' means affection for a place; provincialism. ‘Being local’ however, is also connected to an ideology or discourse of localism rooted in an historical sense of place. Callaghan's (1992) study of resident of England is therefore in a double bind: he is damned if he tries to be an Englishman and damned if he does not.’
the spatial orientation of young adults in Sunderland suggests that ideologies of localism and locality are a dynamic response to economic restructuring caused by the decline of traditional industries and emergence of a new industry (ibid.:23). Young people’s ‘cognitive maps’ of their locality that orient them to social interaction, are part of their cultural stores, accumulated over generations and thus heavily influenced by the past. Unlike Jenkins’ (1983) study of young people in which he defines localism as ‘restricted horizons’, Callaghan argues that localism ‘does not require that they can’t see beyond their local world’ (ibid.:26). On the contrary, localism is a working class strategy for coping with structural change in that these young people’s spatial mobility is limited compared to their more qualified middle class contemporaries who leave the area. In this view localism offers local networks of friends and kin to support them against the worst aspects of unemployment or sub-employment (ibid.:31). Localism, was a powerful yet positive collective form of the assertion of working class values and communal loyalties in which ‘They had a commitment to their town through a collectivist ideology which was not perceived as defensive. They believed that ideology of looking after and sharing was superior to anything available to people in other regions’ (p. 32). What this argument profoundly ignores however is the exclusionist nature of young people’s localist discourse.

In Keighley localism was articulated through an exclusionist discourse and expression of violence towards young people from different areas within and without the town. Localism articulates and inscribes a delimited history and geography of place, and although it may articulate wider ideological forms of racism, it is mediated by place-specific referents in that young people rationalised their racism in terms of ‘being born and bred’ in the town and their pride or sovereignty of place. It might be that in Sunderland where a minority ethnic presence is negligible, localism is a creative and constructive resolution of local problems rather than a defensive racialised mobilisation. Whatever the case, Callaghan’s study points to the fundamental importance of place and spatiality as a way in which young people orientate themselves to social change. A similar resonance of the importance of place and spatiality was found in Keighley where young people repeatedly referred to being ‘looked at’ in certain ways at particular places and times as a precursor or identifier of ‘racism’. The importance of ‘the gaze’ by a potential or actual attacker as a marker of being objectified in the eyes of the perpetrator was in being seen in the ‘wrong’ place at the ‘wrong’ time.

The importance of place and spatiality at a more general level is found in cultural geography perspectives which have highlighted the importance of understanding ethnic boundaries, territoriarity, racial exclusion and closure through an understanding of actors relationship to space and spatiality. Keith and Pile (1994:225) for example have stated that ‘Spatialities represent both the spaces between multiple identities and the contradictions within identities’, where spatiality expresses people’s experiences of displacement (a feeling of being out of place), dislocation (relating to alienation) and fragmentation (the jarring of multiple identities). Similarly, Goldberg (1993:202) has argued for the

among some groups of young people for what is really a consumer identity rather than ‘genuine’ cultural exchanges. This also ignores Asian/Muslim - white cultural exchange where there are less grounds for optimism.
importance of historically and geographically specific connotations of ‘race’ which focus on the microanalysis and the ‘power of place’, yet warns that this type of approach may ignore the broad forms of racist expression such as colonialism. This theme of the connection between place specific identity formation and racial exclusionism with wider forms of racist discourse associated with nationalist and colonial discourses runs throughout the cultural geography literature. Jackson (1989:133)\(^{31}\) for example argues that,

‘While contemporary racism is not simply a historical remnant of colonial stereotypes but an active creation that varies with present circumstances, there is nonetheless an important sense in which contemporary racist ideologies employ a pre-formed vocabulary, adopting and adapting an already available language - a repertoire of racist images and stereotypes that are drawn on selectively as occasion demands.’

The recurrence of this theme that local or place-specific racisms draw on a wider repertoire of images and stereotypes begins to draw the argument towards the question whether and to what extent this can be empirically demonstrated among young people in general and violent racists in particular. The empirical data presented in this study does not bode well for such a demonstration where few links were found between ‘everyday racism’ and a wider repertoire of post colonial or nationalist discourse. Hesse (1993a) for example attempts to convey the sense that violent racism is not contingent and random but is determined by a wider cultural and political geography by linking practices of violent racism and wider nationalist and post-colonial ideas.\(^{32}\) Nevertheless, there are a number of ways in which the Keighley empirical findings do lend support to the efficacy of theoretical work in cultural and human geography which has emphasised spatial forms and processes as a framework for understanding racisms and racist expression (see for example, Hesse 1992, 1993a, 1993b; Smith 1989, 1993; Jackson 1987, 1989; Cross and Keith 1993; Goldberg 1993; Duncan and Ley 1993). Goldberg (1993:206) in particular has resonance with the main themes of this thesis arguing that ‘Race has fashioned and continues to mould personal and social identity, the bounds of who one is and can be, of where one chooses to be or is placed, what social and private spaces one can and dare not enter or penetrate.’

Cultural geography perspectives argue that violent racism and harassment is not a crime problem, but a problem of politics, culture and identity (Hesse 1993b, 1995; Cohen 1993; Keith and Pile 1993) which lends a complexity and dynamism to its effects hitherto ignored by official policies (Genn 1988; Bowling 1993; Hesse 1992; Gordon 1992; Smith 1994), and political ‘antiracism’ (Braham et al. 1992). Nevertheless, cultural geography’s linking of ideas about racism, spatiality and nationalism require

---

31 Jackson’s Maps of Meaning is a defining text of the genre in which he outlines the heritage and genealogy of cultural geography as a discipline, its problems and agenda, and discusses some weaknesses of culturalist approaches to ‘urban culture’ and to the ‘culture of poverty’.

32 See Hesse 1992, 1993b; Cohen 1993; Back 1996, for attempts to make this link. The problem is that the connection is inferred rather than demonstrated, and except for Back’s study, remains speculative although intriguing. It is difficult to establish the link without considerable empirical investigation of perpetrators of violent racism and other racist practices. My evidence
‘testing’ in relation to specific and concrete instances of their articulation where it still holds onto a too
generalised notion of racism. The specific processes and conditions that give rise to racism and the
varieties of racisms are rarely addressed. Whilst it is important to identify what is common and what is
different to racism, this study argues that there are really only specific forms of racism to be found in
their particularity and locality, rather than there being an all-encompassing generic racism. This accords
with Jackson and Penrose’s (1993:13) proposal that ‘By demonstrating the existence of a plurality of
place-specific ideologies of ‘race’ and nation rather than a monolithic, historically singular and
geographically invariant racism or nationalism, the constructedness of ‘race’ and nation is starkly
revealed’. Racisms, then, are socially constructed from contingent and specific mechanisms and
processes (see Goldberg 1993), one aspect of which is the influence of the territorial imperative of
locality.

Whilst violent racism is patterned rather than random (Hesse 1992, 1993a) in the sense that it becomes
entrenched in some localities and not others; involves some groups of young people and not others; is
persistent and long term in the way it affects individuals and the places they live, what was striking
among the young people in the study, was the pervasiveness and ‘normality’ of racism and the
possibility of violent racism as a routine aspect of everyday life, rather than it being a deviant or
pathological activity occurring at the margins of local life (Webster 1995). Little evidence was found of
organised and coherent neo-facist ideologies of ‘race’ typical of a collective criminal form of behaviour
involving Far Right groups (Bjorgo and Witte 1993), although some victims were repeatedly subject to
escalating attacks over quite long periods of time. Attacks ranged from intimidation, abuse, spitting,
and chasing to violence, and these attempts to ‘name, maim and claim’ were aimed so as to intimidate
and disrupt contested areas of ethnic settlement (Cohen 1993).

Cohen (1993:7) describes processes of the racialisation of space as involving the ‘colour coding’ of
particular residential areas, housing estates, parks or public amenities as ‘white’ or ‘black’, articulated
through images of confrontation - ‘front lines’, ‘no-go areas’ and the like - which serve to orchestrate
moral panics about ‘invasion’ and ‘blacks taking over’. Cohen goes on to argue that this colour coding
becomes a self-fulfilling prophesy, creating a form of apartheid, compounded by processes of white flight.33 Cohen’s (1993:17) analysis which posits ‘nationalisms of the neighbourhood, prides of place
associated with certain invented traditions of popular sovereignty’, understands local racisms as
employing symbolism associated with and derived from the wider racist cultures of which they are a
part, condensed at the level of locality, and reinforced by customary local traditions of racist thinking,
through peers and a parent culture of ‘white flight’. At the centre of the analysis and as a linking device

suggests that at least among the young people I studied their was no direct evidence of nationalist or colonialist ideology which
informed their practices, instead they held to a very contingent view of locality and territory.
33 Strong evidence was found that ‘white flight’ was taking place in the locality studied. Indeed local head teachers explicitly
used the term to describe the loss of white pupils from their schools because of parents choosing to relocate or transfer their
children to ‘all white’ schools in ‘white’ areas. Such flight carries a complicated pattern of meaning which for Cohen (1993:7)
involves: ‘a calculated move to reinvent traditions of white territorial dominance associated with ‘old’ working class
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between local forms of racism and nationalism lies the imagery and metaphor of 'home'. By exploring this idea, Cohen recognises some of the more intimate ways through which imagined communities of 'race' and 'nation' come to inform and are articulated by the banalities of everyday life. Seemingly distant and abstract cultural discourses of nationalism and colonialism insinuate themselves into everyday local life which becomes the source of their reproduction as lived cultural practices. Nationalism and racism, synonymous in Cohen's account, are produced through a succession of homely images and fond memories of childhood, landscape now threatened and despoiled by the alien presence.

Cohen's substantive analysis and more abstract theories of racism (Goldberg 1993; Cohen 1988; Bauman 1991, 1995; Jackson and Penrose 1993; Donald and Rattansi 1992; Balibar and Wallerstein 1991) see racism as a form of xenophobia that posits the stranger as an enemy so that the secure 'home territory' transforms the 'outside of home' into a terrain fraught with danger associated with strangers as the carriers of threat (Cohen 1993:8). The implication is that home territory becomes synonymous with 'defensible space' with secure and effectively guarded borders, fought for through territorial warfare and border skirmishes, and brought into being through the declared presence of the stranger conspiring to trespass and invade (Bauman 1995:135, 1993). Young people secure residential and public places through local topographical knowledge, colour coding and through rules and rituals of territoriality through which peer groups constitute themselves as having certain affinities by virtue of the places which they occupy, from which they derive their sense of local identity, and to which they anchor their powers of social combination...all of them extensions of childhood dens, and the "home base" (Cohen 1993:22). For young people the question of neighbourhood control is a question of both 'who belongs?' and 'Who rules around here - Us or Them?' (ibid.:8).

34 The German word 'Heimat' (home) expresses 'a prime symbol of the nation' (Rathzel 1994: 84, cited Billig 1995:75). I understand Cohen to be using the metaphor of 'home' to mean 'Heimat' or 'homeland' which captures the dual meaning of the place of our personal home - my/your home, and the home of all of us - our country.

35 Elective affinities between local 'nationalisms of neighbourhood' and wider 'narratives of nation' are explored by Anderson (1983) through the ways in which 'imagined communities' of 'race' and 'nation' are articulated in everyday life and through political and media discourses. Similarly, Billig (1995) has coined the term 'banal nationalism' to convey the sense that nationalist and ethnocentric sentiment are reproduced in ordinary everyday routines and habits in which 'Daily, the nation is indicated, or "flagged", in the lives of its citizenry' (Ibid.:6). These familiar and continual reminders of nation are registered in an almost subconscious way (Ibid.:8), as metonymic images whose empirical observation is extremely difficult.

36 See also Wetherell and Potter 1992; Balibar and Wallerstein 1991; Barker 1981; Todorov 1993; Van Dijk 1993, for further discussions of the 'racialization' of the idea of national culture.

37 Balibar's (1995:135-137) fascinating metaphor of the stranger who threatens the sanctity of an idealized conception of the secure home, 'which transforms merely "unfamiliar people" into downright enemies', characterises 'defensible space' or 'watched neighbourhood' as 'a territory topographically and semantically transparent and legible', and as remedy for situations in which 'strangers' do not mix.

38 Or detailed knowledge of the features of a small area held by young people.

39 Here Cohen is talking about the racism of white working class youth characterised by physical aversion and threat in which every insult invites injury. In contrast other forms of local racism are respectable and institutional organised around protocols of public propriety (Ibid.:22). Young people in my study in their perpetration of, and resistance to, racism, oscillated between violent and respectable racism, depending on the situation, and as a ploy to neutralise their own (violent) actions.
Thrills, Regression and Local Heroes

Border skirmishes, as one youngster told me, 'makes you giddy'. Whilst offering excitement they also induce stress: 'one needs to remain constantly on guard, yet, even with all the care one takes to calculate one's moves, every step taken is pregnant with risk. In the long run, the gamble one cannot avoid is exhausting, and the thought of a refuge - a home - grows into a temptation ever more difficult to resist' (Bauman 1995:134-135). The fear, fascination, and risk taking associated with dangerous or forbidden territories came through strongly in the study where young people repeatedly referred to calendar events such as the beginning and ending of school terms and local festivals and fairs as high points of particularly intense and dangerous fighting, attacks and rivalries between minority and majority groups. This lore seemed centred on the arrival of the annual town parade or carnival where the presence of a funfair over a period of a fortnight heightened the issue of ethnic control of public space. This white calendar event was routed through and ended in an Asian area of the town, and Asian families were said to 'leave town' for their own safety. According to Balint (1987) in his Thrills and Regression, the primitive amusements of the aggressive game and the funfair provide us with two important experiences: being able to relive original childhood trauma under safe conditions, and the other makes us capable of dealing with some of our anxieties and thus restoring the security that we are surrounded by an harmonic 'friendly expanse' (ibid.:139). Realisation in early childhood that the objects of love are separate induces anxiety and insecurity, and security is regained later through experiencing the thrill of adopting the role of the ruthless aggressor in aggressive games where there is no need to be afraid that one might hurt or damage anything or that the 'aggressors' might retaliate, might turn into 'persecutors'. In contrast, amusement machines or funfair rides offer us the possibility of repeating in adolescent or adult life the great traumatic experience of 'being dropped by our objects, getting perplexed in our orientation in the world, etc.' (ibid.:138). In the locality studied the funfair and the aggressive game spilled over into racialised territorialism and the pleasures or 'giddiness' of 'games' involving ambush, attack and chasing, fighting, testing one's strength etc. These displays of aggression and opportunities for regression are 'safety' valves for pent-up emotions and unresolved traumas in which the presence of the racialised 'other' - an object par excellence - legitimates and rewards aggression within an environment of local and wider racism, and 'The less anxiety and inhibition the individual feels, the more aggressive or destructive he can be' (ibid.:20). In the study area the funfair became a catalyst for the more extreme forms of racial conflict and rivalry among

40 Other people are imaginary aggressive objects and objects of aggression. Object relations emerge from the phase of primary love in childhood as reactions to the traumatic discovery of the separate existence of objects/others. This trauma is resolved in the recognition that others are autonomous people and decides the child's likely future adolescent and adult relationships. If these relationships remain unresolved then the individual is doomed to repeat the trauma in exposed situations that involve the obsessive pursuit of thrills, and of course I am arguing that aggressive territorialism is just such a situation. Unresolved trauma produces two states: the 'philobat' (derived from 'acrobat' - 'he who walks on his toes', i.e. away from the safe earth) who enjoys such thrills (Ibid.:25) through 'introjection of the aggressive and powerful objects, or splitting off parts of the introjected objects as the internal persecutors, and so on' (Ibid.:21); and the 'ocnophil' (derived from Greek verb 'oxvew', meaning 'to shrink, to hesitate, to cling, to hang back') who prefers to clutch at something firm when his security is in danger (Ibid.:25) - aggression and withdrawal.
young people.\footnote{To the extent, as we shall see, of being heavily policed with the express purpose of preventing these occurrences and widespread racially motivated disorder. Balint argues: 'In all amusements and pleasures of this kind three characteristic attitudes are observable: a) some amount of conscious fear, or at least an awareness of real external danger; b) a voluntary and intentional exposing of oneself to this external danger and to the fear aroused by it; c) while having the more or less confident hope that the fear can be tolerated and mastered, the danger will pass, and that one will be able to return unharmed to safety. This mixture of fear, pleasure, and confident hope in face of an external danger is what constitutes the fundamental elements of all thrills’ (Ibid.:23).}

The most serious incidents invariable happened around this time.

Balint’s theory can be linked to Cohen’s thesis about ‘the home’ and ‘home territory’ being a metaphor for a fundamental relationship between space and security, because the origins of ‘primitive’ thrills are found in many forms of children’s games such as ‘pirates’, blind man’s buff, hide and seek, and it is highly significantly that in practically all children’s games security is called either ‘house’ or ‘home’. According to Balint (1987:24) all these games consist of an \textit{external danger}, represented by the catcher, the seeker, the chaser; involve other players \textit{leaving the zone of security}, the ‘home’; in which the aim is to reach security again: ‘all thrills entail the \textit{leaving} and \textit{rejoining} of security’ (ibid.:26). At the boundary between danger and security is found the \textit{heroic stance}: ‘the individual is on his own, away from every support, relying on his own resources…a brave, erect stance’ (ibid.:28). \textit{Heroes} occupy a world of friendly expanses allotted more or less densely with dangerous and unpredictable contacts which are avoided (ibid.:34), and structured ‘by safe distance and sight [always looking]’ (ibid.:37).

Thus on the one hand, Heroes can only feel safe and secure in close contact with familiar people, ideas, and beliefs, i.e. they must be in control; yet on the other they are said to correspond to aggressiveness, and are usually imagined as robust, upstanding, conquering, enjoying their independence, unflinchingly facing danger, and defiantly going their own way (ibid.:39, 42, 44, 55). This type of heroism is both ‘manly’ and at the same time immature because the hero, especially in puberty and adolescence, ‘In order to regain the illusion of the friendly expanses, to experience the thrill, he has to leave the zone of safety and expose himself to hazards representing the original [childhood] trauma’ (ibid.:87).

In refashioning Balint’s psychoanalytical object relations theory so as to offer a promising interpretation \textit{at the level of individual action and meaning} of the data, it is not necessary to accept the more deterministic and reductionist aspects of this type of theory. This level of analysis compliments rather than excludes the argument that local community discourses of ‘race’ provide a legitimising framework for local ‘heroism’ among some individuals and groups of young people, and at least part of the explanation for these behaviours is found in individual psychological processes as well as in group processes. Local heroes are either ambivalent, or express hatred towards the ‘others’ (ibid.:47) who become constructed as resistant ‘objects’ rather than ‘subjects’, unpredictable hazards and obstacles to be targeted and overcome (ibid.:52, 59-60, 61). The consequence of these orientations for some young people is that they experience their environment as both a friendly and supportive place of personal exploration, and as a source of fear, fascination, risk taking, hostility and danger. Balint’s opposite type to the hero, the ‘ocophil’, possesses a different orientation to the problem of security through withdrawing into enclaves safe from attack and where survival consists in moving as quickly as possible
from one safe place to another. As one Asian victim of white attacks told the study: the town is 'small so you can get around quickly.' This group is referred to as 'the conformists' (see chapter eight).

Community Discourse and Neighbourhood Nationalism

Empirical support for Cohen's programmatic analysis of local racisms is found in Back's ethnographic area study of inter-ethnic friendship among young people in London. Back (1996) argues that if anti-racist strategies among young people are to work then anti-racist approaches must abandon their characteristic framework of condemnatory moral absolutism in which whites are constructed as 'saints' or 'sinners'. Whites are neither singularly racist or pure advocates of rejecting racism, and analysis of adolescent racism requires close empirical attention to be paid to the exact ways in which racism enters into the lives of young people. Back's study offers a situated account of inter-ethnic relations in the context of a local and vernacular culture in which, it is claimed, the social meaning of race, nationhood and belonging have undergone important transformations at the local level. The study attempts to explain these transformations in adolescent racism by analysing language use in interaction contexts between young people in two neighbourhood council estates that have contrasting ethnic compositions. Importantly the study did not restrict itself to what young people said with regard to race, ethnicity and racism but also looked at what they did (ibid.:22). This empirical data is organised in terms of a 'local ideology of community' to refer to 'a number of discourses that lay claim to a vision of who is included in the community and the quality of neighbourhood life' (ibid.:29), where these ‘community discourses’ serve social functions with reference to local manifestation or rejection of racism among the young people.

It is of course impossible to do justice to this richly textured and thickly described ethnographic study within a literature review having many competing priorities. The particular aspects of Back’s study that are salient to the concerns of this thesis are firstly, his demonstration that different local histories and conditions found in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods, even when they are adjacent as they are here, result in quite different configurations of racism and responses to racism among residents and young people. Secondly, his empirical confirmation of the centrality of localist ideology, territoriality, boundary drawing processes and the context of white flight informed by discourses of community decline, found in mine and other area studies of multi-ethnic neighbourhoods (Hesse 1992; Cohen 1993; Stenson and Watt 1995; Keith 1995). Thirdly, how these contexts, processes and mechanisms interact in complex

42 Back collected ethnographic data on 99 young people aged 12-25 in a South London neighbourhood. Through participant observation as a youth worker, everyday talk with young people was recorded in individual and group interviews, to show how ‘race’ and national belonging are defined at a local level. Despite finding high levels of inter-racial friendship and syncretic cultural activity and exchange among the young people studied, young people of Vietnamese origin were excluded from these dialogues that were occurring between black (Afro-Caribbean) and white youth. As a result, in the area studied, the adolescent community was structured along lines where the expression of particular racisms were muted whilst others flourished (see Back 1993).

43 Following A. P. Cohen (1985:21) who argues that ‘Community is a discursive construct that is utilised as an ideological resource in situations where inside/outside definitions are discussed’, Back prefers the concept of ‘community discourse’ to that of ‘community ideology’ because discourses are by their very nature less stable in terms of their semantic consistency and they are not formalised in the way that ideologies can often exist’ (Ibid.:29). As we shall see later this is similar to Wallman’s concept.
ways to either/or both encourage or/and discourage racist expression and practice in particular localities. Fourthly, his refinement of Cohen’s notion of neighbourhood nationalism through identifying different neighbourhood nationalisms that are distinguished by the extent to which they give rise to a predominantly inclusivist or exclusivist community discourse which in turn supplies the local conditions under which explicit racism and racial violence can flourish or be curbed. Finally, Back’s focus on the nature and character of local forms of white ethnicity redresses a fundamental imbalance in the literature whereby enormous attention has been paid to the study of ethnic minority young people, when little is known about the ethnicity of white youth and the way racism features in their lives.

Back compares adult and youth perceptions and discourses within and between the two communities studied. Riverview was perceived as a white stronghold essentially hostile to black and minority populations. Adults living on this estate offered racist explanations about the presence of black people in the area coinciding with general economic and social decline, seen in the connection between street youth, drug abuse and crime, and associated with the settlement of new populations (ibid.:55). A ‘golden age’ of community reported and explained local decline, which in turn gave rise to a ‘death of community discourse’ marking the end of community on the estate, ‘explained’ as being related to the settlement of ‘problem families’, black people and Vietnamese refugees. Young people in contrast to adults asserted a local territorialism inclusive of local Afro-Caribbean youth, but which excludes Vietnamese youth. Thus black people are constructed within this discourse as hard and respected while the Vietnamese are labelled as soft and are vilified (ibid.:68). Here ‘neighbourhood nationalism’ is inclusive for some groups and racialized for others to the extent that the racial referent is replaced with a simple commitment to a local territory. In contrast to Cohen, Back argues that in multiethnic communities, racially inclusive forms of neighbourhood nationalism can apply when localism and territorialism take precedence over a more general racialized nationalism. The problem is that this selective inclusion of local blacks requires explanation in relation to the total exclusion of Vietnamese young people from cultural dialogues. The explanation offered that differentially applied racism is a function of ‘a process whereby particular combinations of masculine identity are embraced while others are rejected’(ibid.:70), raises more questions than it answers.

In contrast to Riverview, the comparison estate of Southgate has a strong and established black cultural presence and whereas Riverview is viewed by black and white people alike to be an area where black people should not go because of the intensity of street racism, Southgate is seen as being ‘off-limits’ to white people because of the prevalence of mugging and drug-related crimes. The result is that the South
London landscape is divided into safe and unsafe areas for black and white people respectively (ibid.: 106). In Southgate the adult community discourse of white flight takes a different form invoking the notions of being 'swamped' by black people, and that white people are being forced out (ibid.:119). Overall though, and in contrast to Riverview, the ascendant discourse is one of 'our area' or inclusive territorialism within which racial expression is muted within 'a powerful and racially inclusive localism' (ibid.:122). In contrast to Riverview, in Southgate ‘the inclusive notions of local belonging enable a greater degree of cultural syncretism to develop amongst young people’ (ibid.:179), and ‘The collective struggles of the black community in Southgate have in effect curbed the public expression of racist sentiments. As a result, the social geography of popular racism is divided into areas where it has flourished in an uncontested way and areas such as Southgate’ (ibid.:178).

Whether or not this cultural syncretism or hybridity discovered in the locality exists elsewhere is an empirical question, but the lack of efficacy of essentialist views of ‘racism’ is demonstrated in the fact that white young people can hold multiple attitudes which construct ‘blackness’ in a prestigious way while at the same time use crude forms of racist imagery. Nevertheless this selective or ‘contingent’ racism within the adolescent meaning system which ‘splits’ race registers into either ‘black insiders’ or ‘black outsiders’ according to whether they live in the area or not, still defines Vietnamese people as ‘outsiders’ in terms of ‘cultural’ difference, and this would indicate that Pakistani and Bangladeshi young people are also excluded from such dialogues. Indeed, the local white vernacular stigmatised Vietnamese young people as ‘butt butts’, which is also a local racist term for Asians or ‘Pakis’ (Back 1996: 140). In the words of one white young person, justifying the absence of Vietnamese young people from a local youth club, they ‘like to keep themselves to themselves’ and that they ‘won’t mix’ (1993: 227). The implication is that ‘Asians’ are the object of the ‘new’ or ‘cultural racism’ (Barker 1981; Gilroy 1990) whereas Afro-Caribbeans are not.

Racial Abuse, Language and the Boundary Process

Back underestimates the importance of boundary drawing in the formation of identity and enunciation of ‘cultural difference’, particularly in relationship to young people's use of language. He relies on an analysis of how young people use language to define their own and others cultural identity and yet he does not reveal his premises or theoretical assumptions about what language is, how it works, and the specific role language plays in identity formation. For example, Shoiter’s (1993) survey of the linguistic theories of Vygotsky, Volosinov and Bakhtin, demonstrates that ‘thinking’ itself is a boundary phenomenon. The essential argument is that people’s identity is organized at the boundary between self and other in a process of negotiations ‘at the boundaries of our being’ (ibid.:107-108), where the negotiations are varied in form and require equally varied skills in their ‘management’ (ibid.:108). According to Volosinov (1973: 26, cited Ibid.:107) ‘the subjective psyche’ is located at the ‘borderline’

were vilified (ibid.:43).

45 ‘the location of black peers as “insiders” is always contingent upon the absence of racist talk and practice’ (Back 1993:225).
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between internalized identity and ‘outside’, and therefore identity formation is a ‘boundary’ phenomena, which produces ways of ‘thinking’ and certain patterns of social relations.

Identity, including ones ‘ethnicity’ is not only formed through a back-and-forth process of negotiation with others but through the opportunities offered us by the ‘otherness’ both around us, and within us (Vygotsky 1966:43 cited Ibid.:112). Finally, Bakhtin’s account of thinking processes suggests we live in a way that is responsive both to our own position and to the position of those who are ‘other than’ ourselves, in a world in which we are ‘placed’ (ibid.:121). Thus we have no essential identity or ‘internal sovereign territory’ of our own, instead we are responsive and reactive through language which is both the medium and outcome of our identity - we are always ‘other than’ ourselves.

However, this ‘internal’ boundary problem, that is internal to the formation of identity, like ‘external’ spatial boundaries analysed above is influenced by asymmetries in power realised through language use: ‘If we do try to take the words of others to make them our own, it is in their response to our usage of them that they can exert their power - for they can refuse to respond to us with understanding, refuse to accept us into their group, they can deny us the use of their words’ (ibid.:123-124). This uncertainty as to who can do what in the construction of a word’s significance is what Holquist (1983: 307) aptly calls ‘the combat zone of the world’ and is a struggle over the question of the speaker’s rights and privileges compared with those of the listener (ibid.:125). It is in these senses that racist and other abuse between young people comes to have a social significance greater than first appears because as Back (1996) argues language among and between young people is used both as a form of ethnic self identity and an identifier of the ‘other’, thus as a ‘strategic resource’ to exclude or include. The young people in the Keighley study gave much emphasis to this aspect of exclusionist practices, as a source of anxiety, uncertainty and ambivalence in inter-ethnic contact.46

Group Enmity, Outsiders and Strangers

Back’s findings ignore the possibility that group enmity between ‘established’ whites and racialised ‘newcomers’ can exist whether or not the situation is racialised, and that group enmity can arise out of the proximity of ‘strangers’ who apparently lack obvious racial or ethnic characteristics. Back underplays in his study the fact that the white groups designated ‘problem’ families and ‘newcomers’ were as subject to ‘outsider’ status as blacks and blamed for having caused decline. In other words the likelihood is that the arrival of these groups on the Riverview estate47 would have produced very similar

46 ‘For Bakhtin, the social nature of these signs makes it impossible for me to know whose side “I” am on. The “movement” of my “inner” life is motivated and structured through and through by my continual crossing of boundaries; by what happens in those zones of uncertainty where “I” (speaking in one of my “voices” from a “position” in a speech genre) am in communication with another “self” in another position with the genre, where it is at first unclear which position I should be in, that is, which side of the boundary I should be on. In this scheme of things, I come to know myself as who and what I am, in terms of how, until now, I have resolved all the “differences” that have arisen in me - the differences between me (as I have become) and what I experience as “other than” me’ (Ibid.:124).
47 These groups began arriving partly because of a change in the housing allocation policy of the Greater London Council towards its council estates, and partly because of economic restructuring and a growth in owner occupation that saw members of
kinds of perceptions, attributions and conflicts if ‘race’ had been absent. Whilst not denying the importance of racism to the subsequent development of the estates adult and youth relationships and discourse, other stigmata such as ‘newcomer’ (whether ‘foreign’ or not) or ‘problem family’ are not sufficiently considered as components of community discourse.

The problematic nature of the causal primacy and efficacy assigned to ‘race’, racism and ethnicity as sources of localism and territoriality can be illustrated by turning to a brief consideration of a study paralleling Back’s two-estate comparison but carried out within an all-white area. Elias and Scotson’s (1994) study offers both counter-example and support for the argument found here that racial violence must be placed in context with other processes of local group enmity (also see Jedrej and Nutall’s 1995 study of a non-racialised nationalism of neighbourhood in the Scottish Highlands). Elias and Scotson’s study of a suburban community revealed a division between an old-established group and a newer group of residents. The former closed ranks against the latter and stigmatised them generally as inferior (ibid.:xv). Contrary to the argument so far which posits racism as contingent and situational, these authors suggest that the type of local enmity they describe is ubiquitous and universal to groups who in terms of their power ratio are securely superior to other interdependent groups. In the case of Winston Parva - the area studied, an old established white working-class group refused to have any social contact with members of a new white working-class settlement in their neighbourhood, apart from that demanded by their occupation. They treated all newcomers as people who did not belong, as ‘outsiders’, and this exclusion ‘was kept alive by means of social control such as praise-gossip about those who observed it and the threat of blame-gossip against suspected offenders’ (ibid.:xvi).

The universality of such ‘established-outsider’ figurations is supported in the fact that there were no differences in class, ethnicity or ‘race’ between residents of the two areas studied, and that instead the key dynamic which differentiated them was belonging to established and newcomer groups. Feelings of group inferiority and contempt arise from the power ratio of one group in relation to that of another in virtue of the duration of their residence and therefore differences in their degree of internal cohesion and communal control (ibid.:xviii). This uneven balance of power is maintained through the exclusion and stigmatisation of the outsiders by the established group but that this is carried on by each of the two groups pointing to the worst aspect or sub-group of the other, ‘problem families’, ‘criminal elements’, etceteras, but usually the young:

‘An established group tends to attribute to its outsider group as a whole the “bad” characteristics of that group’s “worst” section - of its anomic minority. In contrast, the self-image of the established group tends to be modelled on its exemplary, most “nomic” or norm-setting section, on the minority of its “best” members. This par pro toto distortion in opposite directions enables an established group to prove their point to themselves as well as to others;

the original indigenous population leave the area, both compounded by white flight and ‘death of community’ discourse (Back 1996:42-43).
there is always some evidence to show that one's group is "good" and the other is "bad".

(ibid.:xix).

The dynamic aspect of this process is that as the less powerful progressively refuses to internalise the social slur which weakens and disarms them, then the balance of power changes so that former outsider groups tend to retaliate so that a power deficit is followed by a power equivalence, then at certain times and in certain situations this becomes a power surplus. Exclusionist practices primarily take the form of name-calling which can have a paralysing effect on outsider groups and may for a while, disable the ability of groups with a lower power ratio to strike back and to mobilise power resources within their reach. It may even help to perpetuate for some time the status superiority of a group whose power has decreased or disappeared. Many Asians in our study defined racism precisely as whites being able to call them names but because of the power situation between Asians and whites they felt unable to reply in kind. Elias and Scotson suggest 'Nothing is more characteristic of a highly uneven balance of power in cases such as these than the inability of outsider groups to retaliate with an equivalent stigmatising term of the established group' (ibid.: xxv). The authors argue that stigmatising abuse between outsiders and established only begins to 'bite' when the balance of power is changing, and the shift observed in the Keighley study in the perception of white youngsters towards an Asian 'right of reply' supports this.

A number of conclusions can be drawn from Elias and Scotson's analysis for this study. First, that the dynamic processes of group enmity observed in the Keighley study can occur in the absence of 'race'. Secondly, the established group's vilification against outsiders follows cognitive processes that are similar to race thinking in that there occurs 'widespread feeling among established groups that contact with members of an outsider group contaminates and refers to contamination with anomie and with dirt rolled into one' (ibid.: xxvii). Thirdly, however, majority ethnic established groups have a greater power margin at their disposal over minority outsider groups compared to majority outsider groups, and in this racialised situation the position or perceived 'threat' of the outsider group is exaggerated and compounded by their visibility and ascriptions of cultural difference. Thirdly, the most severely ostracised section of the outsider group - those who are partially outsiders within their own outsider group - are likely to be its youth, who will in a surreptitious way hit back, especially those whose tendency towards anti-social behaviour is already set:

'The children and adolescents of the despised Estate minority were shunned, rejected and 'frozen out' by their 'respectable' contemporaries from the 'village' even more firmly and cruelly than were their parents because the 'bad example' they set threatened their own

48 The obverse is that for the established to have social contact with outsiders would diminish their power surplus. The problem with this is that in respect to racial stigmatisation found in my study, it cannot be sustained in the long run because the racism of the established whites has not kept pace with legal adjustments (race equality legislation), hence the swell of counter-stigmatisation in a balance-of-power battle with slowly decreasing differentials.

49 'The vicious circle, the see-saw process, in which the old and the new neighbours, the established and the outsiders, were involved ever since they had become interdependent, showed its full force in the relations between their young people' (Ibid.: 129).
defences against the unruly urges within; and because the wilder minority of younger people felt rejected, they tried to get their own back by behaving badly with greater deliberation...They enjoyed doing the very things for which they were blamed as an act of revenge against those who blamed them' (ibid.: xxviii).

This paradox was clearly the case in the Keighley study when Asian youngsters who defended their areas against racist attacks were blamed by their parents and other ‘well behaved’ young Asians for causing trouble in the context of adult-youth interaction in which adult dominance and exclusionism towards youngsters was all to real. It was the youth of the minority ethnic outsider group in the study that were doubly excluded from both the majority established group and from their own minority outside group, and as rejected outsiders conduct a kind of ‘guerrilla warfare’ (ibid.:120). They expressed a great deal of covert hostility towards any form of authority exercised by members of the adult majority established group, but also towards adult members of the minority outside group. Such feelings are a consequence of one age cohort after another experiencing exclusion and exploitation by the majority group and disinterest and reprimand from their own parent culture. Many Asian young people in the study said that their parents blamed and punished them when they were picked on by whites, and were told not to invite trouble or get into fights, and yet their experiences of systematic abuse and attack over long periods of time by whites was ignored or misrecognized. The Local Heroes - those who fought back and defended themselves and others in their group, in the Keighley study have their counterparts in Elias and Scotson’s ‘outcast children’ who are ‘more prone to aggressiveness and in a sense they do actualise the stereotypes attributed to them’ (ibid.: xxviii).

Bauman’s (1993a:160) suggestion that the established-outsider50 ‘pair was meant to capture a kind of social figuration in which two groups are sedimented, set against each other in a continuous warfare of boundary drawing and boundary defence, yet locked together through the service each one renders to the other group’s search for identity’, is consistent with the previous argument that such groups are both interdependent and self-defining at the boundary. Meanwhile changes in the balance of power between Asian and white groups in the Keighley study can be characterised as quiescence (power differentials were very great) through to continuous conflict (the balance of power changed in favour Asians) ending with a form of conflict resolution or territorial settlement based on threatened or actual tit-for-tat actions rather than any suspension of group enmity (tentative equivalence or equilibrium of power). This does however trap both groups in a double-bind situation from which either group found it difficult to extract themselves as they become more interdependent, especially as the balance of power goes some way in favour of the outsiders (see Ibid.:xxxii). This diachronic character of established-outsider figurations involves local histories and the development of group processes of attachments over time.51

50 Of course we mean ‘established’ and ‘outsider’ as subjective locally constructed categories not ‘objective’ permanent groups.
51 ‘Once more one is reminded of the need for reconstituting the temporal character of groups and their relationships as processes in the sequence of time if one wants to understand the boundaries that people set up by distinguishing between a group of which they say “we” and another to which they refer as “they”’ (Ibid.: xlviii).
When this type of figurational analysis is applied to race or ethnic relations then what is found are established-outsider relationships of a particular type (see Ibid.: xxx) where the balance of power between groups seems to be more uneven. Yet between white working class and minority ethnic adolescents the power differential is objectively less than it seems to the established-outsider group members. It is difficult to find any difference between racial and other stigmata in Elias and Scotson’s account where the ‘physical sign serves as a tangible symbol of the assumed anomie of the other group, of its lower worth in human terms, of its intrinsic badness’, and serves to exculpate the stigmatising group from any blame because the physical stigma has an ‘objective’ quality (ibid.:xxxv). What distinguishes racialised established-outsider figurations from similar non-racialised situations is that minority ethnic groups are always likely to be the newcomers or outsider group whereas the majority ethnic group becomes only on those occasions of internal group migration from one area of the majorities jurisdiction to another. On such occasions it is more likely that outsider status will be temporary because a white outsider group will eventually be assimilated to the locality finally to become the established group itself. Besides the original initiative to exclude belongs to the established group and given the centrality of the dynamic ‘who came first’, minority ethnic groups are more or less permanent outsiders compared to contingent outsiders found within the majority white group. Nevertheless, all the features of inter-ethnic relations found throughout this literature review remain intact in Elias and Scotson’s account - social spacing, boundary drawing, cognitive mapping, territoriality, and so on - except that they remind us that the processes described are not unique to ethnic situations, even though the consequences and risks are qualitatively greater and considerably less negotiable for such groups.

The view that minority ethnic groups are likely to be permanent outsiders can be taken further by considering the metaphor of ‘strangers’ and the enmity and ‘ambivalence’ that is said to occur as a result of encounters where ‘There are friends and enemies. And there are strangers’ (Bauman 1993b:53). The ‘friends and enemies’ couplet describes intra-ethnic situations of group enmity whereas the ‘stranger’ position describes inter-ethnic group enmity. Intra-ethnic conflict between friends and enemies which stand in a relationship of opposition to each other, differs from inter-ethnic conflict where the ‘other’ as stranger does not fit within this opposition, because the stranger is neither friend nor enemy. The friends/enemies opposition dispels ambivalence whereas the relationship of the stranger is most likely to provoke ambivalence which is experienced as more threatening. Ambivalence is then

52 Essentially they argue that racism is an effect not a cause of established-outsider configurations: that approaches to established-outsider relationships with ‘racial’ connotations treat them as a here-and-now problem of racism rather than as the product of a long-term group process. Therefore ‘In discussing “racial” problems one is apt to put the cart before the horse’ (Ibid.: xlvi).

53 Stephen Mennell (1989: 122) argues that the stigmatised outsiders are always seen as dirty, morally unreliable, lazy, sly, untrustworthy and criminal.

54 Elsewhere Bauman (1993a), drawing on Claud Levi-Strauss’ A World on the Wane, distinguishes two strategies of controlling social space which operate in unison - the phagic/inclusivist and emic/exclusivist. The first ‘assimilates’ the strangers to the neighbours, the second merges them with the aliens. Together, they polarise the strangers and posit an ‘either/or’: conform or be damned, be like us or do not overstay your visit, play the game by our rules, or be prepared to be kicked out from the game altogether (Ibid.: 163). I would argue that racial or ethnic groups are ‘spaced’ using the emic strategy: they are ‘assimilated’ by a metaphoric expulsion, i.e. merged with ‘the aliens’ and become a permanent ‘them’ except perhaps in situations described by Back’s somewhat optimistic study.
reduced through territorial and functional separation in which the parties operate in completely different spheres of activity, and it is the ethnic stranger not the enemy who becomes allocated this position leading to the kinds of segregation and boundary-drawing efforts discussed earlier. This is because he came after everything else, and his coming violates an important boundary of natural existence and the natural order - what and who came first, and thus must be resolutely resisted because he is a constant threat (ibid.:59). Thus the stranger, in refusing to go away disturbs ‘the resonance between physical and psychical distance: he is physically close whilst remaining spiritually remote’ (ibid.:60). The stranger in relation to a particular community or locality as he makes it his home territory, challenges the simple semantic and behavioural dichotomies operated matter-of-fact by community members (ibid.:63), in ways that make it likely that he/she will remain in the outsider group.55 This brilliant analysis suggests that ethnic minority group enmity is of a qualitatively different order to majority group enmity.

Elsewhere, Bauman (1991:62-82) suggests that racism differs from both heterophobia and contestant enmity in important respects. Heterophobia, or fear of difference, is a phenomenon of unease, anxiety, discomfort and a sense of loss of control when confronted by the unknown; contestant enmity, is a form of antagonism and hatred generated by the social practices of identity-seeking and boundary-drawing, where the contestants dramatically separate, or keep a required distance from one another. Racism, however, differs from these by not admitting any possibility for a certain group of human beings to become part of the rational order, and racism demands territorial exclusion or in some cases extermination. Bauman refutes that these three phenomena are closely related and argues against understanding racism as a particularly intense variety of inter-group resentment or prejudice, by reference to biological attributes which, unlike the non-racist variants of group animosity, it normally contains. This tendency to extend the notion of racism so as to embrace all varieties of resentment and group prejudice denies what is radically novel about racism which is the demand, if conditions allow, that the offending category be expelled from the territory occupied by the group it offends, and failing this, that it be physically exterminated (ibid.: 65-66). This somewhat extreme view of what constitutes ‘racism’ nevertheless points to, as other perspectives reviewed here have, the care that needs to be taken in discovering the context of allegedly ‘racial’ violence and abuse, and avoiding blanket appraisals of behaviour as racist or racial.

**Operationalising the Criminology of Place to Understand Racial Violence**

Criminological understanding of racism shares the analytical weaknesses of the conventional general view from the structural sociology of race that racism is the domination of black people by white people and that the criminal justice system is likely to reflect societal racism. Criminological research efforts

---

55 Bauman does not hold out much hope of assimilation: "The best he can be is a former stranger, "a friend on approval" and permanently on trial, a person vigilantly watched and constantly under pressure to be someone else than he is, told to be ashamed of his guilt of not being what he ought to be." (1991a:72).
focus on establishing and measuring racial disparity and discrimination in the criminal process. Attempts to examine black victimisation and racial violence tend to treat these phenomena as criminal events rather than complex social and cultural processes. However environmental criminology, which has its origins in the Chicago tradition and small area studies, holds an altogether more promising view that a spatial understanding of human behaviour offers insight about the patterning and meaning of criminal events. This tradition (Evans 1992; Evans 1995; Bottoms and Wiles 1992; Wikstrom 1991; Giddens 1984; Suttles 1967; Brantingham and Brantingham 1991) emphasises the unintended consequences of action and processes of change in looking at variation in crime and victimisation (offence and victim rate) in the urban environment. Brantingham and Brantingham (1991:2) for example, argue 'that criminal events must be understood as confluences of offenders, victims or criminal targets', and 'Concentration on the role of location and movement of position and juxtaposition in criminal events' means that 'Criminal events can be understood in the context of people's normal movement through normal settings in the course of everyday life', in which it is important to distinguish area offender rates and area offence rates (see Bottoms and Wiles 1986: 158-60), as well as the importance of housing effects on crime rates. In these ways the criminology of place compliments the previous theoretical discussion of the geography of racisms by focusing on spatial behaviour rather than meaning. Bottoms (1994) has characterised the 'urban' in a general sense as about identity, place, localism and everyday life, and points to the necessity to address geography and social-cultural theory in theorizing the local. The relationship of theory to the sociology of crime can be found in relationships of crime and place, which demonstrates that crime and criminality are geographically skewed, that is they have an uneven spatial distribution in place and space.

Offending and victimisation occurs near the places where offenders and victims spend most of their time and along the major pathways in between, which points to the importance of daily activity and common recreational patterns to understanding crime and victimisation. This is particularly likely to be the case among young people who perpetrate or are victimised by racial violence. The types of activities young people pursue in their leisure time strongly affect the rates and types of criminal victimization they suffer, but this may not necessarily be the case because wider local and socio-spatial processes have to be taken into account. Nevertheless according to Brantingham and Brantingham (1991:3) perpetrators of crime perceive and target their victims spatially 'through structured search and decision processes on the part of offenders (and victims) shaped by perceptions of environmental cues that separate good criminal opportunities from bad criminal risks.' At the same time that a racialised 'ecological label' can affect who might travel to a neighbourhood looking for criminal opportunities, fear of crime in a neighbourhood may be similarly wedded to ecological labels rather than actual crime rates (ibid.:4). For example in the Keighley study access to refuges and safe places in different areas

---

56 Criminology sets out to establish the extent to which racism exists in the courts, the police, prisons, etcetera, not to examine the nature and character of racism. See for example Fitzgerald (1993); Gelsthorpe (ed.) (1993); Lea and Young (1993); Smith (1994); Waters (1990); Wilbanks (1987). An interesting exception to this conceptual naivety is Fitzgerald's discussion in Cook and Hudson (eds.) (1993). In general, Criminology tends to describe rather than explain the apparent extraordinary association of
affected the ecological labels ascribed to areas by Asian and white young people so that the more public their visibility in ‘other colour’ neighbourhoods the more they were led to define such areas as ‘areas to be avoided’ or ‘no-go areas’.  

This geographical understanding of criminal events when applied to racial violence, and where territoriality and localism have important effects on local crime and victim rates, ‘asks the individual to recognize the role of space and place in his own biography, to relate the spaces he sees around him, and to recognize how transactions between individuals and between organizations are affected by the space that separates them’ (Harvey 1974, cited in Brantingham and Brantingham 1991:20). Brown and Altman (1991:55) link territoriality and residential crime to Newman’s (1972) architectural theory of urban ‘defensible space’ which involves a ‘clear articulation of boundaries between totally public and totally private spaces. Such design qualities, in turn, promote residents feelings of territorial control and capability of surveillance of spaces in their residential environment’. Perpetrators in trying to select appropriate targets, seek environmental, behavioural information and qualities of an area in order to arrive at decisions regarding the territorial nature of an area (ibid.:56). They are involved in a ‘boundary regulation process’ of regulating self/other boundaries, and that territoriality is one of several mechanisms used to facilitate privacy control. ‘Privacy’ is here understood as ‘the selective control of access to the self’ (ibid.:56). The meaningful and symbolic aspects of boundary formation intrinsic to the formation of ethnic identities is here found in relation to the behavioural aspects of territoriality: ‘territoriality as one of a variety of behavioural mechanisms that operate in the service of boundary control’ (ibid.:58). Perpetrators (of crime) are involved in an assessment process ‘about the permeability/openness/accessibility of various boundaries in the residential environment’ (ibid.:58), and territorial practices by residents and others are reflections of boundary permeability and accessibility, in relation to the problem of territorial intrusion within a notion of privacy. Territoriality and boundary drawing is about ownership and the defence of ‘property’ when territorial boundaries are violated (Altman 1975:107, cited Ibid.:58-59).

The primacy that young people give to public rather than private space involves making distinctions about the temporal duration of ‘ownership’ and shifting importance of different public spaces. In the study this prioritisation of space designated the town centre as ‘public’ territory, local parks as secondary territory and white and Asian areas as primary territory. These designations follow Brown and Altman’s (1991:59-60) classification whereby primary territories are typically occupied for long periods and are central to lives of their owners; secondary territories are more accessible to a greater

---

57 Brantingham and Brantingham (1991:17) review some of the problems of the approach: the theory sometimes implies that criminal residence and crime location are identical; data on criminal residence leads to questions about motivation, which cannot be answered by ecological data; the assumption that the descriptive characteristics of areas having high proportions of offenders resident identified both areas where crime control programs should be undertaken, and the individuals who were likely to commit crimes. This assumption, called the ecological fallacy (implicit in work of Shaw and McKay 1969, for example) is not warranted, i.e. area variable, factors and correlates do not explain individual factors/behaviour which can have many different causes.

58 Here ‘space’ is understood not as absolute (physical distance) but as relative space in which social relationships are primarily
range of users, but regular users/occupants exert some control over who may enter a territory and what range of behaviours may take place - the amount of time spent there is usually more limited than in primary territories, and these territories are less central to their occupants; public territories are usually occupied for short times and are typically not very central to the lives of their occupants - they operate on a 'first come, first serve' basis. The most intense contestation occurs in proximity to secondary territories as they are at the boundary between primary 'home' territory and public 'neutral' territory. They are potentially most susceptible to misinterpretation of ownership and can easily generate conflict because of their ambiguous mix of public and private use, and they may more readily foster the intrusion of others, unlike primary territories. Public territories, on the other hand, are least likely to see conflict. The intensity of interethic fighting and the locational prevalence of racial violence in the study was consistent with this prioritising of the importance of different public spaces among young people. The reaction of 'owners' to invasion or intrusion is greatest in relation to primary territory: 'The impact of an invasion on occupants and the range and effectiveness of their defensive reactions increase as the territory becomes less public and more primary...[therefore] owners of primary territories in our culture may assume that any intrusion is more or less intentional, and it is quite legitimate to counter intrusion of primary territories by rather vigorous means, including physical retaliation' (ibid.:63). Visible markers, whether physical, symbolic or cultural, are crucial in delineating the seriousness of intrusion, and determining the reaction that an intruder might expect, as well as determining the status of territory as primary, secondary or public. The extent of boundary accessibility and intrusion that is possible by say, perpetrators of racial violence, are sought through indicators which are actual and symbolic cues such as their detectability, the traces they may leave and the social climate of the area. Perpetrators are also influenced by external factors such as the potential pay-off of an attack, and environmental factors such as time, season and foliage.59

The criminology of place is operationalised in the study by discovery of who commits racial violence (offender-based theory), and where and why racial violence is committed (offence-based theory), by looking at offender rates and high offender rate areas, and the direct and indirect consequences of local factors in these patterns. Initially, offence locations and offender/victim residence are addressed through patterns uncovered in official regional and local 'racial incident' statistics, then through the local victim and self-report survey which reveals offence and offender rates. Area offence rate (all offences committed in an area) and area victimization rate (all offences committed against a defined population, wherever these offences were committed) is used as an empirical basis to begin to explain offence and offender locations. Opportunity theory and routine activities theory attempts to explain the location of offences, that is the relationship of the place of the offence to the offenders habitual use of space. However this approach is supplemented by explanations found in community or area influence on criminal motivation.

located, and where relative space is measured by perceptual and subjective, not physical metrics (Ibid.:20). See Ch. 3.

59 I concur with Wood (1991) in emphasising the importance of space and time in this type of decision making in the construction of defensible space.
The status of the Keighley study area as a ‘hot spot’ of racial violence raised the question whether places as distinct from neighbourhoods or social groups are criminogenic, and whether the unit of analysis is place rather than the motivated offender or group. That is, the idea that crime reduction is about ‘changing places, not people’ (Sherman et al 1989:47). Sherman et al (ibid.:27), employing spatial level data to test Cohen and Felson’s (1979) ‘routine activities’ ecological theory of crime argue that criminal events result from likely offenders, suitable targets, and the absence of capable guardians against crime converging non randomly in time and space. Routine activities theory proposes that crime rates are affected not only by the absolute size of the supply of offenders, targets, or guardianship, but also by the factors influencing the frequency of their convergence in space and time, or the ‘space-time concepts of (1) rhythm, the regular periodicity with which events occur; (2) tempo, the number of events per unit of time, “such as the number of violations per day on a given street” (Cohen and Felson, 1979: 590); and (3) timing, the coordination of different interdependent activities, “such as the coordination of an offender’s rhythms with those of a victim” (Cohen and Felson, 1979: 590) - presumably, again, at a specific place’ (ibid.:31). Significantly, Sherman et al define ‘place’ geographically as ‘a fixed physical environment that can be seen completely and simultaneously, at least on its surface, by one’s naked eyes’ (ibid.:31). The authors reject Cohen and Felson’s original (1979) analysis which emphasised individual life-styles as the primary aspect of routine activities affecting crime, implying the inevitability of higher crime with a more mobile life-style (see Hindelang et al., 1978). Instead they focus on the routine activities of places rather than life-styles which means that crime prevention on a place-specific basis, can make targets less suitable, guardianship may be increased, and the supply of potential offenders may be reduced. Part of the explanation for the reduction in racial violence found in the locality studied will draw on this approach as well as adopting Wikstrom’s (1990:23) routine activities theory, and opportunity theory. According to this approach the reasons for inter-area variation in offender rates and offence rates are found in the type of activities being pursued and the social composition of the people in the district at any one time. These in turn are assumed to be related to: firstly, the availability of suitable criminal targets, the presence of motivated offenders and the presence of direct social control (capable guardians); secondly, the occurrence of encounters (environments) liable to provoke friction in the local and public order.

This approach is combined with the idea that, following Giddens (1984:xxv), localities ‘are not just places but settings of interaction, the settings of interaction in turn being essential to specifying its contextuality’ and are a ‘physical region involved as part of the setting of interaction, having definite

60 Sherman argues that people and space should be disaggregated so as to analyse within-city variation across smaller areas whether or not they are theoretically defined, or empirically correspond to local communities or ethnic areas (see Reiss, 1986: 26), to render more detailed information (Ibid.:29).

61 The theory thus integrates several different vast bodies of literature: the factors affecting the supply of ‘motivated’ offenders (e.g., Wilson and Herrnstein, 1985), the opportunity perspective on the supply of stealable property (e.g., Gould, 1969), the life-style perspective on the supply of persons vulnerable to victimization (Hindelang et al., 1978; Miethe et al., 1987), the policy research on physical ‘target-hardening’ (e.g., Jeffrey, 1971), and the literature on the deterrent threat of official and unofficial policing (e.g., Sherman, 1986) implied in the concept of guardianship (see Sherman Ibid.:30 for the discussion).
boundaries which help concentrate interaction in one way or another' (ibid.:375). Routine activities pays too little attention to the perceptions, routine activities, and the decisions of individual actors, and therefore misses the important distinction between the intended and unintended consequences of individual action. Indeed it is the actors' conceptions of the locality which are critical. This thesis argues that it is actors perceptions of their locale and the scope this gives for unintended consequences of action, and the evolution/change of particular micro-level locations towards or away from being 'hot spots' of crime, that are so important. Relations and mutual perceptions between perpetrators and victims are crucial to understanding racial violence so as to 'encompass the notion that a neighbourhood's crime pattern is the summation of the consequences, whether intended or not, of the way a multitude of actors interact (which is itself linked to their practical consciousness of locale) in an historical process' (Evans 1992:25).62 This dynamic aspect of the criminology of place is captured by some authors in the concept of 'community crime career'. Communities change in their prevalence of crime expressed as changes in offender, offence and victimisation rates, and thus there are community crime careers (Reiss 1986, Bottoms 1986, 1992a, 1992b; Bottoms and Wiles 1992a). This thesis explores the changing community crime career of one locality over a six year period.

Summary and Discussion

Mainstream theories and definitions of racism were found to be inoperable in the context of the studies empirical findings. Although a lot of young people referred to racism in terms of colour others deployed cultural and religious categories to define themselves as victims or target others with little or no allusion to colour or descent. The question then was whether because victim groups are treated like a different race and alluded to in race-like ways, they can be considered the victims of 'racism', or whether 'We can have “racism” without “race’” (Cohen 1994:194). An 'aggregation procedure' typical of the mainstream sociology of racism which stretches ‘racism’ to cover virtually all exclusionary discourses and practices is problematic in ways that transcend the issue of definition. It was concluded therefore that there cannot be generic definitions or monolithic concepts of racism, and that the existence of racism cannot be decided in advance of empirical inquiry in specific contexts where racism may coexist with other exclusionary practices.

A provisional theory of adolescent racism called on different disciplinary and theoretical traditions including the following: urban anthropology (Barth 1989; Suttles 1967; Wallman 1978a, 1978b, 1979, 1983); territoriality and power (Hesse 1992; Smith 1989; Sibley 1995); localism and spatiality (Callaghan 1992; Jenkins 1983); cultural geography (Keith and Pile 1994; Hesse 1993a, 1993b; Jackson 1989); nationalism (Cohen 1993; Back 1996; Anderson 1983; Billig 1995; Holmes 1988); group enmity (Bauman 1991, 1993a, 1993b, 1995; Balint 1987; Elias and Scotson 1994); and a situational model of

62 Implicit in routine activities theory is Giddens' notion of time-space paths (Giddens 1984: 110-119; 132-139).
racism (Back 1993, 1996; Solomos and Back 1996). The logic of the argument was that first, through processes of social interaction actors cognitively map their locality in terms where they can go safely and where they must avoid danger and conflict. These perceptual maps operate as ecological labels that can become self-fulfilling prophecies so that actors become entrenched in their own neighbourhoods which are to be defended from incursions by ‘others’ who are perceived to be a (real or imagined) threat. This defence of locality encourages the drawing of boundaries around a given ‘territory’ and also functions informally to control actors within defended neighbourhoods as well as to ward off potential conflict from outside. Although adults share these perceptions it is the young who because of their closer proximity and use of public space defend territories and police boundaries. Territoriality as a solution to the problem of security and danger in urban neighbourhoods becomes heightened and reinforced when presumed ‘outsiders’ are racialised. In this context social interaction becomes saturated with ‘distancing vocabularies’ and gesturing devices the purpose of which is to ascertain with whom it is safe to associate. Secondly, these interactions nearly always involve relationships of (real or imagined) relative power of one group or neighbourhood to another which determines the capacity of these groups to exclude or include actors. This power relationship is amplified in ethnicised or racialised situations where forms of racial violence can be the preferred _modus operandi_ of defending and extending territory and drawing symbolic boundaries. Once territories are established and boundaries drawn however, the two ‘sides’ of the boundary that defines for each group ‘us’ and ‘them’, interact in various ways and it is this social activity at the boundary of their meeting which is most important in forming a racialised group identity. Inter-ethnic fighting as the purest expression of boundary contact becomes one of the means by which identity is formed and gains significance.

Thirdly, configurations of territories and boundaries change and are dynamic in that for example a vilified excluded or out-group can retaliate against exclusionary criteria ascribed it by the in-group by crossing boundaries, but this may serve to further exaggerate the out-group’s imputed threat to the in-group thus reinforcing boundaries. Fourthly, these spatial processes are expressed through and find their rationalisation in various ‘imagined’ community discourses such as ‘white flight’ (whites leaving the area) and ideologies of localism based on a myth of origin, and neighbourhood nationalism. Imagery of ‘home’ and ‘home territory’ found in young people’s repertoires of safety and security come to serve as a metaphor for a fundamental relationship between space and security in the lives of young people, whilst offering the thrill and danger which accompanies the transgressive possibilities of ‘going out’ and ‘leaving’ safe territory. These _heroic_ and yet seriously dangerous adventures into ‘alien’ territory embarked upon by some young people in the study, it is argued, began to change local perceptions of racial violence as these ventures entered the racialised local lore of youth victimisation and retaliation. Fifthly, processes of territoriality, boundary drawing and neighbourhood nationalism go on whether or not ‘race’ or ‘ethnicity’ is present in the situation, that is, they are an ubiquitous feature of situations in which ‘established’ and ‘outsider’ groups form, although these group figurations are processual, dynamic and changing rather than an ontological feature of human group interaction. Their occurrence and strength depends on local conditions but group enmity in situations where there are established and
newcomer groups is highly probable even when race is absent. Minority ethnic groups, however, unlike newcomer groups belonging to the ethnic majority are much more likely to be perceived as permanent newcomers or outsiders because of their status as 'strangers' rather than enemies. They produce such anxiety and ambivalence among some established groups that they are unassimilable, but they do however change local cultures on their own terms, and eventually the wider culture is transformed also.

In emphasising the importance of territoriality and boundary processes in the generation and maintenance of ‘racist’ and other forms of exclusionary practices, racism and contestant enmity were found to be inseparable in accounting for the behaviour uncovered in the study. Territoriality, social distancing and boundary drawing find their articulation through local community discourses about who belongs and who are outsiders, and it is these processes and discourses that give rise to adolescent racism and racial violence. This racialisation of space and spatialisation of race seems particularly marked among young people who share an ideology of localism or pride of place, and who by virtue of their particular relationship to public space, are the main carriers of this exclusionist ideology and its main practical exponents. The logic of the situation however, produces retaliation by the minority ethnic ‘outsider’ group against their stigmatisation and vilification by the majority ethnic ‘established’ group. The empirical case study presented here documents the ways in which the dilemma of establishing community safety was resolved in one locality among groups of white and Asian young people in ways that had unintended consequences for community safety.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY: A SCIENTIFIC REALIST APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF RACIAL VIOLENCE

The Methods Chosen for the Study

In choosing multiple methods it was hoped through triangulation of the different data sets to overcome, with mutual support of theory and data (Pawson 1989:167), the limitations found in previous studies of racial violence. Bowling’s (1993a:244-255) reflections on the way forward in studying racial victimization points to the lack of a longer time frame and lack of contextualisation in understanding and responding to victim’s experiences by statutory agencies and the criminal justice system. That agencies and violence prevention programmes are disabled in their responses when they do not understand the meaning of the ‘event’ (racial victimization) nor the implications for the rest of the communities affected. All the research indicates major dissatisfactions of victims and victim communities with criminal justice and other agencies in that they look only at the incident, not its history and setting (Genn 1988; Shapland et al. 1985). Bowling goes on to argue that agency and other responses to the problem must, if they are to be effective, tackle the underlying processes as well as responding to the reported incidents to which these processes give rise (ibid.:244). In order to develop such a response ‘qualitative as well as quantitative research methods are required to procure a holistic analysis’ (ibid.:244), and in particular that the research should chart the relationships between victim, offender, and local agencies.

The four methods chosen - cohort study, agency evaluation, crime survey and follow up study - were devised so as to offer this type of holistic analysis that would be dynamic in accounting for change and capturing all the moments in the victimisation process, and contextual in setting this process in the local geographical, social, historical and community context. Crucially, it was felt that an understanding of the victimisation process alone could not capture the dynamic and contextual nature of racial violence without equal attention being given to the perpetration process and relationships between perpetration and victimisation. In devising methods that could capture context, history and process, the study was also interested in causality, that is an overall conclusion or set of ‘results’ as to why racial violence occurred and changed in the way it did in the locality studied. The cohort study and the follow up study complimented each other and were meant to trace processes and relationships between perpetrators and victims over time to see whether and how these relationships changed both for individuals as they got older, and in terms of community change or how generally race relations in the locality changed. The cohort study allowed observation and recording of the events involved in the commissioning of racial violence, its immediate aftermath, and long term consequences for those involved; the follow up study allowed a follow through of the cohort and survey data in the sense of providing a ‘control’ on the process data from the cohort, confirming or falsifying the hypotheses found in this data, and in the
survey. Young people in the follow up had not been involved in the cohort, the survey or the evaluation. The follow up also allowed a comparison at a certain point in time with what cohort members had told the study in the previous five years; the survey enabled a statistical profile of crime and victimisation within the general youth population living in the locality to be built up in terms of the relevances and concerns expressed by cohort members - what was discovered among them helped inform the survey design - and survey findings were then tested against both the cohort and follow up qualitative data; finally, by charting the moments at which the youth work project intervened in the processes of victimisation and perpetration of racial violence, agencies impact and effectiveness could be assessed over a longer period than is usual and in relationship to the community context in which the project was inserted. The multi-faceted account of the expression and experience of violence found in the range of data was also expected to identify multiple sites for intervention and to see whether and to what extent the intervention project covered the range of possibility of racial violence among the young people it targeted and across the community in which it intervened.

The Research Design

The study combines a case study approach with what Harre (1979) calls 'intensive research designs' which contains a specific conception of social groups appropriate to the research context. According to Yin (1994:13), 'a case study is an empirical inquiry that: investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context: when the boundaries of the context are not really evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used'. They are particularly useful in countering the limitations of experimental and survey approaches, characteristic of studies of crime and crime prevention programmes, which cannot alone investigate context or all the variables associated with a phenomena. Instead, the case study as a research strategy comprises an 'all-encompassing method' and 'comprehensive research strategy' incorporating contingent or specific approaches to data collection and analysis because 'there will be many more variables of interest than data points' and these multiple sources of evidence will need 'to converge in a triangulated fashion' (ibid.:13). Triangulation means comparing and contrasting one data set with another to see if they 'fit' and to achieve a holistic account of the phenomena in terms of context, history and process. Case study compliments intensive rather than extensive research where the latter focuses on taxonomic groups, that is groups whose members share similar (formal) attributes such as ethnicity, but which need not actually connect or interact with one another. For experimental and survey approaches individual members of these groups are only of interest in so far as they represent the population as a whole. In contrast, intensive research focuses mainly (though not exclusively) on groups whose members may be either similar or different but which actually relate to each other structurally or causally. Specific, identifiable individuals are of interest in terms of their properties and their mode of connection to others. Instead of relying upon the ambiguous evidence of aggregate formal relations among taxonomic classes, causality is analysed by examining
actual connections between individuals and groups.63 Sayer (1992:244) describes intensive research designs in the following way:

‘In extensive studies, the criteria by which samples are drawn have to be decided in advance and adhered to consistently in order to ensure representativeness. In intensive studies the individuals need not be typical and they may be selected one by one as the research proceeds and as an understanding of the membership of a causal group is built up. In other words, it is possible - though not mandatory! - for intensive research to be exploratory in a strong sense. Instead of specifying the entire research design and who and what we are going to study in advance we can, to a certain extent, establish this as we go along, as learning about one object or from one contact leads to others with whom they are linked, so that we build up a picture of the structures and causal groups of which they are part’.

As well as a case study approach, an intensive research design was chosen so as to have much better chance of learning from specific victim and perpetrator groups of young people what the different significance of circumstances were for them.64 The survey part of the design was devised with the intensive case study approach in mind in that the sampling frame was generated from groups and sampling sites more likely to procure victims and perpetrators than the usual random sampling of a 'generalisable' age group, although the usual problems in determining causality remained because actual connections and interactions between survey respondents (which individuals or groups did what to whom and when) cannot be identified when aggregated. Nevertheless because of the intensive nature of the design the survey sought to interview particular groups (e.g. the survey included a booster sample of Asians) across as wide a range of sampling sites as possible, as representative of the range of young people as possible. These issues are discussed below.

**Mainstream Methodological Approaches**

Mainstream approaches to the study of racial violence, and indeed other forms of 'crime', are problematic if they do not address process, history and context, and are unable to decide on the question of what caused the racial violence. Another kind of question however, is likely to arise of why it isn’t enough simply to mention some criticisms of empiricism and then get on with the ‘real’ job of describing how the ‘empirical’ study was carried out. The basic reason is that the type of empirical inquiry conducted here plies a path between or amongst empiricist and subjectivist, quantitative and qualitative, survey/experimental and ethnographic approaches - between approaches that emphasise the importance of behaviour and those that emphasise meaning, whilst at the same time addressing

---

63 Note that the extensive/intensive distinction is not identical to the more familiar distinction between survey analysis and ethnography. Intensive research need not always use ethnographic methods to establish the nature of causal groups and surveys need not be devoid of attempts to understand the social construction of meaning (see Sayer 1992:244).
64 See Marsh et al (1978:20-21) for an intensive realist approach to the study of adolescent violence where fighting is shown to be rule governed rather than ‘mindless’ behaviour.
causality. The basic problem is neither approach seems capable of discovering the causes of the behaviour or meaning uncovered in inquiry in an integrated way. As will become clear what is required instead is a third, scientific realist approach elaborated below, not because the study is method-driven, but from the point of view of providing an adequate explanation and resolution of series of practical problems found in interpreting and analysing the empirical data on racial violence.

First, the practical issue of discovering that 'doing' empirical research into racial violence and harassment was extremely problematic, especially when it is part of the research design to ask victims and perpetrators about not only their behaviour, but their reasons for this behaviour as well. The problem faced was immediately one of the meaning and context of what they told the study, because to invite young people to talk about experiences and what they meant risks inciting a received discourse about racism embellished and influenced by either informal sources such as family members, local lore and peers, or official sources such as schools, the media and youth clubs. Questions about racialised 'attitudes' and 'behaviour' may have resulted in the research/interview effect of encouraging young people to construct racisms and racialist behaviours in ways so that they provided exaggerations, distortions, justifications, rationalisations and neutralisations of their behaviour. The problem is that young people are already knowledgeable about 'racism' and that racialist behaviour is 'wrong' (in a stronger way for example, than young people perceive delinquent behaviour to be 'wrong'), and that this is likely to 'colour' what they will say to a research study. An alternative but practically impossible approach would have been to observe them in their naturalistic setting. Secondly, the issue of causality, for the study was interested in why violence occurred in the way it did in the locality studied and why its pattern and prevalence had changed. Finally, part of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of a crime prevention programme aimed at reducing racial violence which compounded the problems of meaning, contextuality and causality. Because satisfactory discussion or solutions to these methodological problems were absent from the literature on racial violence, although in some cases there was an awareness of the problems, and because this study breaks new ground in a number of areas in the study of racial violence, then there was a requirement to search the extant methodological literature which addresses and interrelates these problems. The realist philosophy of (social) science was found to offer programmatic rather than abstract solutions to these problems - problems central to the study - so that the decision to explore realist philosophy was not arbitrary but necessary.

Problems with the Survey Method

Before going on to the realist critique of method, problems conventionally associated with the survey approach will be outlined. Data collected by the police about 'racial incidents' represent offences that come to their attention and show the patterning of recorded crime and criminal convictions over time but do not include offences which are never reported or detected. Official statistics, then, are a product of decision-making processes within the police and the criminal justice system. They comprise only a small proportion of all offences and may not accurately reflect their pattern and tend to count one-off
incidents. Victimisation surveys provide fuller estimates of both victims’ experiences and of other people's offending but tell us little about the characteristics of offenders and their background. Further they do not identify a range of offences where there are no obvious victims or victims cannot easily identify perpetrators, such as damage to property, carrying weapons and the use and sale of controlled drugs (Bowling et al 1994). Surveys of self-reported offending - that which respondents will admit to in an interview - are able to disclose offences both detected and undetected, irrespective of whether there is an identifiable victim. They avoid some of the biases in official data that result from selection and processing by the police and criminal justice system (Bowling et al 1994; Hindelang et al 1981:13-21). The self-report method, whether used to illuminate victim or perpetrator experiences, relies on the memory and honesty of respondents to measure deviant behaviour and will therefore be subject to its own biases. For example, Anderson et al (1994) has pointed to the ways in which young people deploy 'cautionary tales' that may exaggerate, embellish or distort their experiences of crime as a way of coping with crime. However, extensive research that has checked the reliability and validity of the self-report method suggests that it has quite high levels of accuracy as a baseline measure of the extent and distribution of criminal and victimising acts, and as a means of investigating the characteristics of offenders and victims (Junger-Tas et al 1994; Hindelang et al 1981). Although the self-report method has validity as a means of measuring delinquency, it has a number of limitations (for details of these see Rutter and Giller 1983; Junger 1989; Bowling 1990; Mayhew and Elliot 1990; Junger-Tas 1994; Bowling et al 1994; Junger-Tas and Terlouw 1992; Haen-Marshall and Webb 1992). However, the Keighley studies cohort and follow up studies should be seen as an important device for contextualising the survey data and can serve to check the efficacy of self-report data in discovery of what a particular population meant when they reported victim and perpetrator experiences. A brief consideration of the limitations of the self-report method includes first, the extent to which respondents conceal or exaggerate offending. Their reluctance or enthusiasm to report is very difficult to test fully. The evidence suggests that largely as a result of concealment, self-report studies generally tend to underestimate levels of both trivial and serious offences. Secondly, those individuals for whom self-reports are not obtained, either because of non-response or exclusion from the sampling frame - are more likely to be those who are engaged in serious or frequent offending or are most at risk of offending. Indeed it is possible that those samples that are most statistically representative of the age group - random samples are particularly prone to this problem of exclusion.65

65 '...random sampling does not ensure that one will achieve a representative sample. Some marginalized groups of juveniles, such as school drop-outs, unemployed youths, ethnic minority juveniles and institutionalized youths, are usually underrepresented. These youths are generally hard to reach, and even when one succeeds in getting in touch with them they do not want to participate in such a study. Since one may anticipate that delinquency levels among these groups are higher than among the average respondents, this sampling method may also lead to an underestimation of the extent of delinquency in the youth population'. (Junger-Tas 1994:4) The survey followed Junger-Tas’ suggested solutions, firstly, to combine a random sample with a stratified sample to, for example, maximise variance on delinquency; secondly, to draw a random sample and add specific groups of young people, such as youth training centre trainees, regular visitors to special youth clubs, or ethnic minority young people living in specific neighbourhoods. These sampling methods generated more ‘high risk’ juveniles, known to have higher delinquency rates than average, than one would expect to find in a purely random sample, and included a booster sample of young Asians.
Victim surveys that use the self-report method, although sharing some of the problems found in self-report offending surveys, also present slightly different problems, particularly when aimed at young people, and designed to reveal racial violence. Although they give a more accurate picture of levels of victimisation than the ‘official’ statistics, there are specific problems in using this technique to study young people that do not apply to the same extent when the method is used with adults. So as to elicit meaningful responses about experiences of victimisation (and offending), the survey must use concepts describing these experiences that are meaningful to respondents. This is particularly important where victims’ meanings are not the same as legal categories normally used to compare self-report findings with police statistics. For example, ‘harassment’ and ‘racial motive’ do not exist in law. The problem of comprehension especially with some groups of young people, is compounded when questionnaires are complicated and long - a charge that may well apply to the Keighley survey, although there were high levels of co-operation from respondents in interviews lasting an average of forty minutes. The problem of inaccuracy of recall found in all self-report methods is heightened when asking respondents about experiences of victimisation. Not only do respondents fail to remember everything that has happened to them or forget an incident because they perceive it to be trivial, or because it had no lasting impact upon them, but as victims it might have had such a traumatic effect that, consciously or unconsciously, it is suppressed. Inaccuracy of recall in relation to the timing of an event is countered by a ‘bounded’ reference period - whether it happened in the year immediately preceding the survey, but younger people tend to ‘telescope’ forwards and report incidents - particularly serious ones - that happened longer ago (see Bowling et al 1994; Anderson et al 1990).

Problems with the Experimental Method

Conventional or mainstream criminology (see for example Bennett 1991; Smith 1972) claims that reliable and valid evaluation of crime prevention effects associated with the actions of projects or intervention programmes requires a systematic approach based on experimental control. This approach to measuring the effectiveness of crime prevention or reduction projects like Youthlink usually follow a methodological strategy of the ‘before and after’ model. This model was felt to be inappropriate for a number of important theoretical, methodological and technical reasons discussed below. There are also ethical grounds on which such an approach is rejected in that to monitor and observe a comparison group left alone to offend and racially harass would be negligent. What is important, however, is the issue of possibly discovering that the project had produced certain outcomes among its target groups, but then not knowing how these outcomes had been arrived at during the project’s work. The evaluation

66 In fact this was the approach suggested to me at the outset of the evaluation by the Home Office funders in the Research and Planning Unit.
67 Crudely expressed, this involves matching the social characteristics (socio-demographic, offending behaviour, etc.) found in the group or groups targeted by an intervention project, with a group displaying the same or similar social and behavioural characteristics that have not been targeted. The two groups or sets of groups are matched and behavioural characteristics are measured before the project intervenes and attempts to alter the behaviour of its target group. After the project has intervened, the target group is again compared with the group that had been left alone to see if there have been any changes in behaviour in one group and not the other. If there have been changes in the target group compared to the group that was not targeted, then
would be ignorant of the specific conditions and circumstances - contexts and mechanisms - under which these changes had occurred. Most important of all, the intrinsic nature of offending such as racial violence is that these behaviours need to be understood not as events that can be counted from one moment compared to the next moment, but as processes (MacLean 1986; Genn 1988), that are more complex, dynamic and dislocating for the victim than the notion of an incident can capture (Pearson et al 1989; Stanko 1987; Bowling 1993a, 1993b; Sheptycki 1992; Hesse et al 1992). Evaluations that limit themselves to a 'before and after' model of human action and behaviour, emphasise outcomes rather than processes that would imply a static, decontextualised notion of offending and racial incidents (see Hesse 1992; Farrell 1992; Bowling 1993a).

Cyril Smith et al's (1972) *The Wincroft Youth Project* is often cited as the best evaluation of youth work effects on crime prevention and reduction (see for example Graham 1990; Graham and Smith, 1993).68 The Wincroft Detached Youth Work Project had a strikingly similar youth work philosophy and approach to Youthlink, particularly in its use of case work and social group work methods in attempting to influence and change delinquency behaviour. Its evaluation method however, in contrast to the Youthlink evaluation, was based on 'Before' and 'After' measures of delinquency comparing participant (experimental) group and control group. Although Wincroft documented the history and main events of the project from establishment to project end, from the perspectives of workers, young people and how relationships between workers and young people changed, this data was treated as secondary to measuring outcomes. Thus we knew the outcomes without knowing the processes or how outcomes had been arrived at. To be sure, change was documented, but through on events-orientated understanding rather than qualitative understanding, focusing on 'events' and 'contacts' and their frequency, rather than any changes in the nature or quality of these relationships, except perhaps mentioning that workers were faced with young people's 'crises' and how workers offered 'emotional support' in the face of these. Although Wincroft carried out a very detailed socio-demographic and juvenile crime survey of the city (Manchester) and neighbourhood in which the project worked, this contextualisation was almost incidental to the main thrust of measuring outcomes.

Although the evaluation's statistical analysis (ibid.: chapters 5 and 6) showed significantly lower convictions for the participant compared to the control group during the life of the project, the question of why and how the project accomplished this remained a mystery. Although plentiful data of the type needed to answer this question was available to the evaluation found in description and analysis of the workers and client's perspective to the programme (Chapters 2 and 3) and in detailed case studies of how relationships between the workers and the participants changed, and the outcomes of these changes (Chapter 4), it was not used as a basis to judge effectiveness in terms of influencing the processes
through which changes in behaviour took place, or the contexts and causes of delinquency in the target area or anywhere else. Further, the Wincroft evaluation did not take into account the evaluation effect on the programme as an important aspect of programme outcomes, that is that the process of data construction between evaluators and workers in itself had an important influence on the outcome. Instead the outcome measures were supposed to indicate project/worker effects on young people’s delinquent behaviour, yet these outcome measures are spurious unless there is reflexivity about the research process.

Part of the research was carried out through workers self-evaluation, helped by the research 'supervisor' and 'evaluation of self and the evaluation of work which resulted from supervision benefited the project considerably' (ibid.:73). This research effect and its assessment in terms of what part it might have played in outcomes was ignored. The fact that evaluators ‘trained’ the workers in evaluation techniques and that this fed into project practice and led to increased self-awareness and more consciously informed action among workers, could hardly be a better example of Bhaskar’s (1979) contention that in experimental approaches it is the experimenter’s actions and manipulations of the experimental situation, and the measuring devices themselves that produce the experimental result not the neutral and passive observation on the part of the experimenter of ‘objective processes’. Workers records were expected to assess ‘need’, plan for the ‘satisfaction’ of these needs, and evaluate the effectiveness of these actions. Assessments were based on observed behaviours and difficulties. The evaluation, however, focused on the frequency of use of these procedures over given periods, and frequency of contact. An important concession to the importance of context, that is whether the local community conditions were favourable or a hindrance to programme aims, was offered in the suggestion that overall, changes in adolescent perspectives over time were not the result solely of contact with workers, but also the result of a whole process of maturation and of exposure to new situations. We are not told what maturation means in this context nor why and how ‘new situations’ influenced behaviour.

In summary a range of brief points can be made about Wincroft. First, the initial research design acted as a hindrance to full understanding of why change had occurred, although clearly the ‘before’ and ‘after’ measures had indicated that something had occurred. Second, in attempting to establish that any differences in the behaviour of the two groups could be legitimately attributed to the efforts of the workers, one might ask why this approach was pursued when young people were not (could not) be assigned randomly to each of the two groups, when there was no satisfactory measure of ‘dynamic adjustment’ (change in behaviour), any actual interaction between the two groups was overlooked, and there were severe problems in finding a control group drawn from a comparable (control) area. Third, because of the preferred approach the evaluation’s conclusions ranged from the banal: that the project was more successful with relatively well adjusted, low offending and younger groups (ibid.:241), to the potentially interesting: that ‘The very existence of the project brought a radical change to their [participant’s] personal environment by introducing middle-class attitudes into their lives’ (ibid.:245).
As usual in 'before' and 'after' studies the conclusions are where real explanation and discussion should begin not end.

A realist view of programmes like Wincroft would emphasise the following: first, the importance of evaluation effects on both programme and by extension, delinquency/crime, as well as project effects on delinquency/crime; secondly, and relatedly, whether research, project, community or some other effect are responsible for the statistical difference between groups in levels of delinquency at the beginning of the programme and the end; thirdly, the importance of individual as well as group change, the discernment of which is hidden by aggregated experimental compared to control group changes; fourthly, and conversely, project effects on change within the wider community and youth population at risk, in the sense that not only can the community context be abandoned methodologically, but that instead of projects influencing contextual conditions and causes and tackling criminogenic conditions head on, they encourage exit and mobility strategies among some individuals from the communities in which they are inserted. Why didn’t the project aim to change some of the social and community processes and contexts within which delinquency was said to flourish? That this is rarely if ever addressed in evaluations as a measure of success or failure is unsurprising given a prior commitment of evaluation strategies to extract behaviour from its social context. In summary, we don’t know what happened in the locality over the three years of the project’s life that might have influenced the outcome, and the quasi-experimental approach does not seem equipped to address this problem still (see the debate between Bennett 1996, and Tilley and Pawson 1996).

The Need for A Realist Alternative

In having reviewed some of the traditional problems associated with survey and experimental approaches and having begun to introduce the outlines of a realist approach to these problems, the realist position will be explicitly outlined in terms of what it is, why it is distinctive from say a phenomenological critique of empiricist method, and why it was thought necessary to draw on the realist perspective as a methodological framework for this study. Put in a nutshell, the unifying theme of the scientific realist approach to empirical social science research is the importance it gives to qualitative rather than survey and experimental approaches whilst not sharing phenomenological or ethnographic pessimism about the possibility of establishing causal mechanisms for social phenomena.

It has been noted that an ‘events orientation’ dominates both agency responses to, and study of, racial violence, and this ignores the need to locate it within a process of human action, in which there are interpretational problems associated with its definition (Hesse 1992; Bowling 1993a, 1993b). The best studies of racial violence however have not empirically demonstrated the causes of racial violence, or addressed the problem of causality, and they continue to hold onto a taken for granted and unitary notion of racism, and a too rigid view of the separation of victim and perpetrator rather than inquiring into their relationship within the processes observed.
So as to overcome these omissions in the research literature, the logic of enquiry pursued in this thesis follows the scientific realist (Harre 1972; Bhaskar 1979; Pawson 1989; Sayer 1992; Pawson and Tilley 1994) methodological injunction that the first task of explanation is to provide a possible generative mechanism for an observed pattern of events.69 A generative mechanism is the underlying force(s) which bind events together and allows us to experience the world as a series of regularities. Research into racial violence, as chapter one suggests, has hitherto relied on cataloguing and describing its prevalence and occurrence through historical and contemporary surveys, but few explanations are offered that explain why racial violence occurs in some localities and not others or why its prevalence changes over time. The predominant approach to the study of racial violence has been the survey method and yet as Pawson argues (1989:13), following Blumer (1956:688-699) and Cicourel (1964:8-24), ‘...social life consists not of events but experience, and thus the same happening can carry totally different meanings for people in different social contexts’. However because of the requirement that variables or measures like racism or ethnicity have to have standard meaning across a total sample surveyed, this forces social research into the mistaken assumption that events in the social world are commonly understood within and between different groups and cultures. Blumer’s and Cicourel’s classic phenomenological critiques of the survey method particularly apply when measuring something like racial violence in which the attribution of ‘racism’ and ‘racial motive’ is highly contextual whereas other aspects of social life have meaning more nearly stable and universal (e.g. age, income, education). Previous studies have not taken sufficient account of the variation of possible meaning of ‘racist’ or ‘racial’ violence and abuse, nor the different contexts in which these terms are understood and used, instead preferring either an everyday common sense view of ‘racism’ that racism exists in situations of conflict where the parties to the conflict are different ‘race’, or an unproblematic monolithic concept of ‘racism’ as an ideology, sometimes expressed in a certain type of violence (see chapter two). This study argues that we need a much more refined way of measuring and understanding racial violence which is sensitive to the phenomenological and relativist critiques of social science measurement. At the same time, whilst accepting that the measurement and description of racial violence is problematical because of the changeability and contextuality of everyday meanings of ‘racism’ and ‘racial’, there is a need to focus on the interdependence of the theories reviewed in chapter two with the evidence presented in the empirical study of adolescent racisms.

The Scientific Realist Critique: Overview of Realist Methodological Principles

An important task is to outline in general terms scientific realist methodological principles that are relevant to the kinds of methodological problems encountered in this study, then to offer examples of

---

69 However, different research strategies and objects will have different referents as to what this means. Thus followers of Bhaskar (1979) have taken generative mechanism to refer to social structures endemic to capitalism, whereas another founder member of Scientific Realist School, Harre (1979) points to social life as a pattern of skilled performances explained in terms of underlying mechanism of peoples ‘problem solving’ and presentational activities (see Pawson 1989:9). This study is more appropriately aligned with Harre’s approach.
their practical efficacy for the conduct of the study. To outline, if you like, first principles briefly illustrated by problems which beset this study. The main themes or principles which are considered are: knowledge/action; language context; measurement; causality; community context; spatiality; evaluation.

Bhaskar (1979:115-123) if I understand him, argues that a first principle of social scientific research is that people are knowledgeable about why they act in the way they do (also see Giddens 1984), therefore the reasons people give for their actions are an essential element in social scientific explanation of those actions and the basis of any research strategy should be to ask actors themselves why they behaved in the way they did. More than this, intentional human behaviour is caused by the reasons people offer for their behaviour, whether or not at the time of the action the agent was aware of the reasons. Reasons are cited as a cause when in the circumstances that actually prevailed, ‘so tipped the balance of events as to produce the known outcome’. Bhaskar’s argument that reasons are causes is developed in a number of stages, and importantly the reason for action do not have to be provided by someone else (so-called corroboration) to function as the precipitating cause of a person’s behaviour, even though such reasons may be rationalizations or excuses for a course of action already set upon, grounded in terms of socially acceptable or psychologically undisturbing principles and norms. But rationalisation is subject to detection and two types of control: the control of negotiation in dialogue (the interview); and the control of coherence with the rest of the agents behaviour (over time and/or in different situations). The implications are that studies of racial violence if they are to begin to explain the phenomena, must ask victims and especially perpetrators themselves about why racial violence occurs and what their reasons were for perpetrating violence - something which is completely absent in other studies. Instead taxonomic groups (ethnic groups) are asked whether, how often and sometimes where and at what time victimisation occurred, and the response of agencies. They are rarely asked why it occurred. The basic principle found in realism that the reasons people give for their actions, including their rationalisations, are an important source and cause for action - what they actually do in the world and their effects - was followed in this study.

Sayer (1993) emphasises the context of people’s knowledge about why they do things found in their language use in communicative or social interaction. Studies of adolescent experiences of racism and crime that have used a qualitative approach necessarily rely on first order constructs or accounts from young people themselves, and therefore address the context of language use (see Hewitt 1986; Back 1991, 1993, 1996; Loader 1996). This type of research is led to a consideration of the problems of language and knowledge because as Sayer (1993) argues a basic context of knowledge (about racial motive, violence, racism etc.) is interaction between people (victims, perpetrators and researchers) which involves the sharing or transmission of meaning. So as to discover the context of knowledge/language about ‘race’ and racial violence in these interactions the research focused on users intentions and the variety of interpretations. In constructing different data sets the study sought intersubjective appraisal and confirmation of the truth or falsity of young people’s responses. For example the follow up study explored the survey responses and acted as confirmation or refutation of the cohort study and
so on. Specifically, how young people had understood the meaning of the questionnaire items in the crime survey, and their own meanings of ‘racism’ and ‘racial violence’. This approach was also meant to explore the assumed consensual notion of the term ‘racism’ and racial violence found in other studies. By making judgements about the veracity of these accounts it was necessary to take from these accounts the conventions of language existing in the local ‘language community’ from which young people were drawn, so that for example, the meaning of ‘racism’ was sought according to these cultural conventions rather than as is usually the case, from social scientific discourse. Otherwise misconceptions can arise about the context of knowledge (above racial violence) that can distort researcher’s views of both their object of study and their own activity. Young people’s knowledge about racism then was pursued by means of attempting to understand the local cultural conventions of racist language - their language community.

In contrast to the above argument empiricist researchers emphasise behaviour and constantly remind us that the reasons people give for their actions (what they say) is not the same thing as the actions themselves (what they do). What empiricists do not do is to sufficiently distinguish between physical ‘behaviour’ and the meaning of the ‘actions’ involved in social practices in that sometimes the same behaviour can, in different contexts, constitute different meaningful actions. Again this problem can be resolved if the data captures a range of contexts and situations which as Sayer argues (ibid.:33), gives ‘reciprocal confirmation’, and that in any case we usually find that changes in meanings and practices go hand in hand. It became quickly apparent from the data that knowledges and relations around racial violence derived from or were closely associated with particular kinds of practical situation - where it was safe to go, with whom and at what time. A narrow view of ‘racialist behaviours’ ignores the fact that meaning and knowledge is always embedded in social practices, that derive from or are closely associated with particular kinds of practical situation (ibid.:44). The ‘truth’ about racism and racial violence (our/their knowledge about it) then, is a matter of practical adequacy (ibid.:84 and 151).

Turning now to the problem of measuring ‘racism’, as we have seen above, few conventional criminological or sociological studies of racism and racial violence (see Back 1996, Hewitt 1986 for exceptions) investigate either the instances of use, or the significance of context on actors use of racist discourse/ terminology. This has profound implications for attempts to measure racial violence which go further than ‘technical’ problems internal to experimental and survey approaches outlined above. A methodological strategy which merely pursues the experiences of assumed victim and perpetrator groups identified by ethnicity can fall into a number of traps, unfounded assumptions and propositions about the racist structure and categorization of ethnic groups: racism and racist violence are seen as objective ‘givens’ easily amenable to measurement, and their subjective aspect is reduced to the notion

70 ‘The attention normally given to technical methods of analysis is in gross disproportion to the consideration given to the language in which we characterize the world’ (Ibid.:19).
71 This is not to argue that common sense conceptions of racism and racial violence are accepted as true understandings of reality but to comprehend them by seeing if there are any aspects of their objects, objectives and methods in which they have some practical adequacy (Ibid.:151). To deny these contexts is to invite the tendency as Bhaskar argues, of mathematical (statistical) methods to reify human practice by interpreting it as mechanical and regular rather than always contingent and liable to transformation.
of perceived inferiority/superiority of 'races' or ethnic groups, derivative of and dependent upon the 'objective' structure of racial domination; there tends to be an oversimplification of the cognitive and evaluative processes in actors categorization and classification of the 'Other'; there are insufficiently sensitive measuring and aggregation techniques so that 'White', 'Asian' or 'Black' become unitary and homogenous ethnic categories of perpetrator/victim prior to delineation of cultural variation and the social bases of individual difference; there is a lack of appreciation of the significance of, and the variation in, cultural meanings and natural discourse, and reliance on the vagaries of everyday terminology such as 'racism' and 'racial' as the source of measurement parameters (Pawson 1989:20-24); the generation of a random sample of victims to measure racism and racial violence is artificial due to its production in contrived social conditions, and in any case may be irrelevant in the face of changes in the social meaning of racism; racist discourse is inherently 'indexical' (the meaning of expression depends on the context of their use, see Coxon and Jones 1979), and racist expression can only be inferred indirectly from behaviour and speech; finally, that distinctions of racial/ethnic position into respectively, objective/subjective aspects, is inappropriate (see Wallman 1978b).

This 'list' of 'measurement' problems is constructed from both the interpretative critique of reductionism found in social science, and the scientific realist critique of causality. The practical implications for this study, particularly but not exclusively in terms of its survey approach to measuring racial violence, its analysis of victimization and perpetration processes, and relationships between perpetrators and their victims, ethnicity and racial motive, are briefly discussed.

Firstly, there is the problem of discovering 'racism' and 'racial motive'. The perpetrator acts on the victim in a way that the relationship is one of imputed racial motive, but this assumes that perpetrators and victims cannot be the same person either at other instances in the relationship or at the same conjuncture of the events/relationship. Also that 'racial motive' is isolated, simple and fixed. This consensual view of racism and racist violence found in conventional approaches carries an assumption that in situations of inter-ethnic contact, violence will be racially motivated and racism the monopoly of white perpetrators, independent of contextual and community structural variables or discourses. However we cannot assume people have the same cognition of racism or racial motive in terms of ascribed distinctions and semantics, nor assume a consensus as to the subjective evaluation of racism by respondents. Instead, we should be concerned with subjective (cultural) models of racism, and with how

---

72 Although conventional approaches to the study of racial violence can be subject to both types of critique, Realism sees itself as distinct from and having superseded the 'subjectivism' of the interpretative or phenomenological critique of measurement, specifically because the latter does not offer an alternative to the model of causality it criticises. The issue is complicated but briefly, according to Blumer (1956) the basic problems with social scientific measurement are firstly, the relation between two variables (e.g. perpetrator/victim) can change which may succeed in revising the original relationship, and this excludes the process of interpretation and definition inherent in social life (Ibid.:685). Secondly, when there are recurrent 'stabilized meanings' (e.g. 'race' or 'ethnicity') that are amenable to measurement they are subject to structural change (Ibid.:689). Cicourel (1964: 14) argues that measurement presupposes a bounded network of shared meanings, i.e. a theory of culture, that necessarily relies upon a common sense definition of the world which the observer shares with the actor (Ibid.:20-21), which denies cultural variation, and assumes a '...consensual interpretation of the meaning of the underlying concepts within and between populations studies' (Ibid.:18) (e.g. 'racism'). This study is closer to Blumer's and Cicourel's critiques than realist writers are.

73 See Bowling (1993) for a review of different political approaches to the study of racial violence.
people judge the relationships between ethnic groups.

A second set of problems involves the need to question the reliability of ethnic/racial classifications as measuring instruments, inferred from relations of inferiority and superiority - these classifications require to be established and confirmed in each and every situation of their use (see Hewitt 1986; Back 1996), and the extent to which relations of inferiority/superiority exists and whether they are stable or change in the situation is an empirical question. This is because relative advantage and power gained from ethnic status and prestige stem from the ability of an actor to exploit and benefit from meanings and values at the level of his or her self identification - his or her first order constructions (see Wallman 1978a). Ethnic categories are not formed simply on the basis of some single hierarchical dimension, but should be subordinated to heterogeneous characteristics of the ethnic structure e.g. distinctions within the same ethnic group or between groupings differentiated in their cultural and economic situations (‘Asian’ covers many groupings as does ‘White’).

A third set of problems concern the nature of ethnicity and ethnic relations - what is the nature of the relations between ethnic groups?; why should inter-ethnic comparisons be valid or insightful at all?, and; are relations between ethnic groups external, and contingent or internal and necessary? (see Sayer 1992: 89-96; Bhaskar 1979: 54). An external relation means either ethnic group can exist without the other - their relation is contingent. A common sense understanding is that ethnic groups exist in themselves rather than relationally - in relation to other ethnic groups - and this means that any measure of racial violence is extrinsic to the relationship ethninc groups or between perpetrator and victim. By contrast, an understanding that the relation between ethnic groups is internal or necessary, means that what the object is, is that it is dependent on its relation to the other; a person cannot be subordinate without a superior and vice versa - the existence of one necessarily presupposes the other. This internal relation is part of the definition of either of the groups; and because they are interdependent, change in one part is tied to change in the other. Thus minority ethnic status is a function of white ethnicity and vice versa, and there can’t be one without the other. A common error in conventional studies of violent racism is the reproduction of common sense’s characteristic unawareness of the internally related nature of human action, so that racial violence is seen as an isolated expression of ‘racism’

74 After Schutz, Pawson (1989:7-8) explains that ‘first-level constructs’ are those through which social actors have already prestructured social reality prior to its scientific investigation. On the other hand, sociological concepts like ‘ethnicity’ or ‘racism’ are ‘second-level constructs’ constructed and used by investigators. The adequacy of measurement procedures depends on somehow bridging the gap between the two levels - in this there arises a type of problem foreign to the natural sciences.

75 Sayer (1992:92-93) warns against reifying individuals in virtue of their membership of a ‘sociological group’ - whether class or ethnic group: ‘Within social structures there are particular ‘positions’ associated with certain roles. It is particularly important to distinguish the occupant of a position from the position itself. One of the most pervasive illusions of everyday thinking derives from the attribution of the properties of the position, be they good or bad, to the individual or institution occupying it.’

76 This does not mean dependent upon (see Ibid.:89): ‘contingent’ is used inconsistently between realist thinkers to mean either ‘separate’ (apart from) or ‘existent’ (there in itself) which have different meanings. The theory chapter uses the term to refer to what is found or has come about in a specific situation.

77 Of course there are many instances of internal relations which combine mutual dependence with one sided domination - one can exist without the other but not vice versa - they are asymmetric. Nevertheless, these distinctions are helpful for clarifying different concepts of ethnicity as hinging upon internal relations (typical of an urban anthropology approach) or contingent relations (i.e. race relations approach in which ethnic groups are defined in terms of homogeneously shared attributes: phenotypical features, income, status, cultural attitudes, etc.).
within the perpetrator group whereas in any real situation there is usually a complex combination of these types of relation. The study of the racist actions of one group (perpetrators) on the other (victims) in terms of the prevalence, frequency and location of racist incidents tells us nothing about the nature of the relationship between the groups and how the actions and meanings of one group is affected by the other.

A final set of problems concerning the ‘measurement’ of racial violence is the issue of generalizations (ibid.:100-103). Theoretically this has been addressed in chapter two, however the methodological implications for measuring racial violence have not been considered. ‘Ethnicity’, ‘racism’ and ‘racial violence’ are unlikely to be generalizable because first, they are internally related to other ethnicities, local conditions, gender etc., and are therefore the less likely to be invariant across time and space; secondly, Because they are historically specific or culture-bound and constituted in meanings they are particularly variable and unsuitable as objects of generalisations of the predictive kind; thirdly, the ‘safety in numbers’ approach of surveys cannot help here because of the problem of ‘distributive unreliability’ (ibid.:101); fourthly, careful scrutiny of inferences drawn from generalizations is also needed to avoid the ‘ecological fallacy’, that is, the spurious inference of individual characteristics from group-level characteristics (ibid.:102) to which the study of crime and racism is particularly prone.

The alternative methodological approach followed in this study which is to infer the existence of racism through using a triangulated approach of both naturalistic and formal techniques over time and in different situations, to see if the data converge, does not in itself provide causal explanation. It is here that Scientific Realism’s concerns with an alternative model of causality become important for explaining the data in the empirical study.

According to Pawson (1989:127) ‘the distinguishing feature of realist philosophy of science is the view of causality’, and it is to problems found within models of causality and causal analysis that realist philosophy addresses itself (also see Sayer 1992). Pawson (1989:128-129) goes on to outline the basis in which Generative Theory (Scientific Realism) rejects the ‘empiricist’ successionist model of causality that states we cannot observe causality but only the sequence of events themselves, and that we decide upon causality on the basis of the regularity of the joint occurrence of the events in question (realist critiques of the successionist view are also found in Harre 1972; Sayer 1984; Bhaskar 1979). Instead Pawson holds that there is a real connection between causes and their effects but at a more basic level

---

78 For example, in the survey it was found that over a third of the Asian sample had experience violent victimisation and the remainder had not. Are we then talking about the presence of two types of people, one of which is always violently victimised the other never victimised, or a homogeneous population in which each member has the same propensity to be violently victimised. Of course one can check recency and frequency of this type of victimisation but this is limited but this cannot tell us what did/will happen outside the bounded period of the survey, etc.

79 Sayer offers the following example (from Elster 1978:99, quoted Ibid.:102): ‘..as when from the fact that a high proportion of Negros in a community goes together with high crime rates we conclude that Negros commit more crime than whites. This, of course, is invalid because the community-level correlation may also be due to Negros being more often victims of crimes. An even more striking example is the following: from the fact that juvenile delinquency and senile dementia are correlated at the community level, we can hardly conclude that they are often found in the same individuals.’
of reality than the event, namely the process or mechanism: 'it is the activation of this underlying mechanism which brings about particular sequences of event'..."This means that so-called 'events',...are not discrete items but really the components of a system' (ibid.:128). Real causal explanation depends on the ability to answer the question of why regularities exist in terms of the mechanisms that generate them. It is these generative mechanisms that really explain why things happen and that it is the generative mechanism rather than some single variable that is responsible for the relationship between events. A mechanism is an account of the constitution and behaviour of those things that are responsible for the manifest regularity. Social science is therefore the investigation of a system of internal relationships brought about by the occurrence of an underlying mechanism which connects the parts of the system (whether theoretical or observational). Further, it is by trying to understand how this system passes from one state to another that we comprehend the nature of the variation of its component properties, i.e. changed states reveal generative mechanisms and relationships between parts. It is this insight more than any other that has informed this study.

Most events-orientated studies of racial violence are interested in the prevalence of racial victimisation as an indicator presumably of the extent of white racism and its expression in violence. Unfortunately these same studies do not tell us anything about the mechanisms, processes and contexts which affect and by which white racism is transformed into racial victimisation. We don’t know why the transformation occurred unless we know these mechanisms, processes and contexts. This study suggests that these contexts and processes are localist community discourses and practices of neighbourhood nationalism, boundary drawing and group enmity predicated on territoriality, and that territoriality is the generative mechanism. The type of causality envisaged by Realism can be applied to the study here at two different levels of analysis of racial violence - changes in project effects on racial violence and community level effects. After all the aims of the study were to look at changes in the project and changes in the community context and their relationship. The focus of the inquiry and evaluation in discovery of the underlying features beneath the surface of events involved investigation of the significant features of the particular community in which the crime prevention project was located which give rise to particular behavioural possibilities. Thus the evaluation was not simply about external relationships between discrete objects or events - whether incidents of racial violence had increased or declined and whether this was because of the crime prevention project, important as this was, but was an investigation of a local system of internal relationships brought about by the occurrence of an underlying mechanism which connects the parts of the system.

The empirical or observed properties of the local system were found to point towards underlying mechanisms of a particular form of local racism based in territoriality and neighbourhood nationalism. But this was only revealed by the local systems transformation from one state to another which enabled comprehension of the nature of the variation of its component properties i.e. changed states reveal generative mechanism and the relationship between parts. Consider the following diagram:
Where

\[ M (\text{Mechanism}) = \text{Territoriality as neighbourhood nationalism} \]

\[ X = \text{Availability, willingness and opportunity of perpetrators} \]

\[ Y = \text{Presence of racial motive} \]

\[ Z = \text{Availability and vulnerability of victims} \]

This schematic representation of transformation from state to another in the local system is illustrative of the factors and relationships that the study needed to take into account in explaining why the transformation had taken place that had resulted in a decline in racial violence. In actuality it was discovered that changes had occurred in X, Y and Z and their relationship because of changes in M, where M1 is white territoriality and M2 is Asian territoriality. Of course this is only illustrative and other factors, processes and mechanisms were operating as well. Nevertheless the point is that understanding of process and change requires causal analysis (Sayer 1992:103), and ‘...it is our theories of the social processes into which social properties are embedded which are the appropriate source of understanding of the nature of social variables’ (Pawson 1989:27, my emphasis). At the most simple level causal descriptions can be merely narrative accounts of what produced change, and this element of causal analysis is evident in some parts of this study. But again without knowing what the underlying causal mechanisms were that produced or triggered change then this approach is limited, and a realist approach to causality may be necessary.

Other underlying mechanisms and contexts, which operated simultaneously in the study area and which influenced changes in the prevalence and conditions of racial violence were: a clustering of criminality, violence and drugs, whereby the presence of criminality and high levels of personal violence increased racial violence, whereas the presence of drugs decreased it; increased knowledgeability about where and under what conditions racial violence was likely to happen; territorial

---

80 Pawson's proposed solutions to the weaknesses of conventional models of causality and the phenomenological critiques about the changeability and contextuality of everyday meaning (relativism), is the testing of theories not everyday descriptions; a concern with the interdependence of theory and evidence, and that empirical testing should be made at the point of intersection of rival theories (Ibid.:28). However, Sayer (1992:143) argues that while theories supply ways of conceptualizing the objects, mechanisms cannot be decided in advance and the course of their operation can be uncertain, conjunctural or may even be unique: ‘the same mechanism may sometimes produce different events, and conversely the same type of event [in our case racial violence] may have different causes’ (Sayer 1992:116).

81 Sayer (1992:104-105) argues that causality is about what an object is like (its ‘causal powers’ or ‘liabilities’) and what it can do (it’s ‘mechanisms’). If an object changes then its causal powers will change too, so we need to know what is it about the object that enables it to change and therefore understand the continuous process by which X produced Y, if it did. It is contingent whether causal powers (a potential for racism) are ever activated or exercised (by territoriality) so the relationship between causal powers/mechanisms (racism and territoriality) and their effects (racial violence) is not fixed, but contingent. Territorialism can produce quite different results (racial violence in one situation, group enmity and fighting in another) and different mechanisms may produce the same empirical result, etc.
and topographical context of the ‘defended neighbourhood’; community surveillance; displacement; institutional and agency context, and so on. Mechanisms and contexts operate locally within given communities and therefore explanations of racial violence depend on the characteristics of the local social system in which racism and racial violence operates.

Local social systems are the context within which social practices can be understood and analysed and the fundamental error of quantitative approaches in the social sciences is to assume that social phenomena can be understood by closing off this context as either an unwanted influence or as a source of contamination of the data, that is it attempts to artificially create a ‘closed system’ which apes the experiment in the natural sciences (see Pawson 1989:154). In contrast social systems are open systems in which a number of interdependent generative mechanisms can act and where qualitative change typifies human action. However, ‘within local regions of open systems, closed or quasi-closed systems may occur, perhaps where one mechanism completely dominates or overrides the effects of others’ (Sayer 1992:122). From the data on racial violence this would seem to be the case in the locality studied and is argued in chapter four where the study area is characterised in terms of a ‘local style’ of homogenised insularity. That is that social processes in the town studied are relatively closed off from ‘external’ influences - but this was social not experimental closure! Importantly, social structures and their parts ‘have histories and geographies’, and ‘social systems are not only open but embody learning processes which produce continual innovation and qualitative change’ (ibid.:145).

As Pawson (1989:29) argues contextual control should replace statistical control as the method of achieving closed-system inquiry in the form of longitudinal and comparative investigations which gather data from as wide a range of spatial and temporal sources as possible so as to fulfil the requirements of ‘the identification of the context in which the explanatory mechanism is deemed to operate’ (ibid.:214):

‘The research does not set out to seek the constant conjunctions that occur in general population samples but actively breaks down the population, identifying those contexts where a particular mechanism operates producing certain observable regularities...this approach allows the researcher to work across different units of analysis (ibid.:214-215), and ‘research should take the form of examining the single empirical relationship in a great many contexts rather than the current practice of examining a great

82 Sometimes Realists use these terms interchangeably and at other times to mean different things - that mechanisms are more contingent causes or triggers that both reveal wider contexts or patterns whilst at the same time are an immediately cause of the observed regularities.

83 As we shall discuss a little later this problem of open and closed systems is central to the problems found with quasi-experimental methods of crime prevention evaluation based on the idea of statistical control, which aspire to create closed system with aspiration of complete isolation of causal regularity by way of elimination of all other potential causal factors. As opposed to statistical control which works entirely within an ‘isolationist’ model of closure, that is the exclusion (or inclusion) of variables within a closed system, Pawson (1989:213) proposes an alternative realist notion of closure so that sociological research would pursue the following methodological strategy: ‘Firstly, any empirical relationship requiring explanation would be interpreted as the consequence of the action of a generative mechanism. Secondly, since it is assumed that all generative mechanisms are localized in their action it is necessary to specify the social context where the particular mechanism is expected to operate. This would involve close definition of the social characteristics of the group or location to be studied, rather than simply assuming that mechanisms (and thus laws) act uniformly across general population samples. Thirdly, since it is assumed that the action of a mechanism can be obscured by other mechanisms, some method of controlling the effects of these further constraints on the relationship under inspection is required. Since the physical and statistical elimination of these confounding mechanisms is out of the question, some kind of comparative or longitudinal research design is called for in order to at least recognize their action. Between them, these strategies can approximate what I have characterized as the realistic pincer strategy of achieving closure by matching mechanisms to environmental conditions’.
many relationships in the single context' (ibid.:217). In this sense the studies controls were to try out certain regularities in different contexts of time and place through comparative and cohort inquiry, and this type of community contextual control replaces the statistical controls found in conventional criminological study of victimisation and perpetration. Of course this is not to deny that this alternative method has its own problems such as the care needed to distinguishing age and period effects, etc., and these are discussed in the study.

The theoretical framework of the study emphasises spatiality as a basis in which the dynamics of racial violence are understood and located. Sayer (1993: 146-148) in particular argues for the importance of accounting for spatial form in concrete research in a situation where 'most social scientists ignore space.' The study's discovery that young people's relationship to public space was crucial for their perception of community safety, and that local racisms were predicated on certain groups being perceived as being out of place and time, meant that Sayer's emphasis became the study's emphasis:

'Normally we abstract objects out from this concrete setting without a second thought and come up with categories of roles, institutions, occupations, etc., which are treated as independent of space and time. First we tear things out of their context, then forget that context and treat the objects as spaceless, timeless data, and then proceed to wonder how we might explain them, which involves trying to reconstruct some kind of appropriate causal context in the absence of information on their spatio-temporal form.' (ibid.:146-147)

But the concept of 'space' is meant here in a relative rather than an absolute sense. Benno Werlen's (1993:xv) brilliant Society, Action and Space goes to the epistemological heart of this study in suggesting that space itself cannot 'cause' or determine anything, but that instead location is only socially relevant when filtered through the frames of reference that orientates individuals' conduct. Sayer's (1992) distinction between absolute and relative concepts of space is that the former is concerned with physical distance and the latter with relative social distance, i.e. that space is in an important sense socially constructed. The efficacy or not of ignoring space depends on whether social scientists are concerned with developing abstract social theory or explanations of particular concrete objects. While space is constituted by objects it is not reducible to them. In other words although space can only exist in and through objects, it is independent of the particular types of object present (ibid.:148). In attributing importance to spatial form, it is not 'space' itself but the way in which spatial relations activate and effect causal processes which is important.

The role of spatial analysis in abstract theory is necessarily restricted by the variety and contingency of spatial forms. In empirical research on concrete objects and processes, however, the situation regarding space is different. Since it involves investigating the actual workings and effects of mechanisms in contingent circumstances, then it will be generally necessary to take account of their spatial form since it makes a difference: 'Even though concrete studies may not be interested in spatial form per se, it
must be taken into account if the contingencies of the concrete and the differences they make to outcomes are to be understood' (ibid.:150)... ‘the less explanations of actual events take account of the contingencies of spatial form, the less concrete they can claim to be" (ibid.:151). The social processes uncovered in the study are based on tracing out space-time paths through criminality and victimisation, because what happens to people depends on contacts and connections made within space-time; where are we in relation to others? Whom are we likely to come into contact with? Criminality and victimisation, like most behaviours depends on being in the right/wrong places at the right/wrong times.

As already indicated all these realist themes cast severe doubt on the efficacy of conventional methodological approaches to evaluating crime prevention programmes like the one found in this study. Perhaps the most that can be said is that crime prevention evaluations offer a unique window of opportunity through which we can confirm our understanding of the action mechanisms. Pawson and Tilley (1994, 1996) have addressed the problem of crime prevention evaluation explicitly from a realist point of view. From the discussion of Wincroft above quasi-experimental models of evaluation do not express the nature of causality and change going on within social programmes. How a programme works is not seen as a requirement to judge its effectiveness, yet 'It is precisely those processes which facilitate effectiveness which get written out of the explanation' (ibid.:294). Programmes are not, as experimentalists would have it, an ‘objective’ feature of the environment into which they are inserted, like some external, impinging ‘force’ to which subjects ‘respond’, but are socially constructed and interact with that community. Rather ‘programmes “work”, if subjects choose to make them work and are placed in the right conditions to enable them to do so’ (ibid.:294). Evaluations should embody propositions about how to bring about social and individual change in a community (ibid.:297). The implicit hypothesis being tested is how the presence of the project and other agencies may be persuasive in changing local patterns of thought and deed on crime (ibid.:297). Because community contexts differ we need to know these specific and special conditions that are liable to enable a programme to work, whereas in quasi-experimental approaches ‘we learn virtually nothing of the communities acting either as experimental sites or controls. Hence, the issue of what might operate to facilitate or impede effectiveness of the programme is not addressed’, and ‘since particular communities and their cultures and values obviously exert a profound and real influence on what programmes will be able to achieve...’ then ‘precisely what needs to be understood is what it is about given communities which will facilitate the effectiveness of a programme’ (ibid.:298-99). The implication of this logic of inquiry is that replication and generalizability of a programme to other localities is likely to be extremely problematic when the conditions for the success or failure of an initiative are intrinsically contextual and therefore local to the study area.

In realist terms the crime prevention project evaluated in this study triggered underlying mechanisms of: increased informal social bonds between Asian victims who had fought against racial violence (the ‘local heroes’) and amongst those who had tolerated it or despaired of change (the ‘conformists’); this in turn reduced the social isolation of victims upon which racial violence was able to feed; the resulting
increased informal and relatively organised community surveillance reduced the inclination of perpetrators and their supporters to pursue racial violence in the locality. This worked because it increased activities within the Asian youth community and countered the prevailing local mood about the inevitability of victimization. This in turn fostered a more active interest in racial violence prevention measures amongst those groups which had become resigned to the local culture of racism, and so on (see ibid.: 298 for a parallel example of mechanisms). It was these contextual factors that enabled the crime prevention project to work. The process evaluation reported in chapter seven considers the mechanisms and contexts through which the project outcomes were achieved in terms of: effects on perpetrators; project surveillance through regular contact with potential perpetrators which acted as a deterrence; effective deployment of youth workers in areas where racial violence was taking place and among the individuals and groups of young people most responsible for attacks; publicity effects of the project on local youth work, school and police practice; and the encouragement of risk reducing strategies among victims. Of course these mechanisms operate simultaneously and the particular configuration of 'fired' mechanisms hinges on the local context in which the intervention project is installed, and in the case of the project evaluated the effectiveness of its intervention must be judged according to whether or not it addressed or influenced the underlying local causes of racial violence.

**Actual Methods Employed**

The methods employed for the evaluation part of the study aimed to discover the effectiveness of the local crime prevention programme (Youthlink) which used detached youth work methods in an attempt to influence and reduce racial violence and offending. The intended research design for the evaluation focus on the extent to which the stated objectives of the project had been achieved and, how these effects were arrived at through the course of the project’s work. The projects influence on social crime reduction with particular emphasis on reduction of racial violence, was not used as an unequivocal measure of the project’s success or otherwise as one set of ‘results’ or outcomes. Both the local and national environment can and will influence the outcome. In not judging the effectiveness of the project solely on criteria internal to the projects work, it was placed in the community context and within local conditions and changes in local conditions which can be more or less conducive to projects success.

The evaluation and monitoring fell into two parts: a process evaluation and an outcome evaluation. The *process evaluation* consisted of a narrative account over the course of the project’s life, based on information recorded and collected by the project workers using a recording sheet for guidance, then checked and elaborated in interviews with the evaluator. Workers, young people and agencies connected to the project were also asked contextual questions about what had changed in the locality over the period. This process approach became reinforced in the course of the evaluation as qualitative data that revealed the processural aspects of juvenile offending and racial violence. Data was drawn from in-depth interviews with workers and participants associated with the youth work project; Asian
and white victims and offenders and their families; community police officers; and professionals from a range of agencies connected to the project. Individual and group data on young people, case studies of youth work methods and other agency interventions, served to highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to reducing racial violence and juvenile offending, and in the area of victim support.

It was intended that the outcome evaluation be more analytical, based on systematic interviewing of participants, youth workers and members of other agencies, on a time-series of three to six-monthly periods to discover changes in attitudes and behaviour for individual cases. The evaluation was not exclusively concerned with comparing individual cases at the start of the project with what had become of them at the end, but individual change over shorter periods in relation to significant events and happenings in the lives of workers and young people.

The range of methods employed changed as it became clear that any detailed record keeping, would be onerous and intrusive to the interviewees and the work of the project. These practical exigencies encountered in the field led to the abandonment of the original intention to completely rely on the worker’s records as an indication of process, and instead workers and young people were interviewed at more regular intervals, and in more depth than was originally planned, and that this would happen throughout the course of the project. Also, the evaluation’s methods in accomplishing a process evaluation had to relate to the key stages of the project’s development and adapt accordingly. The expansion of the project shown in increased numbers of participants, and meant that a systematic and structured survey of participants could be administered and statistically analysed. At the same time this was expanded to include a representative sample of the general youth population but which included a booster sample of Asians. Apart from supplying general information about the Keighley youth population, its purpose was to compare project participants behaviour with behaviour found in the general 13-19 year old population. On this basis a judgement could be arrived at on whether and the extent to which the project had targeted an appropriate population consistent with its aims - those most likely to have been victims and most likely to have been involved in offending. Finally, as it became increasingly apparent that Asian young people might also be involved in offending, whereas early assumptions had almost exclusively understood their experience as being victims of racial harassment, emphasis shifted to recording and monitoring as well as victim behaviour. In fact there was probably a bias in the first stages of the evaluation towards assuming that whites would be perpetrators and offenders, and Asian’s victims. The reality, as we shall see, is somewhat more complicated.

Process evaluation, supplemented by survey, was based on following cohorts of young people from the beginning to the end of their participation in the project. Some were offenders, and it was observed whether and to what extent their offending behaviour changed, and whether these changes were influenced or caused by the project. In other instances, the relationships between perpetrators and victims of racial violence were monitored over time, to see how these relationships changed. This
aspect of the evaluation generated the cohort study presented in chapter six which is dealt with separately from the project evaluation found in chapter seven. The main data falls into three main dimensions: project work with agencies, work with young people and data on the participants.

In addition data was sought on the relationship between the crime prevention programme and the locality within which it was inserted. The project was also found to be a source of data on young people and individual and community change almost ‘independently’ of any judgement as to the processes and effectiveness of the programme itself. That is the evaluation was used also as a basis to explore the wider local context. The cohort study and the follow up study provided a further contextual ‘control’ on the evaluation and survey in asking young people in the locality about their own experiences and behaviour and whether there was anything generating these behaviours and was there a pattern which could illuminate why they or other young people were experiencing, or where involved in, crime and racial violence.

It has been normal in the research literature to see these two different behaviours - criminal offending and victimisation on the one hand, and racial violence on the other, as distinct and separate phenomena. However, preliminary investigations among young people suggested that one could not be understood without the other, that somehow they were likely to be connected in the lives of the young people interviewed. At first it was thought that this was a project effect - that the project because of its aim of targeting both violent racists and young people involved in criminality had simply brought the two groups together. However there was found a causal relationship between criminal offending and crime independently of any project effects. There was a continuum of antisocial behaviour and victimisation, so that one form of antisocial act led to another. These antisocial acts or series of acts could not be reduced to, or wholly explained, in terms of criminal motivation in one area of behaviour and racial motivation in another. As the research progressed these different methods and situations began to triangulate so that a data set collected in one situation and time was compared to a data set collected in another situation and time to see if the different sets ‘fitted’. An overall picture was built up from these different perspectives and situations so as to generate the area study of racial violence.

Turning to the survey, administered in 1992, this set out to discover and give voice to young peoples experiences of victimisation, crime and offending and in particular to see if these experiences were associated with inter-ethnic relations. The survey was concerned to record and explain these experiences from the viewpoints of both the perpetrators and the victims of crime and racial violence, and sought to understand what, if any, relationships there might be between these different experiences and points of view. The survey combined a self-report victimisation part with a self-report offending part within the questionnaire device. The methods used to illuminate these concerns and relationships included asking young people themselves about whether they were worried about crime and racial violence, whether certain things had happened to them, and whether they had offended. The aims of the survey were to discover how much offending and racial harassment was going on, and the conditions
under which this was happening. The survey also asked young people about their attachment to school, work, family and peers to enable the analysis to identify predictors of delinquency and racial violence. The main findings and the key dimensions of the survey are found in chapter five.

The survey was unable to gain access to population lists for the age group, although Keighley College provided a full list of its students living in the Keighley area which helped the survey generate a stratified random sample for the 16-19 age range not attending school. The remainder of the stratified sample was generated through a range of methods from street search through to visiting agencies working with young people. The main method used in addition to street search was to draw from as representative a group of agencies and places as possible where young people would be found. Because the approach to young people included visiting informal leisure sites, and in the case of some of the Asian sample, interviewing young people participating in a victim support project, the sample is likely to have picked up a larger proportion of offenders and victims than would be found in a random sample of the general 13-19 population. However, any bias in the sampling method is likely to be offset by the weaknesses found in other random sampling methods which invariably underestimate offending and victim behaviours within youthful populations. The survey then is only generalisable for the age group living in the area surveyed. Indeed as already argued the overall research design was interested in atypical rather than taxonomic groups. This was done so as to collect more detailed information about behaviours of interest to the study, something that would not have been possible if a completely random approach had been chosen given the overall sample size. For example males and Asians were oversampled and within this Asian sample, victims and some young people who had been in trouble with the police. These distinctions and comparisons are made clear. It is emphasised that the overall sample is representative of young people in this locality (see appendix 3, for a profile of the survey sample). Given these sampling issues it is probably not meaningful to talk about non-response, although non-response was very low for those respondents approached and contacted. This is mostly a function of the skills of the interviewers who were selected and trained on the basis of their 'acceptability' to young people and experience in working with young people rather than any research or interviewing background. The Keighley sample discarded a small number of completed interviews that were not considered serious responses to our questions.\footnote{Only eight interviews were excluded, although there were minor inconsistencies in others not serious enough to warrant exclusion. In any case in interviewing young people about the kinds of experiences in which we were interested, we would expect such inconsistencies and contradictions, and therefore erred on the side of allowing young people to speak.} The questionnaire had elements built into it that although not completely fool-proof in every case of inconsistent response, did enable internal cross-checks for consistency of response and response set. Overall, then, the study is confident of the accuracy and reliability of the findings and that they provide a serious indicator of the kinds of problems young people routinely face in their locality. Despite the limitations of the method and the unresolvable and inherent nature of some of the methodological problems outlined, it is believed that the results taken in the round shed light on areas of victimisation and offending, about which little is known for young people, and Asian young people in particular.
The Keighley survey was consistent with other local self-report surveys in discovering higher delinquency rates than are found in national random surveys because local surveys can 'pick-up' geographic and social differentials in criminal offending and victimisation glossed over by national random surveys. Local surveys are able to show, for example, that there is a disproportionate victimization of some social groups compared to others, and victimization in areas like sexual and racial harassment missed by mass victimization surveys of the type represented by the British Crime Survey. The Keighley survey is consistent with other local surveys in showing that certain age or ethnic groups and particular areas are far more frequently subject to criminal victimization than others. Mass victimization surveys then tend to distort the 'real' experiences of crime - especially those of young people and ethnic minorities. The overall effect of the Keighley survey is to have uncovered areas of 'hidden crime', most controversially perhaps, the existence in the locality surveyed of a substantial number of white young people who had been abused and attacked on what they allege to be racial grounds.

Keighley’s findings on the pattern and prevalence of youth victimisation are consistent with the findings of other studies (Anderson et al 1994; Loader 1996; Hartless et al 1995; Aye-Maung 1995; Brown 1995b) although strict comparisons are not possible given different questionnaire designs and sampling methods. However, where direct comparison is possible because of Keighley’s use of a common offending questionnaire and age group with participating countries in the International Self-Report Delinquency Study (see Junger-Tas and Terlouw 1995), the Keighley study tended to find higher prevalence of delinquency, especially violence, than found elsewhere (see chart 1, appendix 1). Nevertheless in an overall sense the pattern of the Keighley data was consistent with the patterns found in sister studies using nine city samples in seven different countries, and suggests comparative corroboration pointing to the validity of the Keighley findings for non-racially motivated offending. This did not mean that Keighley was found to be the 'crime capital of the western world', although it does seem to have a very substantial delinquency and violence problem among young people.

85 The Keighley survey used a questionnaire instrument identical to the one used in the International Self-Report Delinquency Study. Comparisons suggest comparative and distributive reliability of the Keighley findings on delinquency in that the prevalence pattern for different types of offence is remarkably similar to the prevalence pattern found in the other national and city samples including England and Wales. The striking difference is in higher levels of offending, particularly personal violence and crimes against the person when compared to the other sample surveys (see Charts 2 and 3, Appendix 1). This is likely explained by the local nature of the survey and its non-random sampling method. This does not discount the possibility that when these factors are taken into account the locality studied was distinctive as a particularly violent place for (male) adolescents and young people. The England and Wales study, drew a national random sample but added a random sample in high crime areas and a booster sample of ethnic minorities, although it found much lower overall prevalences of offending compared to the Keighley findings. The victim findings are less amenable to comparison because other local victim surveys have used different questionnaire devices as well as sampling methods (but see Anderson et al 1994). Virtually none have asked younger people about racial victimisation. Nevertheless the victimisation items were adapted from the Islington Crime Survey (1986 and 1990) which interviewed people over 16 years old. Perhaps most important, there are virtually no surveys designed to identify and question perpetrators of racial violence which the Keighley survey attempted.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE STUDY AREA

Introduction

The area chosen for the study was renowned in police and agency discourse as a 'hot spot' (Bottoms and Wiles 1992; Sherman 1989; Bottoms 1994) of delinquency, violence and racial attacks among young people. The research was interested in asking why this particular place had come to stand out in the region as having a reputation for violence and racism. Official data is examined and aggregated to build up a picture of racial violence and provide a socio-demographic profile of the area, paying particular attention to social conditions of young people.

The Economy

The town of Keighley has a population of around 67,000. It lies at the edge of Bradford Metropolitan District, a large conurbation, and borders North Yorkshire, a rural shire. Keighley is a major population centre (about a sixth of the whole Bradford district), and is geographically quite distinct from Bradford. Travel to work patterns identified in the 1981 census show that Keighley forms a focus of employment separate to Bradford, with relatively few people travelling to work between Keighley and Bradford. The implication is that the employment prospects of people living in the Keighley area will be closely tied to developments in the local economy (see Bradford Metropolitan Council 1988).

Keighley is still primarily a manufacturing town, with a disproportionate number of its population belonging to the Skilled Manual (44%) and Semi/Unskilled Manual (36%) working class, and only 11% belonging to Senior Management/Managerial Professional occupations, compared to the national average proportions for these occupations. In the private sector, Keighley's 30 largest firms are all manufacturers. This dependence upon manufacturing (almost 40% of the town's workforce are engaged in manufacturing compared with 32% in neighbouring Bradford and an average of 23% in Great Britain), although the proportion is declining, has quite distinct consequences for the future of the Keighley economy. Keighley's industries heavily concentrated in textiles and engineering, have been subjected to very strong competitive pressures in the last decade, which have led to substantial restructuring and local employment losses. The main manufacturing employers have been the woollen textile mills and engineering. These two sectors were worst hit by a fundamental shift in the employment structure of the area. Over the 1972-1984 period, 5,000 jobs were lost in the town's manufacturing industries. The textile and engineering sectors shed 3,000 and 2,200 jobs respectively, shrinking to little more than half their original size. The growth of the service sector to some extent made up for this loss in manufacturing. Recent losses, however, have not been offset, either by the growth of new activities within the area, or by inward investment. There are also comparatively low
levels of public grant assistance, compared to Bradford as a whole (BMDC, 1992). From 1984 - the year of the last employment census - to 1988, there were indications that Keighley’s employment situation had stabilised. However, in the course of the study, Keighley was once again experiencing economic recession, and the economic situation in the early 1990s had changed. Continued dependence upon manufacturing is combined with a rising youth population - partly as a consequence of the age-structure within ethnic minority groups, whereby the age structure of the Asian population is that over 50% are aged under 15 while only 1% is over pensionable age. This means that there is an increasing supply of youthful labour in a context of declining demand for this labour. This, taken together with an unfavourable economic structure, could result in disproportionate rises in unemployment over the next few years (Segal, Quince, Wickstead Limited, 1992).

Unemployment has had disproportionate effects on different groups and different areas. Unemployment is unevenly spread throughout the town ranging from 5.3% in the Craven Ward to 12.6% in Keighley South Ward. Taking smaller areas the differences are even more pronounced. The 1981 general population census revealed an unemployment rate of 22% on the Guardhouse estate and 14.6% in inner Keighley compared to 6% in the neighbouring village of Oakworth. Most of the Asian and some of the white young people the study spoke to came from those areas that are likely to experience highest unemployment. West Yorkshire statistics for 1984-1986 showed that unemployment amongst the Asian population was nearly three times as high as that of the white population. People of Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic origin - 95% of Keighley’s Asian population - were three and a half times as likely as whites to be unemployed. Young people as a whole disproportionately suffer unemployment - the rate for 16-19 year olds in the five Keighley wards in 1988 was nearly double the rate for 35-44 year olds. For 16-24 year old Asians, the national unemployment rate of 54% (Department of Employment 1988) was approximately three times that for young whites of the same age. This is confirmed by Bradford Council’s Careers Service statistics, which show that in 1987 only 20% of Asian 16 year olds who left school to look for a job were successful, compared to 45% for white school leavers. It seems almost certain that, as a group, Keighley’s young Asians are still bearing the brunt of unemployment in the town. It has more recently been suggested that currently perhaps only 30% of Keighley Asians are fully employed (Keighley Target 16/1/91). The survey found very high levels of father’s unemployment - approaching 50% - among Asian respondents.

The Youth Training Scheme can play a significant role in helping to alleviate unemployment among Keighley’s Asian school leaver’s: in 1987 42% of those seeking work went into YTS - an identical proportion to white school leavers. However 38% of Asian young people leaving YTS found jobs, compared with 50% of white YTS leavers. More recently, however, local training agencies and the

---

86 This situation is similar to nearby Bradford where population projections suggest that the size of the mostly Muslim population falling into the ages of 14-20 is set to double over the next decade, and that Asian young people will be 25-30% of the total youth population in the city at these ages (City of Bradford Metropolitan Council 1995, Population Trends 1991-2011). This has a number of implications which I cannot go into here but very low levels of educational achievement among Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin young people will compound the problem of youth unemployment (see Jones 1993; Modood et al 1994).
Careers service reported to the study that substantial numbers of both Asian and white young people neither joined YT schemes nor entered employment. It is unclear what has happened to these young people and what it is they are doing.

The local economic situation as it effects young people can be summarised. Over the period of the study, unemployment levels had been rising faster in Keighley than in surrounding towns. There was a slight overall decline between 1984 and 1989 in the total number employed in Keighley, whereas employment in the wider Yorkshire and Humberside region rose by almost 15% (Segal, et al., 1992). Demographic factors suggest the situation could deteriorate further. There is a rising proportion joining the local labour force from ethnic minority groups, whose members tend to lack the skills needed in the job market, and are discriminated against, and are much more likely to be unemployed.

Finally, although unemployment has special effects on different groups such as white and Asian young people, and on different areas within Keighley, it is not the only factor that contributes to economic deprivation. Low wages are a major issue in the Keighley area because of the dominance of low wage industries, both in the traditionally low paying textile industry and in the service sector. Also, the design of domestic dwellings on white estates like Brackenbank, family breakdown and lack of basic leisure amenities, place particular pressures on white young people and can exacerbate family and generational tensions within households, contributing to homelessness and offending. In conclusion, inner Keighley and the council estates of Guardhouse and Brackenbank are the areas of highest unemployment, suffering from the worst overcrowding, and having least access to a car.

The local economy has influenced the social conditions of many of the young people the study targeted, in terms of the constraints and opportunities of youth labour markets, training and economic structure. This is linked to the age structure and demography of the town and the burdens and implications of this for demands on youth provision.

Social and Demographic Structure

Keighley’s core population of 45,120 is 10% of the metropolitan area’s 457,344, and includes 5,859Asian people of which 80% are Pakistani, 15% Bangladeshi and 5% of other New Commonwealth origin (Census, 1991, Bradford Metropolitan Council 1988, 1989). Asian people make up 13% of Keighley’s population. Taking the Bradford Metropolitan area as a whole to include Keighley, people of New Commonwealth origin (including those from Pakistan) make up 14% (62,243) of the population. Although now officially part of Bradford Metropolitan District, Keighley (set in a valley about 9 miles from central Bradford) has remained an autonomous geographic and economic space in which inhabitants have staunchly maintained a separate identity. Keighley and many of its inhabitants are

---

87 The Asian population is likely to be higher than this because for various reasons the 1991 Census undercounts this group. Local estimates suggest a figure nearer 6,300.
characterised by a relative insularity - by way of both structural factors and self-perceptions - which has arisen through a variety of conditions and which has had numerous consequences, especially for its Asian residents.88

Continued economic expansion necessitated a larger workforce, which therefore led to immigration. Following soon after the Second World War, measures to stimulate economic reconstruction involved the immigration of people from a variety of eastern and western countries. During the 1950s and 1960s, Keighley received a large influx of Asian migrants during a time when the town's total population was declining and its economic base, the textile industry, was shrinking. As throughout West Yorkshire, the industry was able to maintain itself by installing machinery that required continuous running, and by hiring workers such as Asian migrants who were willing to undertake shift work, and receive wages which were unattractive to indigenous labourers. Arguably the type of majority ethnic resentment of these processes found in Pearson's study of the Lancashire cotton industry discussed earlier does not and probably did not apply to the same extent in the Yorkshire woollen industry partly because Asian migrant workers were more accepted as a replacement work force, as white male workers migrated to the better paid engineering industry (see Fevre 1984).

During this period, only a relatively small number of Asians actually settled in Keighley; many lived in Bradford or other nearby urban areas, only commuting to Keighley for work. As time passed more and more Asians arrived in Yorkshire through 'chain migration' networks and settlement in Keighley increased (Butterworth 1967: 4). Butterworth (1967: 5) noted that the process of family reunification was much later in Keighley due to the comparatively more recent settlement of male migrants there. In the 1960s, 94% of Keighley's Asian migrants were employed in the textile industry. Although this fact is no different from elsewhere in Yorkshire, Keighley exhibited a greater tendency toward racial exclusion in employment. This was to have effects on the formation of distinctive and separate social and economic spheres for Asians compared to whites. A survey of 55 firms conducted by the Junior Chamber of Commerce at this time showed that only 31% would employ Pakistanis, while 22% were ambiguous or would not state their view and no less than 47% said they would not (ibid.: 51). Further, of six West Yorkshire areas, in the mid-1960's, 'Keighley...was shown to be the only area in which there were no white collar workers who were immigrants, although 470 immigrants were employed as manual workers' (ibid.: 52). There was also evidence of 'fewer immigrants with higher qualifications in places such as Keighley, where settlement is relatively recent, than in the main and continuing centres of immigrant settlement such as Bradford and Leeds', and in Keighley 'The question of immigrants getting less money than local workers has arisen on a number of occasions'. Keighley young Asians are likely to be influenced by parents, who on the whole have low levels of education and are from manual backgrounds. The evidence is that unlike Bradford, there is no Asian middle class in

88 Some of the following discussion about the Keighley Asian community borrows from Vertovec's 1992 study.
Keighley and this has had considerable implications for the town’s Asian population, particularly in its inability to influence local politics or publicise its experiences and position in the town.

Housing conditions among Keighley Asians have remained poor since the earliest days of settlement by unaccompanied male migrants. However, racially segregated residential areas are partly the result of Asian migrants having moved into depopulated parts of the town, into housing often designated for slum clearance adjacent to industrial works (Butterworth 1967: 53-4). This reflected on the one hand the desire to own property and, on the other, the continued concentration of men without their families in multi-occupied houses. ‘97% of the immigrant respondents from the Keighley area said that they hadn’t considered local authority accommodation’ (Butterworth ibid.: 53). There is a particularly acute housing need in the older central part of Keighley where for the most part the Asian community lives mainly in owner-occupied housing. Two thirds of the houses are considered to be over-crowded with 12% lacking basic amenities (BMC 1988:37). This is likely to put pressure on young Asian males to stay out of the house and on the street, in the parks or at some other leisure place. In fact, 51% of Asian respondents to the survey cited ‘poor housing’, as the ‘biggest or a big problem’ in Keighley. This can exacerbate family and generational tensions within households.

An important factor in Keighley’s demographic make up is the youthfulness of its Asian population, and to an extent the prevalence of males in this population, compared to both the white population in Keighley and compared to, say, Bradford’s Asian population. In 1981 over 51% of Keighley’s Asians were under 15 years old (three-quarters of whom, moreover, were born in the UK). The gender ratio among these young people were as even as expected. Yet among those born abroad, Pakistani males outnumbered females 10:7, while Bangladeshis were in a ratio of 2 males to 1 female (Vertovec 1992). Although this demography does not explain the high proportion of young Asians who are victims or their prevalence of offending, or offending and victimisation patterns or processes, it could suggest that the simple prevalence of a category - young males - in the population that are likely to be targeted for racial attack, can contribute to their ‘availability’ as victims. This demographic structure is accounted for in the rather late reunion of Asian families in Keighley - most women and children joining their Husband and fathers during the course of the 1970s and 1980s (with Bangladeshis undergoing the process most recently).

Whilst some Muslim Asian young people themselves may not be so religious and pious, they do see themselves as belonging to a community of faith. However, the informal controls on Muslim youth from their parent culture are considerable, and more often than not, are experienced as oppressive. Internally, the Keighley Muslim community could be characterised as being relatively unified, compared to Muslim communities elsewhere in Britain. This is partly due to the high degree of communal (Mirpuri/Punjabi) unity exhibited by the Muslim Association, and little factionalism, as elsewhere in Britain. This is because almost all members are of the same original socio-economic and geographic provenance (i.e., a rural background in Mirpur and vicinity), and kinship (biraderi) or
caste (quom) groups are given formal representation in the Muslim Association's decision-making body. Many Mirpuris in Keighley belong to one of some half-dozen close-knit, extended family groups who settled in the town through 'chain migration' (see Vertovec 1992). The overall effect is a feeling among young Asians in the town that 'everyone knows everyone else's business'. While the Keighley Muslim Association has succeeded in many ways in uniting and providing for the Pakistani community at large, it has not succeeded in supporting or integrating the desires, needs and energies of the large number of young Muslims. Although some young Muslims participate in association run events, many attest to feeling alienated from the association and its decision-making elders. There is no youth wing or subgroup for young people. A great many young Muslims in Keighley believe in their faith and are staunch in their identity, but are not happy with the more rigid devotional practices and forms of religious instruction. Instead, they say they would like to be taught Islamic values of 'relevance' to their lives here and now in Keighley. The growing presence of Pakistani families in Keighley stimulated a new self-consciousness, and the building of a Mosque in 1975, which underscored Muslims sustained presence in their own eyes. A Muslim Community Centre was opened in January 1991, and, in late 1991, after a considerable amount of negotiation with the local authorities, the Jamia Mosque was given permission to make azan (the call to prayer) through loudspeakers on top of the building.

There are other ways in which Keighley Asians are excluded or segregated from Keighley whites, and this is compounded by the ways in which Asians in Keighley live and work in rather encapsulated social and spatial enclaves. By this is meant that there is a certain embeddedness in small localities that become strongly bounded. The situation for both Asians and whites is to live and work in discrete localities with strong symbolic boundaries. Firstly, mobility within parts of Keighley and between Keighley and other towns is said to be low among most residents and among Asians in particular: most tend to engage in work or social life within their own locality among their own ethnic group. The survey identified discrete leisure patterns among white and Asian young people, as well as specific parts of town frequented by each - or places, in the case of many Asians, avoided for fear of racist abuse, harassment and attack. In schools, too, (perhaps the only 'statutory' meeting and mixing place for Asians and whites) teachers point to separate friendship and socialising patterns among pupils which very largely reflect racial and ethnic attributes. This is confirmed in the Keighley data when the study asked Asian and white young people to identify and construct a 'mental map' of areas they do or do not frequent for fear of attack, harassment or abuse.

This section has highlighted, through focusing on the situation for Asians, the significance of age and ethnic structure of the youth population along a series of dimensions that draw out what is common to Asian and white young people and what differentiates and segregates them in terms of residential and leisure patterns. This illustrates some of the conditions that may give rise to inter-racial conflict among Keighley young people. Locality and territorialism, it is suggested, are key dynamics operating on these tensions in terms of residential patterns, use and perception of space, and fear of crime and racial harassment.
Youth Provision

It was reported to the study by youth workers, teachers, police officers, council officers and young people themselves that youth and leisure facilities in Keighley are inadequate. Keighley's leisure provision includes a cinema, pubs, an under 18 Disco, wine bars, approximately twenty youth centre type provision, leisure arcades and coffee bars. Keighley youth also use the local parks bordering the town centre, Lund, Devonshire and Victoria Parks, and the Leisure Centre complex in Victoria Park. Asian youths tend to frequent the library, the parks, the Leisure Centre and two Youth Clubs in or close to Asian residential areas that came into existence in the course of the study.

What appears to have emerged are highly segregated leisure patterns between white and Asian youth. For Asian youth, leisure is more localised, often home based and provided by the voluntary or public sector whereas for white youth (in Bradford as well as Keighley), 'leisure is outgoing, conspicuous consumption provided by the commercial sector, often in pubs, wine bars, discos, etc.' (BYRT, 1988). Clearly though, these patterns are highly dependent on age and disposable income, and it seems certain that significant numbers of white and Asian young people compete for leisure space in the parks - places that are still free and are away from adult surveillance.

Schools and 'White Flight'

For wholly maintained schools there is a three tier system of education in Keighley with children transferring from first schools at nine to middle schools and then on to upper school at thirteen. Of the three upper schools in Keighley, Oakbank Grammar and Greenhead Grammar89 had reputations as sites of racial conflict. (The third school, Holy Family, is predominantly Roman Catholic, and has 20% of the town's upper school population). Greenhead has 1,000 students and is situated in the northern suburbs. The school, in 1991 was approximately 64% white, although the ratio of white to Asian students is rapidly changing to numerically favour Asians. As a result of three serious and highly publicised racial incidents in 1981, and January and October 1985 associated with the school, a thorough going review and implementation of school policy and action towards racial incidents took place. These changes have promoted a high profile approach to racial incidents and the school continues to give considerable attention to this problem. Because of its history, Greenhead has addressed racial incidents in a more systematic way than Oakbank and has a highly developed policy. Oakbank has more recently evolved a racial attack monitoring system. Both schools, it must be said, have developed rigorous monitoring and disciplinary procedures to counter inter-racial conflict at school. Although these have been effective in reducing white victimisation of Asian pupils, the effects on raising the consciousness of white pupils about racism seems to have been limited, and may in this area have become counterproductive. This is discussed further in the main study.

89 These are in effect comprehensive schools that have maintained their names as 'grammar' schools. This legacy is partly explained by the proximity of North Yorkshire which has a tripartite system of secondary education.
Both Oakbank and especially Greenhead have a significant Asian intake and it is this change in the racial composition of pupils within the Keighley area which has had an effect on the school situation. Both schools have experienced losses of white pupils by white parental choice. Given a high concentration of children in central Keighley, enrolment at schools there have been under considerable pressure. Due to such pressure, by the late 1980s, some 600 children from this area were attending first schools which were not the nearest to their homes (and thereby entering the 'feeder system' of other middle and upper schools). The majority of these are Asian. This has meant growing numbers of Asian children attending schools in non-Asian neighbourhoods, increasingly prompting the 'white flight' scenario in which white parents choose to send their children to schools further away because those close at hand are becoming 'too Asian'. Certain schools, consequently, have had to undertake active campaigns to maintain white pupils and attract new ones. Keighley Careers Service (1992) reported to the survey its estimate that 100 to 150 white young people in each of the age cohorts 11 to 16 were withdrawing from Keighley schools and moving over the county border to attend an all-white secondary school in North Yorkshire. This is approximately 16% of each age cohort. A good proportion of this movement might be accounted for by 'white flight'. However, there may also be an element of parents evaluating these more distant schools as academically better than those available in the town. It is bound to be difficult to disentangle these different motivations. To the extent that there is 'white flight' it is likely that racism among parents has fed such an attitude among young whites and, may have influenced the climate of racial tension around some Keighley schools. This context of a community discourse of white flight in relationship to the schools in the area from the figures presented here, clearly has an objective reality but whatever the specific evidence of school withdrawal and parents moving out of certain areas, its symbolic importance in the town is irrefutable, and creates a climate of racial exclusionism in a fairly overt way. Young people's assessment in the study of statutory and voluntary youth provision has indicated the relative paucity of provision and its racial segregation. This was the context and motivation for the studies concern with young people excluded from available leisure provision. The brief discussion of 'white flight' provides a background for the survey's description of racial segregation in Keighley. Anxiety surrounding 'white flight' is an important reason why schools should be concerned with the findings of the study and should be seen as a phenomena that can inhibit or encourage racial tension.

Crime And Victimisation Reported To The Police

So as to identify the particular profile of Keighley in comparison to other localities in the region, West Yorkshire Police statistics of reported racial incidents were aggregated and analysed both to compare different localities and to see if their relative positions in terms of the prevalence, location and types of reported incidents had changed over time.
Spread of Reported Racial Incidents in West Yorkshire

An overall research strategy employed by the study was firstly, to aggregate police records which were normally kept as discrete annual descriptions of racial incidents, to show 'entrenchment' or concentration in specific locations over time. Secondly, the study asked both victims and perpetrators of racial harassment to produce cognitive maps (see above) of the locations of these experiences and how and whether these locations changed over time. Both the mapping of police statistics and cognitive mapping from victims and perpetrators gave a view of 'dispersion' and 'entrenchment'.

Police statistics for the region plotted from 1985 to 1992 demonstrated that Keighley possesses a characteristic entrenchment consistently recording high levels of reported racial incidents when compared to other areas in the region (see table 1 in appendix 2, and chart 4 in appendix 1). The regional perception of the town as a place of violent racial attacks seems to be born out, and it is only relatively recently that other, not dissimilar towns in the region are themselves gaining a 'reputation' for racial hostility. According to West Yorkshire Police statistics, Keighley suffers from a disproportionately high level of juvenile crime and racial attacks.90 Juveniles under 17 years, committed 520, 470 and 410 offences in 1987, 1988 and 1989, compared to an average of 469 for the remainder of Bradford Metropolitan District (excluding Central Bradford). In addition to its popular perception as a generally violent town, Keighley also stands out in the region for its notorious public record of racial incidents. Despite having only 10% of the Metropolitan area's Asian and Black population, Keighley reported 41.6% of the area's 'racial incidents' in 1988. As well as reporting the highest number of racial incidents in the metropolitan area, Keighley recorded more incidents than any other police sub-division in West Yorkshire. In 1987 and 1989, in fact, Keighley was said to have the worst such record in the country (Keighley News 27 March 1987; Keighley News 2 June 1989).91

The frequency, distribution and nature of these incidents now requires brief description. West Yorkshire Police 'Racially Motivated Incident Statistics', collected since 1985, show an average decrease in the number of racial incidents by 18% (Median 13%) throughout the region. Within the region, Keighley in particular shows a marked decrease admittedly from having the highest number in

---

90 These and the following figures are based on West Yorkshire Police Records, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992 and Keighley Sub-Division records.
91 Records show a peak of 65 reported incidents in 1987 and 66 in 1988, followed by a secular decline in reported incidents from 1989 to 1992. However this decline still represented high levels within an overall regional decline. The majority of offenders were white male and aged 12-16 years, and the main victims were young Asians (69% of incidents involved Asians as victims). The survey briefly examines these official records and their assumptions in section 3. Nevertheless, taking the latest ethnic minority population figures from the 1991 Census, over the period 1985-1992, the average risk of being involved in a racial incident per head of the Black and Asian population was 1:22 in Keighley, compared to 1:81 for the rest of the Bradford Metropolitan District. Although this figure does not take account of the variation of risk, because it does not disaggregate specific population groups most at risk, young males, it does give some indication of the scale of the problem for Keighley Asians. This 'at-risk' population is likely to grow because the age structure of the Asian population is very different to that of the area as a whole. Over 50% are aged under 15 while only 1% is over pensionable age. As far as juvenile offending is concerned, the prevalence (how much offending is happening), has been of concern in Keighley for some time, with official records showing consistently high levels of offending in the locality. Another concern was the inference by some concerned agencies that offending amongst some young Asians was increasing, as they began to 'catch up' with offending levels among some of their white peers.
1988 and 1989. There were large variations between police Sub-Divisions, although the overall trend is that incidents peaked in 1986 and 1987 then subsequently declined in most areas up to November 1992.

Any meaningful comparison between Sub-Divisions would have to take into account variation in socio-demographic conditions as well as ethnic population size between areas, which could also affect our perception of trends. However looking at the data a reasonable assumption to make is that most incidents occur in or near areas with a significant minority ethnic concentration, therefore extracting these areas we can compare them more easily (Table 1, Appendix 2). This regional picture indicates the obvious fact that the persistence and spread of racial incidents reflects the location of significant or substantial ethnic minority populations, putting simply, the availability of actual or potential victims. However, even among localities having ethnic minority populations, there are marked differences which show a particular and long lasting entrenchment in some localities compared to others. Keighley’s share of the Bradford District’s racial incidents was 28% in 1986, 39% in 1987, reaching 42% in 1988 and then declining to 27% in 1989. Over the eight year period 1985-1992, Keighley reported 25% of all incidents in Bradford Metropolitan District, over twice as many as you would expect given its 10% share of the District’s ethnic minority population over this period. The selected areas follow a similar pattern of change in level of racial incidents. A peak in 1985 to 1987 followed by an incremental decrease in activity, from an annual mean of 29 incidents for all the areas in 1986 to one of 17 in 1989 with the trend being one of decline until 1991, followed by a further decline in 1992.\textsuperscript{92} Looking at Chart 4 (Appendix 1), areas show somewhat different rates of increase and decline, with the overall trend peaking in 1986 and 1987, but with important counter trends such as those in Batley/Spen and Dewsbury in 1991. These differentiated rates are a complex question, but we would need to take

\textsuperscript{92} West Yorkshire Police Community Affairs Department supplied a breakdown of the ethnic make-up of Sub-Divisions in their region. This information was drawn from community policing experience. This was subsequently checked with 1981 census information held by the five Authority areas: Calderdale, Halifax, Wakefield, Leeds and Bradford. Despite the paucity of population data on ethnic composition from the 1981 Census, a reasonably accurate profile was drawn up for each Sub-Division. The exercise was made easier because Police Divisions are reasonably co-terminus with local authority, probation and court areas. Sub-divisions roughly conform to electoral wards but are in any case comparable through numbers of residents although organised on an operational basis of arterial routes. Sub-Divisions were then disaggregated and showed a clear, if unsurprising, relationship between presence of significant ethnic minority populations and higher levels of racial incidents, compared to Sub-Divisions having low ethnic populations coinciding with low levels of racial incidents. Furthermore, this relationship is maintained over the period under consideration. Table 1 (Appendix 1) summarises racially motivated incidents in Police Divisions in West Yorkshire, having significant ethnic minority populations, over the period 1985-1992. Of course a strict comparison would require precise ethnic minority population size in each area to be able to calculate the different risk ratios - population size divided by the number of incidents. Another problem is the possibility of different reporting and recording patterns and practices between areas, with Sub-Divisions having different formal and informal priorities according to local conditions.

\textsuperscript{93} However, there are significant differences between areas, with Holbeck and Keighley having annual means of 37 and 33 incidents over the period compared with annual means of 11 for Manningham and Wakefield. Median measures confirm these comparisons and are more likely to take account of the skewed distribution of incidents from a higher number at the beginning of the period, tailing off towards the end (see Table 1 in Appendix 2). In 1987 there were 65 incidents in Keighley compared to the next highest of 66 in Holbeck and a median of 21 (mean 27.8) for all our selected areas. Significantly, Keighley experienced the largest reduction in reported racial incidents between 1987 and 1990 of 85% reducing by around 20% between 1987 and 1988 and 48% between 1988 and 1989. Of course, because the overall trend is downward (average 25% for all selected areas for 1988-1989) in most of our selected areas we are unable to infer whether the reduction in reported racial incidents in Keighley, was associated with any specific local conditions. For example, Holbeck experienced a 53% reduction between 1988 and 1989. A more detailed analysis is suggestive of a definite clustering of racial incidents at three different times of the year. These are, June, July and September; January and February, and March and April. Interestingly, these periods approximately coincide with the beginnings and endings of school terms. Without more detailed data on specific dates, it is not possible to further test this highly suggestive hypothesis. It might be that school terms, and their beginnings and endings mark out a calendar of old scores to be settled and new ones to begin, for the school age population. These are also periods where teachers surveillance and control becomes more lax.
account of local factors to explain different rates of increase and decline such as the highly publicised ‘white flight’ from a Dewsbury school in 1990, and widespread public disorder in Dewsbury and Bradford associated with ‘Anti-Rushdie’ rallies in 1991. Other factors, in addition to size and demographic structure of local ethnic minority populations, are variations in reporting and recording patterns. Although we should not place too much weight on these findings alone, in a provisional way they can be regarded as estimates of the spread and persistence of racial harassment across the region.

Another question concerns which ethnic groups are most likely to be perpetrators or victims of racial incidents. The distribution of perpetration and victimisation amongst majority and minority ethnic groups indicates the likelihood of being either a victim or perpetrator by ethnic background. Chart 5 (appendix 1) shows victim/offender analysis for the region from 1985-91, and the overall picture is of an overwhelming dominance of white on Asian attack. However, there is a significant decline of such attacks compared to a significant increase in Asian on white attacks from 1989.

Whether this is atypical or signals a secular future trend remains to be seen. However, as will be seen, the self-report data does suggest in the locality studied, a significant increase in Asian on white retaliatory attacks. However, when ‘Not known on Asian’ attacks are taken into account, that is the victim couldn’t identify the ethnic identity of the perpetrator, but alleged racial motivation, then Asians are 66% of all victims for the whole period.

White on Asian incidents are nearly half of all reported racial incidents and clearly Asians are most likely to be victimised, and by whites.

Turning to the varieties of racial incident shown in Chart 6 (Appendix 1), damage to property constitutes the largest category of racial incident followed by violence, abuse, threat and nuisance with violence being a quarter of all incidents, and abuse, threats and nuisance a third. Of course these regional figures for the period provide only partial information, for they say little about the relationship between these types of incidents in the experience of the victims over time. For example, Hesse’s

94 In 1987, Asians were over seven times more likely to be victims than whites, whereas by 1991 this had reduced to just over twice as likely (and this on the assumption that ‘not known’ attacks on Asian, are all racially motivated). Up to 1989, the mean proportion of racial incidents that attribute white victimisation to Asians as perpetrators, was 10.5% of all reported incidents. In 1990, 23%, then in 1991 24% attributed white victimisation to Asians. The mean proportion of incidents over the whole period up to 1989, that attributed Asian victimisation to whites was 47%. That is, 47% of all incidents could be described as involving an Asian victim and white offender. Although 1990 was consistent with this figure at 46%, 1991 saw a decline of white on Asian incidents to 34% of total incidents reported.

95 We might also take into account, the possibility of changes in reporting and recording practices, for example the greater willingness of whites compared to Asians to report interethnic incidents as racially motivated, or even the greater willingness of the police to record such incidents as racially motivated - an ironic if unintended effect of a raised awareness of racism and racially motivated attacks towards the end of the period among whites and/or police officers.

96 These categories may suffer from the fact that police report statistics tend to rely on legal definitions and categories whereas it might often be the case that harmful behaviours having racial motives are in themselves not technically criminal. Racially motivated behaviour doesn’t necessarily encompass criminal or illegal acts. Nevertheless West Yorkshire Police’s definition of a racial incident (see below) suggests a wide range of behaviours could qualify for inclusion under the heading ‘racial incident’. Assuming that this definition is applied when officers decide whether an incident is racial or not, and that these decisions are translated into official recording, police records ought to give us a reasonably accurate guide to the variety and types of recorded incidents.

97 Measures and evaluation of ‘seriousness’ are controversial but it is likely that many of these incidents would, according to conventional, legal or police criteria, be considered trivial. This view may be strengthened if we refer to Chart 8 (Appendix 1) which shows a relatively high level of attribution of racial motive by Asian victims to unknown offenders. Given that these attributions are most likely when considering damage to property incidents (because the nature of these type of attacks make offender identification less likely than other significant types of incident), then the view of ‘triviality’ might be supported to some degree, at least for a large minority of incidents.
evidence suggests that racial abuse is also the most common precursor of other forms of racial victimisation (such as assault, and in the absence of the victim(s) retaliating, damage maybe done to their property, Hesse, Ibid.: 152-3). Here we can speak of 'a racial victimisation scenario', in which particular places are used as settings for certain types and combinations of racial victimisation. It is clear from Chart 6 (appendix 1) that the mostly young and non-white population is subject not only to criminal assault, but to a variety of harassing incidents ranging from intimidation and verbal abuse to petty vandalism and physical attack. Lea and Young (1984) have stated that: 'The crime (racial attack) sticks in our mind as the most distant example of [such] anti-social behaviour, but it is only the tip of the iceberg. A lot of the more frequent, every day offences are scarcely criminal - they are 'just' kids fooling around but they are part of the same appalling aggression towards defenceless people.' The Islington Crime Survey (1986) when discussing categorisation of racial assaults and problems of respondent response has suggested 'It would seem...that some segments of the population are so over exposed to this kind of behaviour that it becomes part of their everyday reality and escapes their memory in the interview situation, indicating that our estimate is probably low'. Chart 7 (Appendix 1) shows that over the period reported racial incidents were most likely to happen in the street or in and around houses or private grounds, followed by shops or businesses suggesting that over half happen in the public arena, in what might be considered as 'racially contested' places (see Husband 1981).98

In summary then, reported racial incidents in West Yorkshire over the period 1985 to 1991/2 indicate wide variation between localities in the region in the prevalence of racial incidents. At the simplest level most incidents occur in the areas where non-white populations are concentrated. Nevertheless, even between these areas there is a wide variation with Keighley and Holbeck suffering an annual average of 33 and 37 incidents compared with only 11 in the Manningham and Wakefield areas. The overall regional trend is that incidents peaked in 1986-1987 and have since shown a downward trend. Incidents are more likely to occur in the spring and less likely to occur in winter. White on Asian attacks were nearly half of the total, but if include incidents where the offender is unknown, 69% of all incidents involved Asians as victims up to 1990. Most incidents occurred either in the street or in and around houses and private grounds. The majority of incidents ranged from damage to property, assault, through to abuse, threats and nuisance. The overall pattern of variation between localities, time of year, offender-victim analysis, and place and type of incident, remained fairly constant from one year to the next within the downward trend. A recent development is an increase of reported Asian on white attacks. The significance and longevity of this trend has yet to be established, although the self-report data from the survey would appear to support the idea that this development is important and perhaps marks a shift in the patterning of racial incidents. The prevalence of reported racial incidents in the

98 Supplementing this information with self-report data, allows both a more accurate and specific analysis, and comparison of official estimates and the actual experiences of victims and perpetrators. A Home Office Study of 'racially motivated' incidents reported to the police carried out in 1987, found that over 26% of all racially motivated incidents took place on a local authority estate or in the victim's council house or flat. While 18.5% of incidents took place in the street and just over 11% of incidents took place in shops owned or worked by victims (Seagrave, 1989). Both this and the West Yorkshire Police figures point to households and the street as the main places where racial harassment occurs. This finding is contradicted by evidence from our self-report survey, and again points to the specificity of locality.
locality studied was the highest in the region when the study began but subsequently the reporting of attacks declined.

Using local and Regional Statistics

What sense are we to make of these local and regional trends? Hesse et al. (1992) point out the uses and relevance of local official and police statistics in their account of racial harassment in Walthamstow in that, 'Figures are essentially symptomatic of entrenched social behaviour in particular places and locales which need to be appropriately patterned' (ibid.: 132). They go on to reiterate a well rehearsed argument that 'reporting of incidents of racial harassment or any other crime to agencies does not necessarily reflect the recording of those complaints. The statistics compiled reflect the particular recording practices of those agencies. This means that incidents not reflected in the statistics will consist of levels of non-recording as well as non-reporting' (ibid.: 132-3). Although Hesse et al. are correct, this study is more cautious in relegating official police statistics to a secondary role in that they may be good indicators of underlying trends. Indeed the analysis of West Yorkshire racial incident statistics suggests a remarkable congruence between official reporting patterns and what seems to be happening on the ground in terms of reporting. The self report survey discussed in chapter seven revealed a willingness on the part of whites to report their victimisation by Asians, and this is reflected in the changing pattern of police statistics. Nevertheless this study in many respects followed the methodological injunction proposed by Hesse et al. 1992:134):

'The failure to report racial harassment seems to say more about the experience of dissatisfaction with local agencies responses than about the lack of impact of the incident itself. In order to develop an understanding of the problem we need to look beneath the issues raised by the statistics of under-reporting. Quite simply we need to focus on people's experiences of their surrounding locations. We need to be particularly sensitive to the fact that the pervasiveness of racial harassment appears to be shaped by its entrenchment in particular places over time and its dispersion across various locations. We need to conceptualize this as a pattern.'

Although 'The key problem in conceptualising a pattern however has been the temporal basis of these statistics, their yearly periodization as aggregates of random incidents' (ibid.: 134)99, ironically, it is the consistent levels of recorded police statistics when aggregated (which are 'random') both over time and across localities, which point to the pervasiveness, longevity and regularity of racial harassment, i.e. its non-random nature. If experiences are contextualised beyond the statistical, to the significance of the 'cartography of racial harassment' in the lives of victimized communities as they 'lived' its geography and history (ibid.: 135), then racial harassment can be patterned in terms of its spread, defined as both its

---

99 West Yorkshire police racial incident statistics are normally kept as a series of discrete and incremental annual statistics, therefore it is difficult to discern a pattern from this type of information, and this has obscured the persistent spatial recurrence of racial harassment. Remarkably these statistics have been collected on a monthly basis since 1985 but are not aggregated or analysed by the police themselves. This procedure was followed here so as to establish a discernible pattern over time and across localities from the mass of random information which West Yorkshire Police provided.
entrenchment and dispersion. This particular form of aggregating official statistics can be complemented and compared with self-report data generated through asking young people to cognitively map their victimising experiences. Young people's 'mental mapping' of the locations of these experiences serves to clarify the 'randomness' and patterns of victimisation. It is possible for people to cognitively survey the distribution of actual and possible victimisation experiences in particular settings (Hesse 1992; Stanko 1990; Jackson 1989). In this way domains of relative safety or places to avoid become focal points in 'seeing' the social landscape. These perceptions and understandings of the social environment vary across race, gender, sexuality, class and so on. They also generally construct the basis of the lived relation to the surrounding locations: 'Clearly where this spatial awareness inscribes itself in the personal or social skills used to improvise strategies to cope with danger or to wrestle with safety considerations (see Stanko, 1990) a distinctive 'mental map' has emerged' (Hesse et al 1992:135). Victim's or perpetrator's mental or cognitive maps, then, disclose the spread of racial harassment where the historical incidence of racial harassment (i.e., its entrenchment) had stimulated a geographical awareness of its various locations (i.e., its dispersion). Hesse et al (1992:136) state that: 'Spatial experiences contain indicators of the locations and patterns of racial harassment. When combined with the statistics which arise from those complaints of racial victimization actually recorded by local statutory agencies (e.g. police, Housing departments), despite their limitations, we can begin to develop firmer indications of these spatial patterns.' This is demonstrated in the self report-data as well as in the official statistics analysed here. As will be seen in chapter seven when a comparison of mental maps offered by whites compared to Asians is made then the ways each community elucidates their sense of dispersion and entrenchment of racial incidents in the locality is revealed.

Discussion and Summary

This final section asks what differences of context account for marked contrasts in ethnic relations within the same region and between localities having significant minority ethnic groups? Are there processes and factors operating in the study area that distinguish it from other comparable areas that might predict there being high levels of violence and racial violence? Are there characteristics specific to the locality that might lead us to expect these behaviours? Wallman (1986) in attempting to operationalise and apply the theory of bounding process reviewed in chapter one to an empirical situation, offers some answers as to how these kinds of questions might be approached. She was concerned to examine the social context in which ethnicity is expressed by reporting those dimensions of context affecting ethnic relations in two inner London areas.

The two areas had very different 'local styles', one being a relatively closed and homogenous system and the other a relatively open and heterogeneous one, respectively, Bow and Battersea. Ethnicity counted for rather little in Battersea, whereas Bow was popularly considered to be a 'racist' area. Although the industrial and demographic history of Bow is known to be very different from Battersea's which in part accounted for their different 'local styles', both contain ethnically mixed neighbourhoods
and both cases provide opportunity for ethnic exclusion. Industrial structure, employment opportunities, labour movement, travel to work patterns, housing options, criteria for local ‘membership’ and political traditions were examined and compared between the two areas. This comparison is summarised in the diagram.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Battersea</th>
<th>Bow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Structure</td>
<td>Service industries prevalent</td>
<td>Manufacturing prevalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Opportunities</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Work Patterns</td>
<td>Locals move out to work</td>
<td>Locals stay in the area to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour Movement</td>
<td>Large night population</td>
<td>Large day population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Options</td>
<td>Mixed: private/public; rented/owned</td>
<td>Limited (94% public housing); less fluidity and flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Local resources</td>
<td>Many ‘gates’ and many routes of access to local resources, therefore difficulty for one ethnic group to monopolise them.</td>
<td>Fewer ‘gatekeepers’ and therefore control &amp; exclusivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for Membership of Local Community</td>
<td>If you behave like a local and stay around</td>
<td>Ascribed by birth or marriage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Traditions</td>
<td>South London Internationalist working class ethos</td>
<td>East End Nationalist working class ethos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Style</td>
<td>Open/Heterogeneous</td>
<td>Closed/Homogeneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wallman (ibid.: 242) found that ‘the more closed and homogenous the local structure, the sharper the recognition of ethnic difference on the one hand, and the less flexibility and resilience of the local economy on the other’, and that these differences are located in the way the system is bounded, i.e. they are about the different styles of organisation throughout the two local systems. In the Battersea/South London structure ‘there is no neat overlap of the domains of people’s lives or of the local resource systems…the people you live with are not likely to be the same as the people you work with or the people you drink with’ (ibid.: 242-243), whereas by contrast, in the homogeneous East London area the boundaries of the various systems overlap much more tightly: ‘The people you live with tend to be the same as the people you work with. You are likely to grow up with them, drink with them, marry their daughters, depend on them in everything. At the same time, the people who control information about jobs tend to be the same as the gatekeepers for housing, leisure opportunities, etc’ (ibid.: 243). In the Battersea case, the newcomer has only to breach one boundary, say housing, to
begin to be treated like a local, so that 'The longer you are there, the more 'local' you become, whatever your colour or ethnic origin' - including information about jobs which tends to be held locally (Wallman et al 1982: 182-3). Whereas in the Bow case 'If as a newcomer you want to be granted local status you actually have to breach all the boundaries together' (ibid.:1986:243) which is extremely difficult, because it cannot be achieved just by entering into one domain such as housing. This 'network effect' (ibid.:243) of these contrasting local systems is that in the more open heterogeneous Battersea case, most people have connections of different sorts outside it and 'because their ties spread more widely, the friends of their friends reach further, and they are more able to adapt, more able to pull in resources from other areas, less dependent on the local core'.

In areas where all your resources are in one overlapping local system, possibilities for adoption are much more limited, local relations are not linked with systems outside in the same way, and ethnic groups are more likely to remain distinct. Because incomers can only take up options that are there, members of minority ethnic groups who do move into the East End tend to live in ethnic enclaves, feel safer when living close together, and Asian groups in particular 'claimed that they must have vigilante or citizens' watch groups in order to protect themselves against racist attack' (ibid.:244). Whereas in the South London locality 'Neither the sense of ethnic collective danger nor the ethnic collective response are reported' (ibid.:244). Finally, the policy implication is 'that the same input of government or other outside resources will be distributed in different ways, and because the local systems are not equally adaptable or receptive of change and will react differently' (ibid.:244).

Clearly Wallman's model, which predicts the likelihood of strictly racial or ethnic conflicts, is important to the present study and many of the features and characteristics which she identifies as distinguishing one area from another can equally be applied to localities in the North of England. Although the study area was not compared with other localities in the region in a systematic way many of the local conditions which apply in Wallman's East End example could also be said to apply in the Keighley case study (also see Back's 1996 and Husband's 1989 comparisons which have similar implications). In terms of all the key areas identified by Wallman, and looking at the socio-demographic profile of the town above, Keighley can be said to 'fit' all the categories of differentiation of a closed and homogenous local system like Bow rather than Battersea, except in the single area of housing options. On all other criteria - dominance of manufacturing; narrowed employment opportunities; low levels of travel to work outside the town; highly localised and controlled access to leisure and other resources; local myths of origin expressed as 'being born and bred in the town' and conflict with 'offcomeders'; predominance of an insular working class - there are striking parallels with the conditions laid down by Wallman as predictors of inter-ethnic segregation and hostility. Of course some

100 That there are quite high levels of working class owner occupation in Keighley can be accounted for through the peculiarities of both the regional and local housing market in that within the region there is a surfeit of stone built back to back or terraced properties, a local tradition associated with the woollen industry of owner occupation in older properties, and Keighley has traditionally possessed the lowest cost owner occupation in the region (BMDC 1988).
101 People from surrounding towns and elsewhere.
or many of these conditions also apply to other West Yorkshire woollen textile towns like Dewsbury, Batley and Halifax having significant minority ethnic populations, but this in itself does not contradict the overall argument. Indeed close study of these comparable towns, if local conditions warrant it, may well reveal (and anecdotally do reveal) high levels of ethnic and racial conflict and violence. The themes outlined by Wallman will be referred to throughout the thesis.

More generally in terms of the studies initial theoretical framework of the boundary process (see Ibid.:244-245), it can be said that the significance of ethnicity and the expression of ‘racist’ sentiment and violence varies from one area to another because different ‘local styles’ and identity give it different scope. The character of a local system is governed in some part by the local industry structure - its degree of heterogeneity or homogeneity and that this homogeneous/heterogeneous dimension also effects boundary principles and processes. In the latter (like Battersea) localist principles are stronger: insider status can be achieved by residence and recognition, whereas in the former case (like Bow and Keighley) ethnic principles will tend to prevail: insider status will be ascribed by birth, in-marriage, etc. Of course both systems operate different kinds of localist ideology distinguished by whether it is exclusionist or inclusionist, and as Elias and Scotson demonstrated localism in its exclusionist sense can exist without the presence of ethnicity. Finally, the resilience of any system varies with the flexibility of its boundaries in the face of economic change or population movement, and here ‘a heterogeneous and open local structure offers more scope for generative and regenerative organisation’ (Ibid.:245).
CHAPTER FIVE

THE SURVEY: CRIME, VICTIMISATION AND RACIAL VIOLENCE

Introduction

The survey pursued three areas of concern; first, to map mostly male young people’s perceptions of, and knowledge about, local geographies of racial violence and crime; second, how this was manifest in young people’s fear of violence and crime; third, to establish the prevalence of offending and victimisation among the local male youth population. The overall aim was to discover whether and to what extent there might be a relationship between racial violence and other types of violence and crime, and the theoretical focus was on inter-area variation by location of victimisation and by fear of crime and violence. A supplementary interest was the usefulness and predictive power of control theory - whether a young person’s ‘attachment’ to social institutions predicts delinquency, anti-social behaviour and perpetration of racial violence. Information was sort about the nature and extent of crimes committed against young people, the ways in which crime and fear of crime effect young people, and informal strategies and techniques they adopt to cope with crime (all themes explored among adults in the Islington Crime Survey, see Jones et al 1986; Crawford et al 1990; and among young people in Anderson et al 1994).

It was felt that none of these concerns and issues can be understood in isolation from each or any of the others. The way in which questions about offending were joined to questions about victimisation was intended to explore the idea that many young people are victims of crime, but also that they can often commit the same crimes themselves. Essentially this is the question of whether or nor perpetrators and victims are different or the same persons. Perpetration and victimisation experiences can often mutually interact, in inconsistent, contradictory and confusing ways, especially in relation to racially motivated crime. An exclusive concern with racial victimisation which excluded perpetration, a characteristic of virtually all surveys of racial violence, would it was felt distort the place and reality of racial violence in the lives of young people. Overall, a lot of the data did suggest that among young people, offending and victimisation are primarily experiences of location.

Themes and Questions

Specifically the survey asked young people about whether they had perpetrated or had been victims of racial violence and crime to see if these different victimising and offending experiences were associated. Young people were asked about living in the town, and where they went, what they did, and

102 A small (36) ‘pilot’ sample of Asian and white girls and young women were included in the overall sample. The detailed findings from this female sample are not reported here because the numbers were too few to be statistically meaningful. The
whether certain things had happened to them. One of the things they said was that there was a lot of fighting, another that there wasn’t much to do or many places to go. The survey asked both general and specific questions about their town. Some of the young people said they were afraid to go to or walk through certain areas for fear of being chased or attacked. They were asked were there any areas they avoided and if so why? Were there areas that they would call ‘dangerous’ or ‘unsafe’, and why were they unsafe? Were there safe areas, and why were these safe?

Questions about racial violence asked whether the young person had been involved in fighting or abuse where the other person(s) was of a different race, and whether this was because of the other person’s race or for some other reason? Were they attacked or abused or did they attack or abuse someone else because they were of a different race, or for some other reason? Why did they do this/why was this done to them and did this happen often? They were also asked had they been involved in fighting or abuse where the other person(s) was of the same race and did this often happen? Why did they do this/why was this done to them and did this happen often? Was there any difference between this happening with people of a different and the same race?, and so on. The in-depth interviews presented in chapters six and eight aimed to uncover through what processes young people constructed racisms in their social environment, and what racism meant for them as victims and perpetrators of racialist actions. In relation to other types of offending, young people were asked had they ever done certain things that are against the law, or had anything ever been done to them that is against the law? How often and how recently?

Main Findings

The reader is referred to the charts and prevalence tables in the appendix one and two which summarise the detailed findings.

The survey was planned on the basis of local agency perceptions that there was a problem of youth crime in the area, and these perceptions were largely borne out by the survey findings. The study found high levels of offending (including status offences) among young people who agreed to participate in the survey, with 89% of these young people saying that they had at some time committed at least one offence, and 63% that they had offended recently - in the year preceding the survey interview. However, conventional views of the ‘youth crime problem’ as youthful delinquency primarily directed at older people requires reconsideration. Young people are at least as concerned about crime and fear crime as adults, primarily because they experience high levels of victimisation as well as offending. Startlingly high levels of criminal victimisation were found, compared to local crime surveys of adult populations (for example, Anderson et al 1990; Crawford et al 1990). Over a third of the total Asian sample had been victims of some crime. This went up to 37% for personal violence and 40% for...
vehicle damage. Many of these experiences of victimisation had happened recently in the year preceding the survey. Among whites, fully 62% had experienced personal violence, and a third had their family’s vehicle stolen and a third had a vehicle deliberately damaged. Again, there was much evidence of recent experiences of victimisation. At the same time offending was widespread with only 10% of young people saying that they had never offended, and 67% saying that they had offended recently. What was striking about these findings was the prevalence and normality of violent victimisation.

Looking at racial victimisation, the indications are that this type of victimisation among young people is widespread. Most racial violence against young Asians occurs in the parks, the town centre and at school, and is concentrated in particular parks. Racial insults follow a similar, but slightly more varied locational pattern. The survey’s findings are quite remarkable in regard to alleged racial victimisation of young whites. All previous research has suggested that those populations most likely to be victimised are Black and Asian populations. Because of this, white young people, as a specific group have not been asked about their experiences of racial harassment in any detail. On the basis of what young people told the survey these assumptions of white perpetrators and black victims are problematic. A third of the Asian males compared to 40% of white male respondents had experienced racial violence and a similar percentage of Asians to whites, over 60%, had experienced racial insults. Of these, over a quarter had experienced racial violence and more than half had experienced racial insults in the year prior to being questioned, again both groups reporting similar levels. Other forms of victimisation, especially from violence, were also very prevalent. Like for Asians, the main locations of this white victimisation were the parks and schools, although whites were much less likely to be violently assaulted in the town centre. The implications are discussed later, but the main finding is that many aspects of these forms of racism among young people were territorially based in the sense of victimised young people being in the ‘wrong’ area at the ‘wrong’ time in the context of highly racialised perceptions of public space.

Young people’s contact with crime, both as perpetrators and victims was a routine experience for many survey respondents. Fears and anxieties occasioned by such incidents were reflected in young people’s ‘fear of crime’ and the ways in which they identified crime as a ‘problem’. Young people were asked about their fear of crime in the area, and the strategies they deployed to avoid or reduce the risk of being a victim. Questions were couched in terms of whether and to what extent their decision whether to go out was influenced by fear of crime. For example they were asked about the relative safety of journeys and about whether they had been victimised. Of those who had been victimised, whether they, or someone acting on their behalf, had reported the incident to the Police. They were asked those who had reported an incident to the police, how they felt the problem was dealt with. Victims of racial abuse, harassment and violence were asked to detail their experiences.
When respondents were asked about their specific locality, crime followed by unemployment were seen as particularly serious problems by a large proportion of those interviewed. Although both white and Asian young people reported high levels of worry about crime, Asian young people were particularly worried about crime and becoming victims of crime. Most marked was the lack of mobility and movement of Asians in terms of going out compared to whites, and the large number of Asians identifying specific areas they avoided compared to a large number of whites who were unable to identify any areas they avoided for fear of being a victim of crime. White estates, parks and the town centre are all mentioned as places where there is, in effect, a *curfew* placed on Asian young people. Further, the main reasons cited for avoiding these areas are fear of being attacked and racial violence. White young people in their turn stated areas they avoided for fear of crime but generally felt much less restricted in their movements than Asians.

These findings are clearly important and raised a number of difficult questions about the discrepancy between the Keighley findings and both official and other local crime survey’s estimates of both the victimisation of young people and of their involvement in offending. Were such findings specific to the study area or would the same patterns be found in other areas? What, if any, was the relationship between offending and being the victim of crime?

A popular stereotype of young people is of their disproportionate involvement in delinquency and offending. While the survey was initially planned primarily as a survey of racial victimisation and secondarily as a survey of delinquency, it was important to understand whether and in what ways racial victimisation was connected to the other ways in which young people come into contact with crime. Young people were therefore asked to detail the variety of ways they experienced victimisation as well as their involvement in offending. By doing so, the study hoped to reveal two things, firstly that racial victimisation occurs in the context of a range of victimising experiences, second, to overturn the usual emphasis on the ‘delinquent’ - the young person as perpetrator rather than as victim of crime - and show the ways in which the different points of contact with crime are inter-connected. In short, that a more rounded view of young people’s experiences of crime, must include the fact that young people are major victims of crime as well as being offenders. Much official and police attention and resources are directed at apprehending and punishing young people as offenders, rather than supporting them as victims. In many respects, this imbalance is unwarranted, and may go some way towards explaining young people’s distance from and alienation from the police. Young people’s actual experience of crime is quite different to that portrayed in the media and other agencies.

**Detailed Findings of Victimisation**

Asian Young People’s Fear of Crime
Only 13% of Asian young people stated that they felt unsafe due to the fear of being a victim of crime in their home, but when asked about going out and the relative safety of journeys, 78% said that they did not use public transport after dark, and 58% said that their decision not to go into certain areas after dark was due a lot, or quite a bit, to the fear of becoming a victim of crime. Because only 29% said that they had use of a car, personal safety in using public transport played a large part in going out, but a third stated that when using public transport they were worried for their own safety after dark, and 20% avoided using public transport altogether due to the fear of being a victim of crime. There was a sub-sample within the general Asian sample participating in the victim support project discussed in chapter seven, and were those more likely to have been victims. They had more use of a motor vehicle, were more fearful of going into certain areas after dark, were generally more attuned than the general population sample to the dangers, and possible risk avoidance strategies associated with going out.103 As Chart 9 shows (Appendix 1) young people saw unemployment as the main problem in the area, but when asked about their specific locality, crime was seen as a particularly serious problem by a large proportion of those interviewed.

Comparison of Asian and White Young People’s Fear of Crime

Very few whites like Asians (The percentage figures from the Asian sample are in brackets) felt unsafe in their own home, and generally the issue of safety for young people is in relation to public space. Fully 78% (54%) of whites went out alone after dark, and only 14% (36%) of whites stated that they ‘worried a lot or quite a bit’ about being a victim of crime when they went out. On the other hand, 73% (58%) replied that their decision not to go into certain areas after dark was due a lot, or quite a bit, to the fear of becoming a victim of crime. Asians reluctance to use public transport after dark was matched by whites overwhelming willingness to do so.104 Charts 10-17 in appendix one describe young people’s perceptions and fear of crime and indicate the extent of concern or worry about crime in terms of not going out at night and avoiding certain people and places. Summarising these charts, both Asians and whites saw crime as the biggest local problem. Asians stayed at home more often, perhaps reflecting their perceptions of the safety of going out. Many avoided certain people and streets when they did go out. However, few young people carry any form of defensive weapon or alarm, instead finding safety in numbers. Fighting and racial tension were also mentioned by a large proportion of both Asians and white young people as significant problems.

Young people’s strong sense of community safety and danger seemed to be strongly associated with their perceptions of different localities in the town considered safe and those that were dangerous and thus best avoided. Charts 25-31, in appendix 1, represent young people’s cognitive mapping of certain places as carrying particular dangers and risks and by extension define other places as safe. The

103 The data on fear of crime is presented in appendix one.
104 66% of whites used public transport after dark compared to 78% of Asians who did not, and 92% of whites were not worried for their safety when using public transport compared to a third of Asians who were.
Cognitive maps of Asian and white respondents were almost a mirror image of each other, in which each avoided the other's area, with Asians in particular having a strong sense of areas they avoided. This suggests a highly racialised view of the area they live, and where they feel comfortable or safe. Asians avoided the white estates, certain parks and the town centre for fear of being attacked, racially harassed or to avoid fighting. Whites on the other hand were much more likely to state that there were no areas that they avoided or that they avoided the town centre and certain parks (usually where there were Asians). Whites and Asians tended to avoid each other in the parks and town centre. The charts stand out as indicating a strong sense of danger associated with particular localities, with Asians in particular mentioning white estates, parks and the town centre as places which exclude them, and where, in effect, they are under curfew. Asians unlike whites offer as the main reasons for avoiding these areas fear of being attacked and racial harassment. These different spatial ‘positionings’ (see Monmonier 1993) of Asian and white young people expressed in the ways they map or construct the local geography and topography, should be seen in time as well as space, in the sense that perceptions of dangerous and safe areas change as some areas are made secure and others are relinquished through processes of inter-racial fighting. Parks in particular seem subject to changes in their 'ownership’ by Asian or white groups, and are ‘zones of transition’ within the dynamics of inter-racial fighting. The maps presented here were the position in 1991-1992. Young are expressing the ways in which they are ‘seen’ by and ‘see’ others, where they feel they can be seen and where, if they were to be seen this would pose severe problems of personal safety and security. The convey the ever present possibility of violence by simply being in the wrong place at the wrong time. The frequency with which young people mentioned the same places as safe or dangerous points to a lot of agreement about the relationship of their own to other localities, and chart 25 can be read as the ‘Asian’ perspective and charts 27 and 28 the ‘white’ perspective.

Chart 25 suggests that for Asians certain white estates such as the Braithwaite estate are a particular source of threat, not because Asians are likely to go there, but as areas seen as sources of white racism and of white racists they meet or know, or they have heard about. Chart 27 shows that whites, despite their fear of ‘attack’, possess a less attuned sense of the local geography of danger than Asians, although they do associate parks in or near ‘Asian areas’ with danger, the town centre with drunks, and white estates with inter-estate rivalries in which someone from one estate needed to be careful when

---

105 White estates, parks and outlying areas are indicated in chart 25. Devonshire park is located in an intermediary area between white and ‘Asian’ areas; Cliffe Castle park is similarly placed but adjoins an Asian area; Victoria park is located in an Asian area. Lund park is further out from inner Keighley but adjoins a smaller more recently settled Asian community. All parks except Victoria are located on major route ways between white estates and the town centre. They are thus important markers for white youngsters routinely ‘going to and coming from town’ (see Evans 1995), whereby they pass areas ‘colour coded’ as ‘Asian’. It is this confluence of activities - parks adjoining Asian areas routinely used by Asian youth and whites passing through that makes the parks in the town particular foci and sources of racial violence and inter-racial fighting.

106 These types of chart can be compared in a number of different permutations in terms of agreement and disagreement about areas and their significance which generates further location charts and so on. For example, charts 27 and 28 are different ways of presenting the white perspective, although the overall pattern is clear. The charts offered here are examples from this exercise.

107 The study generated the white follow up sample from this estate discussed in chapter eight.
visiting another for fear of being attacked. As chart 31 shows, less whites than Asians mentioned fear of racial attack as a reason they avoided areas.

Victimisation of Asians

The survey asked young people whether certain things had ever happened to them (prevalence), and of those who answered that these things had happened to them, then whether they had happened in the last year (recency) and how many times (frequency). Frequency is not addressed here because the overall sample size was too small to give a reliable result.

Over a third of Asians had either been a victim of violence, or had their or their family's vehicle damaged, or had property stolen from a vehicle, or their home had been vandalised. Some had more than one of these things happen to them. Of these 21% had been a victim of a criminal offence, or a suspected criminal offence, in the past twelve months. Project participants clearly suffered higher rates of victimisation, and for them victimisation was more frequent.

Young people were asked whether a person or persons of a 'different race to themselves' had damaged their property, stolen from them, insulted them or had attacked them, then whether they thought this was racially motivated. That is whether they thought it had happened because they themselves were of a different 'race' to the perpetrator, or whether it had happened for some other reason. Asian young people who had been victims of damage and theft incidents involving an 'other race' perpetrator, stated that two thirds of perpetrators were aged 16 - 25 years old, and two thirds were identified as white. 18% of victims ascribed 'other race' status to apparently same 'race' perpetrators. This was mostly accounted for by an interpretation of 'different race' as also meaning ethnic group, usually Pakistani or Bangladeshi. Half of the incidents took place in the evening and a third had occurred in the morning. 43% had reported the incident to the police, however 82% of incidents were not detected by the police.

There is little evidence here of Asian young people being more likely to report offences to the police when the

108 An important factor influencing these perceptions of 'Asian' areas is the age profile of the area, created by the timing of settlement in some areas compared to others, in that areas comprising a longer established, more residentially concentrated Asian population, in which the age profile of Asian youth is older are perceived more as 'defensible space'. More recently established, usually Bangladeshi, communities, in ethnically mixed white and Asian areas, are seen as more dangerous for Asians.

109 Frequency is not addressed here because the overall sample size was too small to give a reliable result.

110 Reporting rates were quite high for 'criminal' victimisation. Asians who had a higher rate of being victimised were no different in their dissatisfaction with the police than the general youth population. Dissatisfaction with general police handling of reporting offences was high, as was dissatisfaction with the way individual officers treated them. 60% of Asian victims replied that they, or someone acting on their behalf, had reported the incident to the Police. Of those who did not report the incident to the police, 23% said that it would be pointless and 23% said that they considered the incident not serious. Of those reporting 15% stated they were satisfied, 31% were dissatisfied and 54% very dissatisfied with the way the police had dealt with the problem. (Only 22% of project participants were very dissatisfied indicating the success of the project in liaising with police officers). Young people's local knowledge of Community Officers was encouraging, suggesting an effective presence and influence on young people. 51% of Asians stated that there was a particular police constable responsible for the area, 23% said that there was not, and 26% answered that they did not know. 51% of non- and 31% of participants thought that the police had a good understanding of the problems in the area and 37% thought they did not. Overall there were clear differences between the general Asian youth population and participants - those who generally were more likely to have had direct experience of crime, either as victims, offenders or both.

111 Charts 32 and 33 derive from the question 'Has anyone of a different 'race' ever [been violent; damaged or stolen your property; insulted you]?' This was then followed by the question 'Do you think this was done to you because you were of a different race to the person who did it. That is, was the incident racially motivated?' The results were weighted so as to supply a more accurate comparison between Asian and white samples. It is important to realise when reading these charts that the percentages for 'last year' describe behaviour that happened recently for those respondents who initially answered that they had been victimised at some time in the past.
perpetrator has been identified as 'different race', when compared to the above findings for general criminal victimisation. However, when asked whether they thought the damage or theft was racially motivated half said that they believed that it was and a third that the incidents were not racially motivated.

Unlike theft and damage, racial attributions associated with abuse were less ambiguous. 71% of perpetrators were aged 16-25 and 18% were under 16. 90% of perpetrators were identified as white. Half the incidents took place in the afternoon and 42% in the evening. 90% stated that they had not reported incidents to the police and of those few reported 89% were not detected by the police. Fully 86% of Asian young people who had been insulted thought that the insult(s) were racially motivated. 64% of Asian males reporting that they had been racially victimised in some way and of these 26% had experienced racial violence in the year leading up to the survey, whilst 55% had experienced racial insults. Perpetrators of racial violence tend to be in groups of two or three, and in groups of two to five when perpetrating racial insults. Most racial violence against young Asians occurs in the parks, the town centre and at school, and is concentrated in particular parks (Chart 34). Racial insults follow a similar, but slightly more varied locational pattern. Asian victims tend to be older than white victims (Chart 35). Generally criminal victimisation of Asian young people was high, particularly offences of personal violence.  

Victimisation of Whites

The survey's findings are quite remarkable in regard to racial victimisation of young whites, and require some elaboration. Because all previous studies (for example, Hesse 1992, Home Office 1981, Home Affairs Committee 1982, Bowling 1991, Layton-Henry 1984, Brown 1984, CRE, 1987 ), have found the main victims of racial harassment and racial attack to be Black or Asian, research has focused on Black and Asian populations, those most likely to be victimised. White young people, as a specific group, have not been asked about their experiences of racial harassment in any detail, and perpetrators have been ignored. And yet young white males told the study that they had been abused and attacked by Asians in quite large numbers (Chart 33). The figures for Asians are in brackets. 62% (64%) of whites said they had at some time been racially victimised, and 40% (33%) had at some time experienced racial violence and over 60% (64%) had experienced racial insults. That is they had been victims of violence and abuse at these levels where they were prepared to ascribe a racial motive to the incident.

---

112 We asked respondents whether they had ever been victims as a filtering device to identify those who were then asked whether this had happened in the last year and to give details. This served to focus respondent’s memory and recall; to establish whether victimisation was a frequent occurrence; and to allow a statistical computation which controlled for age effects. That is, a more accurate picture could be sought if the cumulative effects of age were discounted. Findings were weighted to take account of the differences in age profiles between the Asian and white samples and within samples.

113 For example, the Home Office report, Racial Attacks (1982: 14) provided an initial policy impetus to change in statutory agencies' attitudes to racial harassment. It revealed that Asian people were 50 times more likely to be attacked on racial grounds than white people, and Black people were 36 times more likely to be attacked. Further, that the incidence, frequency and 'insidious' nature of such attacks have far reaching and long lasting effects on whole communities. In 1987 the Home Office carried out its second survey, since 1981, concerning racially motivated incidents reported to the police. It reported further
Of these 27% (26%) said they had experienced racial violence and 53% (55%) had experienced racial insults in the bounded period of the year preceding the interview, similar levels to Asians. The levels at which whites were prepared to ascribe racial motive to an incident involving an ‘other race’ perpetrator was also similar to Asian males (see above). Overall, both Asians and whites experienced similar and high levels of violence and abuse involving an ‘other race’ perpetrator, in which they demonstrate similar and high levels of ascribing ‘racial motive’ to the incident. Of course, other forms of non-racialised victimisation, especially violence, were also very prevalent.

78% of whites who stated that they had been a victim of racial violence were alone at the time of the incident and a third of their attackers were under 16 and 59% were 16 to 25 years old. 82% of perpetrators were identified as Asian, 7% as Black and 8% as white\textsuperscript{14}. Half of the attacks were in the afternoon and 41% in the evening. Only 11% were reported to the police, but all of these were successfully detected by the police. The picture for racial insults was that 27% of perpetrators were under 16 and 69% were between 16 and 25 years old. 92% of perpetrators were said to be Asian and 46% of incidents were in the afternoon and 47% in the evening. Hardly any incidents were reported to the police.

Comparison of Asian and White Victimisation

Whites report being racially victimised at a higher rate when they are younger (< 16), whilst Asians report being racially victimised at a higher rate when they are older (>17). The peak ages for racial victimisation are 15-17 years for both Asians and whites. Asian and white young people told the study they had been a victim of other offences - the Asian figure is in brackets. A fifth of whites who had at some time been a victim of a criminal offence, or a suspected criminal offence, said this had happened recently. Whites were less likely than Asians to report the incident to the Police - 40%(60%) of incidents were reported, and half gave the reason as due to the belief that it would be pointless to do so. Although there was a high level of dissatisfaction with the police - 75%(85%), generally, whites were more satisfied than Asians with how individual officers treated them.

Detailed Findings of Offending

All Offending

\textsuperscript{14}Respondents were allowed to identify same race perpetrators if they believed the attack was racially motivated, i.e. the two parties were perceived to be from different white ethnic groups, and there was also a racial motive involved.

\textsuperscript{114}Increases in the victimisation rates for Asian and Black people, with the rate for Asians being 141 times that for whites and the rate for Black people 43 times that for whites (Seagrave, 1989).
Chart 18 summarizes the prevalence of offending found in the Keighley sample\textsuperscript{115} (see table 2, appendix 2). Within these high rates of offending property offences, followed by graffiti, vandalism and arson, and violence against the person were the most prevalent categories of offending. Among property offences, buying and selling stolen goods, followed by stealing at school and shoplifting were most prevalent, although over a third of the sample had burgled at some time. 69\% had vandalized property, 27\% recently, in the last year. Carrying a weapon and fighting and being involved in public disorder were, significantly, given the victim data, similar in prevalence, with nearly half the sample reporting that they had done these things at some time. A third of the sample had taken soft drugs and worryingly a fifth had taken hard drugs.

Comparison of Asian and White Offending\textsuperscript{116}

Asians offended less than whites in every category of property offending except stealing from a car where prevalence was the same for both groups, and stealing something other than those items mentioned in the survey, although there was a relatively small number of responses to this questionnaire item. In fact across the whole range of offences Asian offending was significantly less than white offending. The exceptions were threatening for money, beating up a family member and hurting with weapons where in these cases Asians and whites came out as having the same prevalence. Whites were far more involved in drug offences than Asians, with 54\% of whites having taken soft drugs on at least one occasion and 49\% recently. Nearly a third of the white sample had taken hard drugs recently, in the year preceding the survey interview. However Asian offending was more prevalent than white offending for driving without a licence and/or insurance.\textsuperscript{117}

Summary and Discussion of the Survey Findings

Young People’s Reporting of Crime and Victimisation

\textsuperscript{115}The data on offending uses a different measure of prevalence to that seen in the presentation of the data on victimisation. This disparity was made necessary to be able to compare the Keighley findings with similar self-report delinquency studies that had been undertaken elsewhere. Whereas in the victim data, young people who had answered that they had in some way been victimized in the year preceding the survey interview were counted as a proportion of those who answered they had at some time (‘ever’) been a victim, the offending data counts those who had offended in the last year as a proportion of the total sample, not just of those who had ‘ever’ offended.

\textsuperscript{116}The Asian sample is skewed by inclusion of participants (77) in a crime prevention project so which is likely to lead to a higher offence rate than would be found in a random Asian sample. As expected participants offended more than the non-participants, for example carrying a weapon, being involved in a group fight or disorder and drug taking.

\textsuperscript{117}It is important to distinguish occasional (‘ever done it’) from recent (‘the previous year’) offending. Most young people tend to experiment and because they have offended once or twice this does not mean that they persist in offending. Also the ‘have you done this in the last year’ question is designed to capture offending behaviour that is recent and therefore is more likely to be recalled. Importantly the ‘last year’ question is designed so as to control for the age effect on both offending and victimisation, that is to discount cumulative offending. Clearly both these behaviours are cumulative as young people get older, so that when answering positively to the ‘ever’ question older youngsters will have been more likely to have offended or been victimized at some point. Hagell and Newburn (1994) in their study argue that the background and social characteristics of persistent offenders hardly differs from desisters, a finding somewhat at odds with this study.
Crimes against the person such as racial abuse and violence were much less likely to be reported to the police than other types of offence. A third of young people said they had been the victim of a criminal offence or a number of offences, and of these half had reported the incident to the police. Asians victims were more likely to report than white victims, although when they did report Asians were generally less satisfied than whites about how they were treated. Nevertheless, generally of those, Asian and white, who had reported the incident, dissatisfaction with how their problem was dealt with, and their treatment by individual officers, was high. Although perceptions of local Community Police Officers seemed more positive than those of other police officers, these reporting patterns are consistent with a view that young people are somewhat alienated from the police, and this might in part be explained by a public perception of young people as primarily ‘causing trouble’ or ‘committing crime’ rather than being the main victims of certain crimes - a view which is more than likely shared by the police. This might lead to a situation where the police are perceived by young people as unlikely to be sympathetic to them as victims. This issue has to be separated from the fact that many forms of victimisation that effect young people, such as personal violence, are intra-generational, that is both the victim and perpetrator are in the same age group. The important point is that young people share a considerable experience and knowledgeability about crime, whether as victims, witnesses or perpetrators and are therefore potentially an important source of information and intelligence about offences and their execution. Crime prevention strategies, the police and the courts will ignore this source at their peril.

Young People as Victims of Violence

Racial violence needs to be understood within a local context of very high levels of general personal violence. A third of Asians and two thirds of whites had experienced personal violence at some time, suggesting that young people and especially white young people are routinely exposed to personal violence against them. The survey is left with the puzzle of why white young people reported similar or higher rates of racial victimisation to Asians. 40% of whites compared to a third of Asians had at some time experienced racial violence against them, and similar proportions (over 60%) of whites and Asians had at some time experienced racial insults. Was it that white respondents were confused by the studies question about ‘racial motive’? Did whites say an incident was racially motivated simply because the perpetrator was of different race? How do we account for the high proportion of all reported victim experiences explained in terms of racial victimisation? Did white respondents want to emphasise or give exaggerated importance to victimising experiences when the perpetrator was other race? Would this also apply to Asian

118 In the period the survey covered, 1991-1992, 33 racially motivated incidents were reported to Keighley Police. However, young people reported to the interviewers that they had been victims of racial incidents far more often than these reported figures indicate. Of our general Asian sample (n = 216), 39 incidents of racial violence, 71 incidents of racial abuse and 11 incidents of racial damage or theft were reported to the survey as having happened the year prior to the interview. Among whites (n = 194), 63 incidents of racial violence, 127 incidents of racial abuse and 15 incidents of racial damage or theft were reported to the interviewers as having happened in the last year.

119 ‘Race’ may have been involved but the survey did not ask about the ethnic identity of the perpetrator for this questionnaire item.
respondents? The study draws on some of the qualitative data from the cohort and follow up studies in discussing some of these questions.

A number of issues are involved here. First, white and Asian victims of any crime against the person where they were able to identify the perpetrator as ‘other race’, tended to attribute racial motivation as a reason for them being a victim in the situation. When whites were attacked by an other race perpetrator they attributed racial motive in 80% of cases and Asians in 76% of cases. However, the majority of young people’s experience of crimes against the person seemed to involve other race perpetrators so that for Asians most of their victimising experiences involved other race perpetrators, whereas for whites two thirds of their victimising experiences involved other race perpetrators (having racial motive). Any relationship between ‘any violence’ and ‘other race violence’ cannot be established from the survey design because it is not known whether the general and the racial attack(s) were contiguous or not, only that they occurred at some time in the respondents experience. Nevertheless the inference remains that young people experienced their victimising experiences, in general, as ‘racially motivated’. Nevertheless, because we would expect the victims of racism to be black not white, this still leaves open the question of whether there is a greater propensity among whites to attribute racial motivation to any offence involving an other race person whether the incident is racially motivated or not. Another explanation is that at the time of the survey, victimisation of whites by Asians was prevalent and this was perceived by white victims as racially motivated.

A second set off difficulties surrounds the issue of whether respondents had understood what was meant when asked whether they had been the victim of a crime, and whether this was racially motivated, or had other motives. The follow up study attempted to discover the basis on which ‘racial motive’ is or is not attributed, through repeating the question and asking for more detail, and for young people to give examples of what they meant. The following comments are representative of what white young people said to the study.

“If a white lad fights with a Paki, there will be something racist behind it….It’s the way it is isn’t it. Pakis don’t like us and we don’t like them”....“Whites don’t like Asians and Asians don’t like whites, and that’s all there is to it”.....“We were down at fair, and they (some Asians) were calling us ‘white bastards’ and that, because we were down there, down in their...

120 Whites attributed racial motive on average in 80% of incidents involving insult, 79% involving violence and 31% for damage or theft of personal property. The figures for Asians attributing racial motive to white offenders were respectively, 86%, 76% and 50%. An indication that both white and Asian young people were being honest and consistent in responding to our questions on racial motivation, was that when asked about racial motivation in relation to ‘damage to or theft of their personal property’, whites ascribed racial motive in 31% of incidents and Asians in 50% of incidents. Because there are fewer indications of perpetrators’ motives for these types of offences, and/or the motive will be seen as simple gain, then any racial motive is correspondingly more difficult to identify. Young people, especially whites, in ascribing lower levels of racial motive in the case of theft and damage seem to have understood the nuance of the questions.
area, and they didn’t like it”....“Teachers think its just racial all the time....coloured person
could have started it, you just don’t know”....“I’ve changed my opinion about them because I
started talking to a couple, but its the ones that fight, I can’t stand them, they start
trouble”....“some are nice, they’ll talk to you, but some will beat you up”.

In other words whites infer racial motivation will be present in Asian-white encounters. Although some
white youngsters offered the study examples and details about attacks by Asians on themselves or
incidents they had heard about from their peers, it was apparent that many of these second hand
accounts were based on the same incidents or series of incidents. Certain incidents although they had
almost certainly happened, had gained notoriety and were embellished, told and retold thus entering
local lore. Whites seemed to employ stories of Asian attacks as ‘cautionary tales’ that both rationalised
and reinforced racism and racial segregation, whilst being in some way mixed up with ‘fights’ between
Asians and whites, although having an important basis in reality. This discourse of fighting and
therefore of some kind of equivalence of aggression predominated over straightforward accounts of
Asian on white attacks (although there were some of these as well). Asian accounts of attacks seemed
more trenchant as stories of unprovoked attacks in a context of general white racism, as the following
range of Asian remarks illustrate: “You walk through town, and people are giving you eyes, and you’re
just minding your own business. For someone of my age, 21, I notice it. When I was younger I didn’t
notice it”....“Its very restricted in town because of attacks and abuse, because of colour and people’s
attitudes”....“I was battered in town by a white lad who called me a ‘black bastard’. Even our mothers
and sisters get spat on and called names”.

A third problem encountered in the survey findings was that the survey was unable to uncover many
young people who were prepared to admit in an interview that they had perpetrated racial violence or
abuse. A similar number of Asians to whites were prepared to admit that they had carried out a racial
attack, but these were only 9% (37) of the total Asian and white sample. In the follow up study young
people were pressed on whether they themselves had victimised others and whether or not this was
racially motivated. In virtually every case when the young person, Asian or white, had been involved in
aggressive or abusive actions or behaviour towards an other race person, the question was seen or
interpreted as an invitation to launch into an account of them being attacked or in some way victimised
by someone of a different race, and that they had been attacked for racial reasons. The overwhelming
reasons given for attacking another race, when this was volunteered was either self-defence or
retaliation for a previous attack. Young people were then pressed to explain why, if there were so many
white and Asian young people saying that they had been racially attacked, so few were prepared to
admit that they had perpetrated attacks. Young people then denied that they themselves had attacked or
abused someone because of race, but knew others who had - the ubiquitous ‘I haven’t but I know people
who have’. This becomes in the words of one white informant “I’m not racist, but I know a lot of racist
people, who will throw petrol bombs”. Who was it then, doing the attacking? One white response was:
What it really is, is that whites attack blacks, and blacks attack whites, but they always say the other side attacked them first”. Another white said “Both Asians and whites fight, its the same”.

It became increasingly clear to the study that for many whites, at least, racism was synonymous with inter-racial fighting, i.e. that they were mostly victims of fighting rather than harassment or attack. Significantly ‘being attacked’ or ‘fighting Asians’ invariably involved an unknown Asian attacker or adversary, whereas in situations of intra-white fighting the parties to the fight invariably know each other. The qualitative cohort and follow up data demonstrates that ‘race’ provides a vocabulary of motive for fighting between adolescents, without there necessarily being an exclusively or even partially racist motivation. The issue is one of how to separate ‘racially motivated fighting’ from ‘just fighting’ or incidental abuse. Young people, both Asian and white, routinely differentiate their action’s and behaviours between racial targeting - ‘I attacked him because he is Asian and I don’t like Asians’, and a more contingent ‘fighting’ - proving oneself through fighting. These two explanations may exist in the same situation - alternatively young people may be quite specific about why they are fighting - attributing a racial motive in one case, and a ‘proving oneself’ motive in another. This is not to deny or bury racially motivated attacks in pedantic obfuscation but to clarify, as far as possible, what is really going on. Racial harassment and attacks by white young people, goes on amongst groups who at the same time, also demonstrate other forms of aggression. Specifically, white young people who target and attack Asians tend also to be involved in fighting and victimising other white young people. Often its impossible to isolate the ‘racial’ incident from the general aggression.

A fourth complication from the findings, was that perpetrators of racial abuse and violence also tended to be involved in other criminal acts as well generalised violence and fighting and. It has been normal in the research literature to see these two different behaviours - criminal offending on the one hand, and racial harassment on the other, as distinct and separate phenomena. However, preliminary investigations among young people suggested that one could not be understood without the other, that somehow they were likely to be connected in the lives of young people. This continuum of general violence, criminal offending, antisocial behaviour and racial violence (and victimisation), meant that one form of antisocial act led to another. These antisocial acts or series of acts could not be reduced to, or wholly explained, in terms of criminal motivation in one area of behaviour and racial motivation in another. In other words, young people who were involved in racially motivated abuse and harassment also tended to be involved in more general antisocial behaviour including crime. Racial violence seems to be part of a continuum of antisocial aggression and crime and cannot be understood outside of this context of generalised antisocial behaviour. Racial harassment and violence could not be understood solely in terms of racist attitudes and beliefs, but were part of a wider repertoire of a specifically masculine antisocial and generalised aggression. This context of generalised aggression was a characteristic of the locality in which they lived. Among the groups studied, the more property and non-racial violent offending going on, and the more serious and persistent this is, then the more intractable and prevalent is racial violence. The conclusion is that in a situation where there is a multiracial
element, offending and racial harassment are likely to be associated, and in this context general offending is likely to indicate racial harassment and harassment, offending.

Young people’s reluctance to tell the study about perpetrating racial violence contrasted sharply with their willingness to admit to other offences and report their victimisation. The implication was that young people knew racial violence to be ‘out of order’, ‘over the top’ in ways that other offending was not, especially among peers. Racism then becomes coded as victimisation. Specifically, the connotation is that racial motive or racism is understood as being a victim of someone else’s actions not what one does to others. For white young people in particular, racism is ‘being more sinned against than sinning’ (in a different context see Hartless 1995). Racism is something done against one, even as a white person, rather than something done by oneself against others, even a black person.121 This underlying paralogic always locates the victim as self and the perpetrators as the others and can act to ‘neutralise’ the perpetration of racial violence, particularly among white people, and is tantamount to making a moral equivalence that ‘we attack them, and they attack us’. The evidence suggests that although each ethnic group perceives itself subordinate to the other (victimised), the persistence and entrenchment of racist effects are primarily located among Asians not whites. Among young whites, experiences of being racially attacked or harassed are generally one-off incidents, whereas for Asians these experiences tend to be repeated and long term.

Sykes and Matza (1957) in contextualising juvenile delinquency within the dominant social order - which in our case is a strong social disapproval of direct racism - they suggest that the delinquent exhibits guilt or shame when violating social norms, in a paradoxical way. The delinquent is able to ‘avoid moral culpability for his criminal action’ by evoking justification for deviance that are seen as valid by the delinquent but not by the legal system or society at large (ibid.:209). These ‘rationalizations’ protect the individuals from self-blame and the blame of others after the act, ‘they precede deviant behaviour and make deviant behaviour possible’. They are both antecedent and post facto rationalizations that enable the delinquent to represent him or herself as ‘an apologetic failure, often more sinned against than sinning in his own eyes’ (Ibid.:209). Of course these justifications or techniques of neutralization take a number of different forms, the most important of which in the context of this study is adeptness at denying the victim, where even an admission of injury or hurt, is neutralized by an insistence that the injury is not wrong in light of the circumstances, and that, rather, it is a form of rightful retaliation or punishment. In this scenario the perpetrator transforms himself into an avenger and the victim into a wrongdoer (ibid.:210). The denial of responsibility by the delinquent enables his acts to be seen as due to forces outside of the individual and beyond his control, enabling him to view himself ‘as more acted upon than acting’. The denial of injury or that his behaviour ‘does not really cause any great harm’ enables the link between acts and their consequences to be broken by

121 Smith (1993) has argued in a different context that the ideological sway of neo-conservative thinking has accustomed white people into constructing black people as violent and threatening, and as demanding special privileges. I shall be returning to this in the conclusion.
White youngsters who were known to the study independently as perpetrators routinely differentiated Asians into those they 'knew' who were 'all right', and those who 'caused trouble' which had the effect of categorising potential victims into deserving and undeserving, which denies the existence of the victim by transforming him into a person deserving injury. In interviews with whites, some of whom were known to be perpetrators, when it was mentioned that a lot of Asian youngsters said that they had been attacked yet few white youngsters had admitted they had attacked Asians, their reply was invariably to 'condemn the condemners'. This, Sykes and Matza's fourth technique of neutralization may well have accounted for some of the prevalence of self reported white victimisation. Here perpetrators say of their condemners that they 'are hypocrites, deviants in disguise, or impelled by personal spite' wherein they have 'changed the subject of conversation in the dialogue between his own deviant impulses and the reactions of others; and by attacking others, the wrongfulness of his own behaviour is more easily repressed or lost to view' (p. 211). It was seen in chapter six the quickness with which some whites (and Asians) stated that the police are corrupt and teachers show favouritism towards Asians (and vice versa for Asians). Finally, in relation to the wider social disapproval of violent racism, perpetrators may appeal to higher loyalties of white territorialism and pride of place, which neutralise external and internal social controls 'by sacrificing the demands of the larger society for the demands of the smaller social groups to which the delinquent belongs'...Therefore, 'deviation from certain norms may occur not because the norms are rejected but because other norms, held to be more pressing or involving a higher loyalty, are accorded precedence' (ibid.:211). This 'dilemma and conflict' about violent racist expression then is rooted in overriding loyalty to the group and not 'grassing' either to a survey or anyone else outside the group. It was also seen in chapter six in relation to the 'violent racist' group that, 'some delinquents may be [so] isolated from the world of conformity that techniques of neutralization need not be called into play' (ibid.:212).

Coping with Violence and Crime

There are a variety of methods which young people employ in coping with crime aimed at reducing the risk of being a victim of some crime. These range from simply not going out, going out in company, avoiding certain streets and people, to in some cases, carrying a defensive weapon. Asians take more risk avoiding strategies than whites although both groups are worried about crime. This may explain the prevalence of violence against the person among whites compared to Asians because whites go out more and when they go out feel that they do not have to avoid certain areas to the same extent as Asians. Asians, however do not escape racial violence despite their caution. Presumably if they were to throw caution to the wind then they would experience much higher rates of racial victimisation than those found in the study. In the studies view this caution is a realistic appraisal of the risks based on an

122 Based on information from teachers, police officers and youth workers.
evaluation of experience rather than a disproportionate response to actually existing crime. This is demonstrated in young people’s mapping of their fear of crime expressed in avoidance of certain areas and each other. The actual location of crime incidents (see charts 19-24 in appendix 1) reflected young people’s cognitive appraisals of the geography of crime and racial violence in the locality. Asians and whites avoid each other, both in leisure spaces and in school (perhaps the only ‘statutory’ meeting and mixing place for Asians and whites). Teachers pointed to separate friendship and socialising patterns among pupils which very largely reflect racial and ethnic attributes.

Young People’s Offending

Nearly two-thirds of white young people told the survey that they had at some time shoplifted, been involved in fighting, had bought and sold stolen goods, and had taken soft drugs. Although drug use was widespread\textsuperscript{123}, perhaps of most concern was that over a third of whites had used hard drugs. However, the survey defined ‘hard drugs’ to respondents as including heroin, coke, PCP, LSD, or speed etc. These levels seem alarmingly high, but it should be remembered that these are proportions of the sample who admitted ever, on at least one occasion, doing these things. However in relation to drug offences recent offending was higher than in other categories of offending. The conclusion is that the local culture of violence was in many respects also one of widespread drug use.

Attachment

On the theoretical assumption derived from control theory\textsuperscript{124}, that young people’s ‘attachment’, or sense of ‘belonging’ to family, other social institutions, and values associated with doing well at school,

\textsuperscript{123} A finding not inconsistent with a range of other studies (see Gilman 1991; Graham and Bowling 1995; Mott and Mirlees-Black 1995; Parker and Measham 1994; Parker 1995; Shapiro 1993).

\textsuperscript{124} Again, a discussion of the theoretical and empirical debates about the efficacy of control theory in predicting delinquency are left out of this thesis because of requirements to focus on racial violence and space limitations (see Webster 1995). Broadly, however I concur with developmental and life span perspectives found in some variants of control theory which suggest that the nature and sources of the social bond may change with age (Briar and Pilavin 1965; Menard and Elliot 1993; Sampson and Laub 1993). However, there also appears to be strong continuity in antisocial behaviour running from childhood through adulthood across a variety of life domains (for example, crime, economic dependence, marital discord). Nevertheless, informal social control (commitment and attachment to social bonds) in adulthood explains changes in criminal behaviour over the life span, regardless of prior individual differences in criminal propensity. Childhood pathways to crime and conformity over the life course are significantly influenced by adult social bonds. There is a reinforcing process: ‘...initially weak bonds lead to high delinquency involvement, the high delinquency involvement further weakens the conventional bonds, and in combination both of these effects make it extremely difficult to re-establish bonds to conventional society at later stages. As a result, all of the factors tend to reinforce one another over time to produce an extremely high probability of continued deviance’ (Thornbury et al. 1991:30). For example, Patterson’s (1992) data shows significant changes over time in the relation of parental monitoring and child antisocial behaviour. There are also important changes in the form and intensity of the antisocial acts themselves in that new forms of antisocial behaviour are constantly being added (and deleted). Changes happen in the setting in which antisocial acts occur, in the degree of adult supervision or in the development of street - deviant settings. In interpreting the Keighley data, and particularly the attachment data, the basic question is how the process is changing while the antisocial trait remains stable over time (Patterson and Yoerger 1991, cited in Patterson 1992). The key issue in interpreting the attachment data is interaction between parental monitoring and child/adolescent antisocial behaviour, and how this changes over time. For example, as the antisocial behaviour of the adolescent increases, it may disrupt parental efforts to monitor, thus defining a bi-directional relation. Contrary to the static picture portrayed by the Keighley data and survey data generally, during the time interval (adolescence), antisocial acts may change both their form and intensity. This can be seen in the cohort data. A good critical discussions of control theory can be found in Agnew (1993) who, among other things challenges the causal model employed by control theory.
work, and so on, is likely to predict their likely involvement in delinquency, the Keighley study 'tested' this assumption against empirical data collected by the survey (see 'attachment' tables 3 and 4 in appendix two). This exercise was completed for both general offending behaviour and racially motivated offending. Focusing on racially motivated offending the study sought to discover whether there was a relationship between the type of family arrangement a young person lives in - whether two or one parent - and the young person's likelihood of involvement in offending behaviour, and racially motivated offending. Although no relationship was found between the type of family arrangement a young person lives in - whether two or one parent - and the young person's likelihood of involvement in offending behaviour, offenders and recent offenders in particular were more likely to go out in situations where their parent(s) did not know who they were with, or where they were going. This was even more likely among young people involved in racial offending. Recent offenders were less likely to get on with their parents than either occasional or non-offenders. Generally, Asians got on with their parents better than whites, but white female recent offenders got on with their parents least among the sample. Offenders were less likely to embark on family outings than non-offenders. In all these areas, that explore the nature and 'quality' of family relations (see Graham 1989; Graham and Bowling 1995), racial offenders tended to report the least 'satisfactory' family relations.

The survey also found a strong relationship between offending behaviour and whether the young person liked school or not, and whether he or she thought it worthwhile. This was the case despite quite high levels of agreement about the purposes and necessity of schooling - to work hard and get a qualification - between offenders and non-offenders. Where they disagreed was their respective experiences of school where offenders were more likely to be negative about the experience. In contrast to the different experiences of school between offenders and non-offenders, there was a high level of commitment to work among all respondents. An overall conclusion is that control theory has a promising if as yet unexplored application in respect to young people who racially offend. It seems that young people who had racially offended were least attached. However there was a strong association between racial offending and intensity of involvement in offending generally.

Relationships Between Offending and Victimisation

The analysis looked at characteristics of offenders in terms of the likelihood of them also being victims of criminal acts. This analysis was repeated for characteristics of non-offenders and their victim experiences, and for non-racial and racial offenders. It was hoped that this type of analysis would provide a more rounded view of young people's experience of crime as both perpetrators and victims, and whether these two diametrically opposed ways of experiencing crime were connected for some and not others. It was found that high profile offending groups - those who were most involved in a range and seriousness of offending - were also likely to be the most high profile racial offenders. This suggests that racially motivated crime is likely to be on a continuum of antisocial and general criminal
activity. Further, that there would seem to be a willingness on the part of both Asian and white victims of offences involving other race perpetrators to ascribe racial motive to the perpetrator, and that these types of crime encounters make up the bulk of victimising experiences among the young people in the survey. The problem with these findings is that only a few respondents were prepared to admit that they themselves had attacked or abused or damaged another person's property on racial grounds. The overall impression is one of high levels of racial victimisation and non-racial offending within the sample as a whole and these categories of behaviour made up the bulk of what was happening among young people surveyed. However, at the margins of the sample were young people who had never offended and were less likely to have been victims than other groups, and those who had never been the victim of an offence were least likely to have offended. This confirms other findings (Hough and Mayhew 1983) that among young people offenders and victims are often the same person.

Cluster Analysis

A rudimentary cluster analysis of the survey data was devised to see if any groups emerged that could be characterised by a particular pattern or range of offences. The study was particularly interested in locating racially motivated offending within any patterns discovered. A cluster analysis is designed to identify if there are any groups in a population which seem to share common traits or characteristics that distinguish these groups from other groups in the same population. That is, are there traits which cluster within a population in ways that cause some individuals to have behaviours in common that identify them as a group. Cluster analysis was carried out on the Keighley offending data to see if such groups could be identified in terms of characteristics or features of their offending behaviour. The analysis found that there were distinct groups. There were found to be some groups having a low or medium profile of offending in the sense of prevalence and range of offending. However, the analysis revealed a particularly high offending group. What was distinctive about this group was that within it were found the whole range of offending categories compared to a much smaller range in other groups. The exception to this was the use of soft drugs which was prevalent in all the groups identified regardless of whether a lot of other offending was going on or not. The high profile offending group was 'into everything', whereas other groups were only into some types of offending, or very little offending of any type. Further, the high profile group, as well as containing the greatest range of offences, also had more prevalence of the more serious types of offending than other groups. But

125 The cluster analysis went an evolution process, first controlling for sex, race and age and then making sure that a suitable, comparable base for the percentages could be established. To this end Asian males aged 15 years and over, who admitted at least one offence during the last year (i.e. categories 4 and 5 of the offender groups), omitting any consideration of alcohol use, were selected first. This is narrower than earlier preliminary analyses, but this was made necessary by the need to calculate the percentage admitting racial motivation (this could only be done in 'last year' offence comparisons). Having selected this group, it was then possible to cluster cases according to their pattern(s) of 'ever' offending. This was done for a five-cluster and then a two-cluster solution. This gave broadly similar patterns of 'ever' offending as in the initial preliminary work, for this sub-group. Having obtained the five and two cluster solutions, the cluster membership has then been retained and cross-tabulated against offender type. This gives a percentage reading for racial motivation against cluster membership. There is a strong indication that the higher profile offending group tends to have a higher incidence of racial motivation. This procedure was then repeated for whites. Here the offending patterns shown in the 5-cluster solution are rather more diffuse than for the Asian sub-set. The two-cluster solution is clearer, however, as is the percentage analysis for racial motivation.
crucially virtually all the racially motivated offending that had been reported was also found in this group. High profile offenders were also high profile racial offenders. This high offending 'statistical' group contained both Asians and whites, although there were more whites than Asians. This analysis is consistent with the findings from the qualitative study which also showed the tendency for high profile offender groups to also be high profile perpetrators of racial violence.

**Discussion of the Findings**

**Cautionary Tales**

Anderson et al (1994) administered a crime survey to young people in four different areas of Edinburgh distinguished by social indices and social class. They found that over the nine month bounded period respondents were asked to say whether they had offended, two-thirds of all young people had committed minor offences and incivilities, such as petty vandalism and rowdiness in the street. Edinburgh’s findings were similar to Keighley’s with half of the young people surveyed having been victims of one or more offences against the person in public places (theft from person, assault and threatening behaviour) during a bounded period of nine months. Again similar to Keighley, Anderson et al found that 37% of young people had been assaulted and 31% threatened, and that offending levels were high with 69% having committed at least one offence nine months preceding the survey (including rowdiness and vandalism). Again the Keighley data is supported in the high levels of violent offending among boys in Edinburgh with 23% having committed a violent offence; 57% having been involved in fights; 23% having injured or assaulted someone in the previous nine months (ibid.:92-94).

However they also found that young people employed 'cautionary tales' seen as the ways in which young people talked to each other about crime as a way of coping with crime. Young people stereotype areas with clearly exaggerated stories, thus 'stereotypes of an area are attributed to the personality and characteristics of the individuals who live there' (Ibid:.15), and tales about crime 'were often gruesome and exaggerated but they carried important warnings about potentially dangerous people, places and situations' (ibid.:81). This ecological labelling and exaggerated stories clearly raise the issue of the reliability of young people’s accounts of their victimisation. And yet the Keighley survey found that perceptions of dangerous areas correlated with where victimisation actually took place, and the Edinburgh like the Keighley study found 'uniformly high contact with crime, much of it serious and most of which adults would find intolerable' (ibid.:30). Shapland and Vagg (1988), among others, have suggested that these stories are urban myths about dangerous places in the city, and become part of local folklore and more often than not bear no relation to reality. The Edinburgh study insists however, that the mythical stories told by the young people they interviewed 'are rooted - not necessarily in actual happenings' - but most certainly in their collective experience of crime' (ibid.:83). Nevertheless, the coping mechanisms employed by young people such as mutual support, 'cautionary tales' and collective self-defence by associating in groups (ibid.:85), needs to be balanced against a
methodological 'caution' in interpreting young people' accounts of crime and victimisation.

There was much evidence in Edinburgh of the need to be knowledgeable about whether different areas were safe or not expressed in a neighbourhood nationalism whose constant refrain was loyalty to 'folk from your own bit'. The authors explained this in terms of 'extreme spatial segregation' based on social class in Edinburgh (ibid.:86; Ch. 1): 'In a city where areas have such a distinct history and character, it is crucial for young people to know both their area and the dangers it holds (the function of 'cautionary tales') and to be able to rely upon other young people for mutual support (the function of groups)' (ibid.:86). Crucially reluctance to report victimisation to adults or the police rested on group support, which if it is to work as a means of self-defence, relies on the 'solidarity' of those it protects ('loyalty' and not grassing), and to 'break with this is to threaten the whole basis of the strategy - and with it the personal and collective safety of all' (ibid.:152). The authors conclude that a 'vicious circle' is set in train whereby:

'Young people are left to negotiate their problems without reference to the adult world. They develop their own strategies for coping with the realities of crime and policing...A central feature of all these strategies is the attempt to reduce the impact that crime has on their everyday lives. “Not grassing”, we have argued, has to be seen in this context. To report something that happens to you is to risk exacerbating its effects on your life. Either as a victim or a witness you may be asked to explain yourself, overcome the disbelief of others, even turn up in court to give evidence. All these things inflate the importance of the initial incident. All risk giving crime a paramount place in your life and curtailing your freedom. As such they are to be avoided, if possible...’ (ibid.:157).

Because young people are not being taken seriously by adults or the police, or are even held in some way responsible for their victimisation, their experiences remain hidden from the adult world, which in turn increases the extent of adult's disbelief, and 'Young people do not “grass” because they anticipate such adult indifference and because they do not report, the incredulity increases’ (ibid.:157-8). The circle is completed in the response of the police to young peoples victimisation who ‘are deprived of the information that young people undoubtedly have and that they require to successfully investigate crime. Faced with this situation, the police are left to resort to the very adversarial methods that contributed to this lack of information in the first place’ (ibid.:158). Other writers (Loader 1996) have pointed to this vicious circle effect in the relationship between young people’s victimisation and police response, and suggests that the frequency with which young people are moved on by the police is matched only by the rarity with which they call the police as victims of crime. Further that these encounters define police-youth relations generating mutual suspicion, frustration and resentment.

Despite an increasing body of evidence that young people daily face risks, and often serious risks, as both witnesses and as victims of crime (Anderson, et al, 1994; Aye Maung 1995; Hartless et al, 1995;
Brown 1994a, 1994b, 1995a, 1995b) there is an overwhelming fixation within popular and political discourse about adolescent offending. Young people are the object of ‘respectable fears’ (Pearson 1983) and are said to be ‘at risk’, not of victimisation, but of offending. According to Loader (1996) the police share this common sense which determines the way they police young people’s use of public space, making distinctions between, different public constituencies of young people - the ‘respectables’ and ‘roughs’. Police-youth contact ‘focuses both on the questioning and apprehension of young people on suspicion of technical delinquency and more generally, on the routine supervision of their use of public space’ (ibid.:26).

Loader’s analysis implies another but somewhat different vicious circle to that described by Anderson et al, this time based on young people’s uses and meanings of public space. This vicious circle is explained by the theoretical framework in chapter one and involves the following process: Young people’s dependence upon narrowly circumscribed areas of public space (partly because of the way that they are policed) requires that they develop a detailed practical knowledge of the locality through cognitive mapping. This shared informal understanding of ‘our area’, in turn reinforces attachment to locality and both its existential and strategic significance becomes amplified and accorded meaning. Accordingly regulation of routine spatial movement takes place in the locality measured by its symbolic boundaries which in turn encourages the importance given to different areas - them and us, ‘belonging’ to area groupings which produces area ‘rivalries’ sustained by demonstrating verbal and physical capacity to ‘defend’ ‘our area’. These inter-area conflicts and the story-telling which surrounds them reinforces the original dependence on areas and their attachment and so on. Loaders secondary analysis of qualitative data from the Edinburgh survey (Anderson et al 1994) in a majority white situation replicates the Keighley findings about territoriality, safety and perceptions of public space126 in that young people in Edinburgh generate a world-view which divides people into ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, those who belong and those who don’t (ibid.:60).

Comparisons Of Self-Report Racial Victimisation Surveys

Recent ‘sweeps’ of the British Crime Survey (BCS) have increasingly incorporated questions designed to elicit racial victimisation enabled by the inclusion of ‘booster’ samples of ethnic minority populations. Maung and Mirlees-Black (1994) have summarised these findings127, suggesting that Afro-

---

126 ‘The collective practices that provide some young people with a positive identity become part of the back-drop which others have to accommodate if they are to “go on” safely in public space. It is against this backdrop - one pertaining to the risks of public space - that youth practices take on a more strategic significance as routines for the production of personal safety. As regulars users of public places young people individually and collectively become practical ‘experts’ in managing risk; developing a set of understandings and practices that position particular people and places according to their perceived danger, and regulate young people’s everyday spatial movement’... ‘Young people forge a number of individual routines concerned to enhance both their material safety and their sense of personal well-being. One of the most prominent of these routines is avoiding sites of perceived danger altogether, through for example, treating certain places as personal ‘no-go’ areas, or simply keeping a distance from groups of youths believed to be “trouble”’ (Ibid:65).

127 The data suggests that there were nearly 17 million incidents of criminal victimisation and threats in England and Wales in 1991 of which 730,000 (4.4%) were against Asians and Afro-Caribbeans - more than would be expected from the number of adult Asians and Afro-Caribbeans in the population. About a quarter of the 130,000 estimated racial incidents were assaults (of which most were common assaults rather than more serious wounding) and two-fifths were threats. Vandalism comprised another
Caribbeans and Asians are more vulnerable to many types of criminal victimisation than whites. This is largely explained by social and demographic factors, particularly the areas in which they live. But even taking account of these, ethnic minority risks still tend to be higher, with Asians particularly at risk of vandalism, robbery and theft from the person. Asians were more likely than Afro-Caribbeans to say that incidents of criminal victimisation and threats were ‘racially motivated’, or to leave the possibility open. For both groups, the offences most often thought to be racially motivated were assaults, threats, and incidents of vandalism.

Local crime surveys exclusively focusing on racial victimisation, have pointed to ‘the range of its incidence’ (Hesse 1992; Newham Crime Survey 1987; CRE report 1987; Mayhew et al., 1989); its persistent nature; its impact on people’s living conditions; the inadequacy of police responses; and to the recurrent experience of victimisation. Saulsbury and Bowling’s (1992) Racial Harassment ‘Citizens Survey’ carried out in an area of East London is particularly salient to the present study. The survey findings supported local perceptions in indicating that ‘a very large number of incidents were occurring and that they affected a significant proportion of the area’s ethnic minority residents’, and in particular ‘the problem was not an isolated one even in the perception of victims and those most at risk. It must be considered in the context of criminal victimisation more generally and that of a poor physical and social environment’(ibid.:24). It was this contextualising of racial victimisation in relation to more general criminal victimisation that is so resonant of the Keighley findings.128 This association of racially victimising with criminal behaviour, however, was anecdotal, supported by possibly stereotypical views of police officers: ‘The police officers interviewed characterised the perpetrators of racial violence as being ‘yobs’ - young people with nothing to do who are involved in all kinds of ‘anti-social acts’. They also spoke of ‘disputes’ between neighbours where racist language was used and which were connected to white residents’ dislike of, or resentment towards, ethnic minorities’ (ibid.:120). The survey was particularly careful to delineate effects on women, and Asian women were the group upon whom racial harassment had the greatest impact because the effect of victimisation seemed particularly severe and to have serious long term and cumulative effects. ‘A striking feature of the victimisation described by white women was the proportion of incidents carried out by other white people’. An important proposed explanation was the targeting of mixed-race families as targets for attack and harassment. This again
points to the importance of uncovering specific forms of victimisation in particular localities that are missed by national surveys, however 'representative'.

The Keighley survey shares the argument with other local crime surveys that national surveys like the BCS have severe limitations in that they can ignore geographic and social differentials. Local Crime Surveys (for example, Merseyside 1985; Islington 1986, 1990; Hammersmith and Fulham 1989; and Edinburgh 1990, 1994), by focusing on particular localities have attempted to pinpoint the higher levels of crime prevailing in socially deprived inner city areas; to highlight the disproportionate victimisation of women, or members of ethnic minority groups, and of those lower down the social scale; and to set crime in its broader social context by including questions about racial and sexual harassment, drug abuse, and other forms of anti-social behaviour (Crawford et al 1990; for a review see Zedner 1994). This greater sensitivity to the uneven distribution of risk by age, social group and area (Zedner 1994:1215), has resulted in local surveys finding higher prevalence of particular types of crime than is found in national surveys.

The Keighley study can be distinguished from mass victimisation surveys through focusing on local variation and the feelings of victims themselves; avoiding the use of interviewers with a 'market research' background; selecting interviewers more 'acceptable' to, and experienced in working with young people; ensuring that interviewers themselves were relatively young, and were matched with respondent groups by sex and ethnic background.

National surveys (see Hough and Mayhew 1983) like local surveys have found that victims of violence tend to share many characteristics with offenders, however local surveys seem more able to refine and differentiate the precise nature of the relationship between offenders and victims (Zedner 1994:1217). Maguire (1994) has reviewed the radical critique that local surveys offer to national crime surveys focusing on concerns about the tendency of the BCS to distort 'real' experiences of crime - especially those of woman, ethnic minorities, and the very poor. This concern has been raised by several authors (e.g., Matthews and Young 1986; Stanko 1988; Genn 1988, Dobash and Dobash, 1992). Maguire, in his discussion of Young (1988) suggests that: '...such massive differences between subgroups illustrate “the fallacy of taking of the problem of women as a whole, or of men, blacks, whites, youths, etc.”' Rather, he insists, criminological analysis should 'start from the actual subgroups in which people live their lives' (1994:267). Young (1988:173-5) argues that what are 'objectively' similar criminal events can have enormously different meanings and consequences for different people, and in their ability to withstand crime: 'The “same” punch can mean totally different things in different circumstances...Violence, like all kinds of crime, is a social relationship. It is rarely random: it inevitably involves particular social meanings and occurs in particular hierarchies of power. Its impact, likewise, is predicated on the relationship within which it occurs' (Cited in Maguire 1994: 267-8). The impact of violence has a quite unequal effect on

129 Findings regarding white victimisation were that only 7% of white men had experienced a racial incident in the preceding 18 months (Ibid.:122-123). However, with whites, incidents diverged from other groups in that 43% involved the theft of property, between twice and five times the rate of the other groups. The most frequent reason for believing the incident was racially motivated (in half of the incidents mentioned) was a perception that the incident arose from 'racial vengeance, getting back at white people'.
different victim groups. Some people may also be subject to exceptionally high levels of victimisation (Genn 1988; Maguire 1994). On the other hand Genn questions how meaningful it is to ‘count’ certain crimes at all:

'It is clear that violent victimization may often be better conceptualized as a process rather than as a series of discrete events. This is most evident in cases of prolonged and habitual domestic violence, but there are also other situations in which violence, abuse and petty theft are an integral part of victims’ day-to-day existence' (Genn: 1988: 91, quoted in Maguire 1994: 269-70, emphasis added).

Victim surveys - whether national or local - if they are to have efficacy require, at the very least, supplementing with good qualitative data that captures the processes Genn alludes to, if they are to take account of the differential impact of victimising experiences, and incidents individually too 'minor' to be reported or recorded but which, when repeated over time, profoundly blight the lives of their victims (Cooper and Pomeyie 1988:85; Zedner 1994: 1221). For those Asians living in predominately white communities, isolation may make them feel even more vulnerable, and victimisation may entail greater costs than mass crime surveys have implied. This construction of fear of crime by different social groups may be as closely related to feelings of power or vulnerability as it is to calculated perceptions of actual risk (see Zedner 1994).

Although the Keighley findings demonstrated that whites as well as Asians perceived themselves to have been victims of racial violence, the nature and intensity of this victimisation may have been different. National crime surveys have shown that young white working class males who spend a great deal of leisure time outside the home, may be most at risk of victimisation but admit to very little fear (BCS Hough and Mayhew 1983). Recent studies have sought to explain the differential impact of victimisation, in order to understand why some victims are more severely affected than others by apparently similar crimes. Skogan has identified a number of key factors in determining the differential impact of crime: isolation, resources, vulnerability, and previous experience (Skogan 1986b: 140-3). Some groups, such as ethnic minorities are likely to experience multiple or series victimisation more acutely than others, and express generalised feelings of vulnerability which also appears to magnify the impact of crime. Lack of ability to resist or to defend oneself against an attacker may amplify pre-existing feelings of vulnerability. The significance of previous experience was a particular focus of the Keighley study. The problem is that although vulnerability may influence the impact of a crime like racial violence, and multiple or series victimisation may compound the impact suffered with each repeated occurrence, this may be counter balanced by the fact that for some individuals, their repeated victimisation makes it so that it becomes virtually impossible to distinguish the impact of discrete crimes from the generally impoverished quality of their life (Genn 1998).
In Keighley it was likely that Asians under-reported racial victimisation because of the normality and routinization of such attacks, even serious ones, compared to whites where apparently similarly motivated attacks - having a racial element - have much greater impact because they are ‘unusual’ and are therefore given much more importance. The extent to which this differential recall effect influenced the willingness of whites to report to the survey that they had been victims of racial violence is difficult to assess. Other studies (see Smith 1994 for a review of the arguments) of selective (self- and official) reporting of offences by members of the public that might lead to greater willingness on the part of white victims to identify black perpetrators and/or ascribe racial motive when an assailant/perpetrator is Black or Asian, have focused on victim reports among adults and young adults. Smith (1994) argues that on the basis of victim reports (the great bulk of offences processed by the courts and the police first come to notice as a result of victim reports), it is likely that about 85% of offences committed by black people are on white victims (see Mayhew et al 1989). A possible theory according to Smith, therefore, ‘is that because of racial hostility or fear, white victims are more strongly motivated to report an incident to the police if they think the offender was black. A grave problem for such a theory, of course, is that racial hostility among the general public is directed just as much against South Asians as against black people’ (Smith, Ibid.:1062), and South Asians are not overrepresented in crime reports or indeed in the criminal justice system and prisons compared to black people. Smith suggests another explanation - one that has already been suggested might apply to the Keighley data, especially given the highly focused racial hostility found in the locality - the differential recall effect: or the tendency for respondents to recall or fail to recall incidents according to whether the offender was black. For example, respondents might take longer to forget about incidents involving an Asian, rather than a white offender.

Some other limitations of crime surveys that the Keighley study modestly addressed are: there has been little attempt to compare victimised with non-victimised groups in order to ascertain how far attitudes and experiences are attributable to victimisation alone; there have been few attempts to undertake longitudinal research which would allow pre- and post- victimisation comparisons; there has been little comparative work on the impact of different kinds of victimisation or on the impact of victimisation on different kinds of people (see Zedner 1994; Skogan 1986b:136). Both the cohort and the follow up study address these problems in the victimisation research.

Asians and Crime

The origin of the Keighley survey was a ‘concern’ by local criminal justice agencies that offending among young Asians was increasing. The dangers of this type of hypothesising have become only too real in relation to Afro-Caribbean young people, where a belief that this was the case among agencies, notably the police, arguably resulted in an escalating spiral of police attention, higher arrest rates and the construction of the ‘Black criminal’. The implications for Asians are discussed in chapter nine. The survey, then, set out not to answer the question whether ‘Asian crime’ had increased (an impossible
task without comprehensive time-series data), but whether delinquency among Asian young people was any more worrying than delinquency among white young people.

Mawby & Batta's (1980) study, *Asians and Crime: The Bradford Experience*, one of the very few studies of Asian offenders, looked at Asian offending in the 1970s using official police and court records. They argued comparison of offender rates between whites and Asian may be spurious because of the failure to compare like with like. Young Asians tend to be over-represented amongst groups with relatively high crime rates (working class, poor, inner city, etc.), and yet, the authors argue, this expectation is not fulfilled: Asian crime rates are *lower* than average, *despite* their over-representation in the high risk categories or situations, and this demands that we focus on the *strengths* of South Asian communities (ibid.:6). The study concluded that despite the cultural and structural problems facing the Asian minority, crime rates for all age groups were lower than those for the non-Asian population in Bradford, further, that crimes by Asians are either intra-racial or minor. These findings at the time were broadly comparable with those of other studies of Asians in London (Rees et al., 1979; Stevens and Willis 1979, both cited in Mawby and Batta) and implied that the position had not changed markedly for Asians since the early 1970's.

How do we explain low crime rates among Asians compared to other groups? Mawby and Batta offer a *cultural* theory which relies on control theory in accounting for low crime - Asian family and community informal controls are greater than for other groups despite similar experiences of economic and social deprivation. Despite the fact that relative deprivation among Asian boys was high, this was a feature of the general economic disadvantages faced by Asian *communities*, rather than being distinct for Asian *offender groups*. Both Asian and non-Asian offender groups were similar in terms of family relationships - living at home with both parents who were generally concerned about their sons offending behaviour. Instead the key to explaining low Asian crime rates lies in 'the strength of the subcultural 'support' (or perhaps 'control')' (ibid.:52). Moreover that this support or these controls are likely to continue to influence 'second generation' Asians, especially in large Asian communities like the one found in Bradford, being 'strong enough and stable enough to withstand the pressures towards integration and assimilation.(and)..conformity to British norms'. Contemporaneous research on young Asians (Anwar, 1976; Brah, 1978; Jeffery, 1976), despite its emphasis on cultural stress and conflict between the generations, seemed to confirm this view.

Mawby and Batta distinguish between how a subculture explains failure to its members, and the solutions it provides for those in need (ibid.:54-55). Controls rely on community enforcement and family prestige the latter being key to controlling family members in that deviance would have
repercussions for family, both in Britain and Asia, with additional economic impact in terms of marriage potential:

‘Socialisation within the home contributes to the development of a set of values according to which the interest of the family takes precedence over the individual’s own interest.....while Asian adolescents growing up here may not share the depths of their parents’ commitment to the norms of the extended family system, their identification with the family prestige (izzat) remains strong.....The importance of the social and psychological support provided by the close-knit family structure to the individual cannot be underestimated’ (Brah, 1978:200, cited in Mawby and Batta, 1980:55).

These positive aspects of control deriving from the ‘quality of Asian family life’ are however not in themselves a sufficient basis to thwart deviance (Mawby and Batta, bid: 55-56). There still remains the problem, explored in other contexts by strain theory, of how to justify to young Asians the possible discrepancy between aspirations and actual achievement or lack of achievement. Although potential delinquents may share the goals and values of the law abiding community of which they are a part, if the legitimate means of achieving these goals are thwarted, then other illegitimate means are employed such as crime. The authors argue that this solution is less likely to be preferred by Asians, in contrast to other disadvantaged groups like Afro-Caribbean youth, who have responded to the structural problems of unemployment and racism, by lessening the importance of racial discrimination as a reason for failure, and evolving or adopting alternative employment strategies like self-employment. Persistence in the search for work and with school as an alternative to unemployment underpinned by a strong meritocratic ideology are other features, it is claimed, of Asians. Recent evidence (Jones 1993) suggests that even if this had been the case in the past, this may no longer be true for some Asian groups. The authors prognosis for any future possible rise in Asian crime rates rests on the weakening of cultural support, or an increase or even continuation of pressures on young Asians, particularly high unemployment rates. Finally there are demographic pressures that could see a rise in Asian crime - that a rising number of adolescent Asians will mean that their proportion of the total adolescent population will rise, and since crime is largely a youth phenomenon, the number of crimes by Asians is likely to rise.
CHAPTER SIX

THE COHORT STUDY: YOUNG PEOPLE’S GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY OF RACISMS

From 1989 to 1993 various opportunities presented themselves to conduct in-depth interviews with young people participating in the crime prevention programme about ethnic conflict and racial violence. In-depth interviews were also carried out among youth workers, police officers, school teachers and other agency personnel. In following the same young people from thirteen or fourteen years old until they left at sixteen or seventeen, or were expelled from school, the study was able to plot biographical changes in their experience of violent racism and crime. As the cohort study proceeded it became apparent that the prevalence and intensity of racial violence was declining in the experience of these young people suggesting an age effect and/or project effect and/or locality effect. The cohort study also revealed different perpetrator and victim group experiences of, and responses to racial violence.

The White Cohort

The ‘normal’ racists

A discussion between a group of eleven 16 year old white males (and one Asian member) and a youth worker took place summer 1991 about the theme of what it was like growing up and living in Keighley. When asked how they and the youth worker had met, the discussion was thrown into an immediate, recurring and compelling theme among many young Keighleyites: ‘First time he (the youth worker) took us, we were shouting abuse at that nigger across the road’. These ‘normal’ racists, seemed representative of what the youth worker referred to as ‘the normal white attitude in the town’. The group tended to express constant racist abuse towards Asians in general and particular Asians they observed in public places or in ‘Asian areas’ they passed in the course of their leisure activity with youth workers. In contrast with other groups abuse rarely escalated into overt physical aggression towards Asians.

The following verbatim exchanges between a white youth worker and group members are instructive in revealing what appears to be straightforward and seemingly intractable white racism.

Group member: When you have lived in Keighley all your life you grow up like a Keighley lad - there are too many Pakis.

Youth worker: Don’t you see that those people were born in Keighley?

GM You think they are all taking over, you can’t go in the park without them there.
YW They are in that bottom corner, they have a right to be there, as much right as I have.

GM Yes they have got a right to go into the park....No (someone else disagrees).

YW Why is that?

GM I don’t like ‘em.

YW I would say that is a typical attitude for Keighley.

GM Yes it is but you get that bred into you when you live in Keighley.

YW Yes that is what (the previous speaker) said but as you grow older you can have a choice, as you become older you become more aware.

GM I like some of them, he’s all right (referring to Asian group member), all right, some of them are but....

GM Yes, but it is the same with white people isn’t it, I don’t like (this white person), I can’t stand (that white person), you think about it, if a nigger said something to you, right, they wouldn’t get done for it but if you said something to them - I remember on last day (at school) we were bringing metal bars.

YW That’s typical though isn’t it - end of school - for 40 weeks you could be okay - you might not like them but on the last day.

GM You get right giddy and excited...everyone got very worked up and started egging that (Asian pupil) and his new f-ing...

These different voices that construct ‘normal’ white racism ‘justify’ their dislike always in relation to the ‘place’ of their upbringing - a place that has immediate and concrete referents whilst at the same time has an almost transcendent ‘naturalness’. It is the very ‘naturalness’ and ‘normality’ of their racism that is most striking. There is nothing in this group’s outlook that suggests there is anything ‘wrong’ or ‘malicious’ in sharing these attitudes. The other theme is ‘territory’ - ‘theirs’ and ‘ours’, particularly in relation to the town’s parks in the town which are major sites of contestation between white and Asian young people, because although they offer few facilities, they are considered to be ‘neutral territory’ away from the gaze of adult surveillance. Members of the group rationalise their dislike of Asians by reference to a ‘natural’ ‘inbred’ attitude born out of time and place - being born,
growing up in Keighley. Their ‘pride’ in the town, in being a ‘Keighley Lad’, is said to be both natural and learnt in the process of growing up - a feature of birth and age, simultaneously origin and destiny.

Whatever rationalisations they offer for their racism, they are committed to the sheer excitement and physicality of fighting, chasing and being chased, whether Asians or whites. However their racism splits Asians who are known and possibly liked from other Asians, said to be ‘troubleshooters’ who are categorised in hostile ways.

YW You said that you felt he (group member) was the only coloured lad you know or you liked.

GM I know and like, yes.

YW So there are a lot of people out there you don’t like but do you know?

GM I don’t like another Asian.

YW Why don’t you like him?

GM I was walking back down to work, right, and there was an Asian lad walking up and I had seen him once, I was with a load of white lads and started shouting, I didn’t know who he was.

YW When you came down to the centre (Youth centre used by Asians) that time…

GM White and black will never get together.

YW Why?

GM I just don’t like the ones that really smell bad. (Laughter)

YW Is that because you are frustrated. (Youth worker is referring to a white group member being attacked by Asians when he was coming home from an evening out)

GM Every night, on a Tuesday, they are just as bad.

YW Why didn’t you tell anyone about it.

GM We were just getting slagged off and there were now’t we could do about it.

YW It would have been handy to know, there is a possibility of a complaint.
GM There would be all the f-ing family out, they would come out with carving knives. There's nowt like a good flight between whites and blacks is there? *(laughter)*

YW How many people agree with that, you are on your own........

GM *(Another group member)* I don't particularly like them, no.

YW You got jumped by three didn't you.

YW Yes but your attitude afterwards because I took some time to talk to you about that, I asked you if you were going to go and get your mates.

GM I wanted to go back and kill them.

YW You said to me that you would get them one by one.

GM I will do if I ever see them.

YW I said, the first Asian you see in the street, are you going to beat up and you said, no, because that would be wrong.

GM I can't say I like them because that would be a lie and I am being truthful.

YW I am asking for your honesty but what I am saying is that you weren't prepared, though you had been singled out by these lads and had been beaten up, your attitude was that you weren't going to beat up the next Asian you saw.

Time and again white young people told the study that they as individuals had 'Asian' friends who were 'all right' and 'different' to 'the rest, the Pakis'. This distinction between having personal knowledge of an 'Asian' person, either liking or disliking them, and hostility towards 'Pakis' as a racial group, was rigorously and rigidly maintained. This 'splitting' of racism between 'contingent Asians' whose friendship is valued yet whose membership is conditional on them ignoring racist abuse towards other Asians, and 'Pakis' in general who are vilified, was a constant feature of these young people's discourse, and of young people in other studies of adolescent racism (see Back 1991:19,35). Friendships between white and Asian young people, if they happen at all, operate on terms and conditions that defy the interventions of youth workers to create them.

GM What does he *(Asian group member)* think about white people?
YW  Who?

GM  *(white group member referring to Asian group member)*...He’s not going to say anything f-ing here is he...He’s different. He has gone round with all these whites from Ingrow. I can’t remember him fighting against them at Ingrow. He’s different that way. As long as he’s fighting with us he can stop. I don’t class him as being like them.

YW  I am also aware when *(Asian group member)* is the victim of abuse at school. I get really frustrated because he doesn’t turn round and batter them.

GM  He should do...

YW  You are saying that to him. On the other hand you are saying that if it was an Asian lad you would just smack them. What chance has he got?

GM  He gets all his mates and there is a massive brawl. He has got mates hasn’t he?

YW  That is another thing *(he)* is not a Muslim is he?

GM  No he is an Indian...*unintelligible*...aren’t you from India? ... *unintelligible*.

The centrality of a culture of fighting and its justification in retaliation is not easily moderated by rational arguments and comparisons.

YW  If you have a bad experience, that is bound to have an effect on how you behave. If you have a number of bad experiences that will prevent you from getting to know people, I spend most of my working time at *(Asian youth centre)* and I have got to know a lot of lads, lads who are very similar to you lads, grew up in Keighley, not so much the same opportunities, black lads. You were made welcome weren’t you but I would turn round and say if I bought a black lad into the building there might be some vibes maybe if he is with me he might be more acceptable.

GM  ...*unintelligible*...

YW  *(Group member)*...would come in the building, I am not saying he would have not faced hostility you would certainly have asked him who he was looking for but what you are saying is that if a black person comes in, you can hurl abuse at them.

GM  No if he came in on his own then they would say whose that f-ing nigger. I don’t think that we like them at all. I think if you brought same amount of Asians up here with us I think we would end up
fighting. I don’t. I do. I think if you brought them up here, same age, we would fight, it wouldn’t work.

YW Why?

GM We just don’t like each other.

YW That’s bullshit. You are saying you don’t like them.

GM I don’t like them... I never have liked them. I can’t help it, I have had...

YW So you are saying if you go on a residential with a group of Asian lads, you do various things like you have done today.

GM I wouldn’t be able to help laughing.

YW Laughing at what.

GM Just laughing at them, I don’t know why. It’s like all those football competitions we play, we nearly all ended up scrapping. Yes it’s biased is that. It is them over there and we are over here. ...unintelligible...You know cricket down at thing Mesh (youth facility). We were playing against United Moslems and they played three nineteen year olds and won. They got game, and these nineteen year olds made a big contribution towards game. I think if it had been a white team, it would have been awarded to the black team because the white team had played nineteen year olds. I think they are all lying bastards because when they come over here with moustaches and say they are nine years old. Who was it with a ‘tash and a beard who pretended to be still at school?

This adolescent racism provides both a vocabulary of motive for racial violence and fighting whilst attempting to neutralise the pernicious effects of such violence, effects that create climates of insecurity and fear in whole communities not just among the victims and their immediate families. Violence is neutralised by the routine allegations that Asians receive favoured treatment from schools, housing departments, council services generally, and the police. Asians are perceived as somehow having authority and ‘respectability’ on their side, and that this imbalance of power and influence is to be redressed by whites taking out their own type of informal ‘rough justice’ so as to re-establish a ‘level playing field’. An area of particular concern are local schools’ ‘get tough’ anti-racist policies that monitor racial attacks at school. These attempts at moral equivalence come through strongly in what young people told the study.

GM Paki, no if they start fighting with you, you get suspended for it, and f-all happens to them. From their point of view though, if they had done it our way they would get done as racist - wouldn’t
they? No, but they don't do they? They would wouldn't they? But they don't, you get put in racist book, they don't get put in racist book for calling you stuff. It's true, I agree, what I am saying is that is probably why they do it. Mind you if they call a nigger a black c-, you get put in racist book, they get away with everything. I have been called a white bastard and the teachers have just sat there. They wouldn't f-ing call me that again.

YW I have certainly been involved in a few fights, well dealt with a few at the school and we have certainly questioned how the school handled it. We questioned it in a way that it certainly perpetuates violence as in white backlash, they may send the white lad home, the Asian lad may stay in school and all of the white lad's peers get angry and wonder why their mate's out but the Asian lad is in. Tension grows.

GM I think it is the wrong way round - that it used to be against blacks and it is always whites that are getting done now...If you don't get a job and you are black they take it to court and you win all the time. They are getting too much now.

These inversions of the power positions between whites and Asians were a constant feature of white young people's community discourse, confirmed by the youth worker: 'It came across to me (from the group) as because they (the Asians) were black they get certain treatment in school, certain treatment with the police, that they get more preferential treatment'. Nevertheless, racial attacks and harassment at school had declined as a result of these policies: 'I tried asking them about an incident, a fight in the school. An older Asian lad had beaten up a white kid. When I asked them about that, they said it doesn't happen very much any more, there will be no retaliation in school. As far as they knew nothing was going to happen because, the staff, authority, came down on everybody so hard' (Worker). This observation was common place among most young people, that there was a greater willingness on the part of school authorities to punish and control racial abuse and harassment.

Young people's repertoire of racism was constructed from local lore and media sources - anecdotal and based on selective reading of the local news - and from parents. That Asians own roomier, better and cheaper housing whereas whites are evicted for not being able to afford the rent. They take all the houses...that the government invited them over, and the people weren't consulted. The group believed that the local mosque had been paid for through local taxpayers money. That 'they don't work and have lots a lot of children...If Asians are born in Keighley they should live according to English ways of life'. These views were not disabused by parents. As one group member stated, 'I have been brought up not to like them', and as another confirmed 'Me mum and dad don't like them'. Young people often referred to their parents dislike of Asians. This culture of hostility shared by many parent's was described to the researcher as typical of 'normal' racism - a repertoire which displays routine abuse towards Asians in general - as a local 'common sense', and as a repertoire particularly invoked when
things become problematic: ‘Whenever a particular problem comes up they (young people) fall back into what you could call the normal white attitude in Keighley’ (Worker).

Although routine verbal and sometimes physical abuse towards Asians was a group norm, their own notion of ‘racism’ was ambiguous. Because a group member is Asian, and routinely abused by other whites, group members felt strongly that he should not ‘have to put up with that’, because ‘he is not like them (Pakis)’, whilst they themselves behave in the same way towards other Asians. The group do not consider themselves ‘racist’, but they defined ‘racism’ in relation to the actions of one of their members as being ‘over the top, aggressive, physical...’. For them ‘racism’ is violence towards Asians whereas abuse is not, and this understanding is common among young people. At the same time as defining the term ‘racist’ as physical attacks on Asians, young people admire and give prestige to members of their own and other groups considered ‘good fighters’, and yet a good fighter isn’t necessarily a ‘racist’, and ‘fighting’ involves the same (non-racial) behaviours and motivations whether Asians or other whites are fought.

Although the normality of violence in their everyday lives was striking, violence was expressed within certain limits and rules of what was acceptable behaviour (see Marsh et al 1978). The group were generally agreed that one of their members was ‘seriously’...‘into fighting and stuff’, ‘a bully boy, someone who gets sent off at team football bringing the team down’. This social disapproval indicates that ‘fighting Asians’ may be, for this group, an aspect of a general culture of ‘proving oneself’ through violence rather than being an exclusive and racially focused activity. Whether racialised or not, many of these rivalries and conflicts were territorial, or as one group member put it ‘...They have got their own areas, why don’t they stay in there, why are they coming out?’. This white perception of Asians ‘coming out’ of their areas is, as we shall see, highly significant because it is predicated on Asians challenging the prerogative of white territorialism. What is important however is that this territorial defensiveness, extends beyond race to ‘outsiders’ in general, whites and Asians. There is a self-contradictory loyalty to the place (Keighley), that emphasises territorialism: ‘I like Keighley I am proud to live in Keighley, it give us some kind of buzz’..... ‘if you go anywhere else and you say you come from Keighley they hit you - mind, we hit people who come from out of town...someone said they came from Burnley and someone said right you bastard and thumped him - the only reason was he didn’t come from Keighley’.

The ‘normal’ racists were involved in minor offending and vandalism, often associated with alcohol use. When interviewed at sixteen they said that they used alcohol a lot in the parks, although they also attempted to get in pubs. The group complained about lack of suitable leisure facilities in the town for their age group, especially at night, and consequently spent most of their time on the streets and in the parks. Because of this they were often moved on and experienced a lot of reprimands from police officers and others in authority. For example they were chased out and then barred from school playing fields and then a local park for causing minor damage: ‘When you have no where to go you start
smashing windows and stuff...In winter last year we were all right but the winter before was shit, we went round smashing windows, we stopped playing football so we took ball in and started smashing windows. I still enjoyed it. There is now’t in Keighley'. The issue of suitable leisure places was central to this group, and the alternatives that were available were of no interest, or at least those places that could be afforded by the age group. These young people dislike youth clubs and don’t attend them. The paucity of imaginative and engaging leisure outlets for the age group seems apparent and arguably the simple provision of evening cafes in the town where young people can meet and talk might go some way in offering a structured and convivial environment for these young people: ‘You can’t go to the youth clubs because they are not your age and there is fuck-all else. You can’t get into pubs, well I can!’ The group were knowledgeable about drugs like hashish, LSD and ‘magic mushrooms’ which they saw as recreational rather than in terms of dependency. Generally, the group disliked the police, but mentioned individual (Community) officers in glowing terms ‘..because they have taken time to bother with youngsters’. Some of the group had been in trouble with the police, and said that the police pick on them, and move them on, when they have been using alcohol. Generalised attitudes towards the police were very negative: ‘They lie though, don’t they, coppers...how can they call them policemen. They are supposed to stop trouble, not cause it’.

Their attachment to school was conditional on particular experiences and seemed to depend on relationships with individual teachers and an assessment of their humour. All eleven members of the group had gained employment since leaving school. Many of the group pointed to the importance of knowing relations and their influence in recommending them to employers. The group expressed contradictory and different experiences of the careers service. However parents and relations were seen as far more important in delivering results than the careers service as far as employment was concerned. ‘It’s who you know not what you know these days’. Their views about youth training were ambivalent: ‘YTS is the only way you can get into work these days. It is good thing and a bad thing, you get shit pay for a couple of years but then after that you have got a trade’. Nevertheless there was high motivation to work and maintain employment. Indeed there was a lot of peer group encouragement and support for individuals striving to get employment. This group of ordinary working class young people, although routinely and abusively racist in outlook, were firmly located in the centre of a consensual and respectable local culture.

The ‘aggressive’ racists

Another white group comprised six males aged 15-16 years. All were born in Keighley although one was of Anglo-Polish extraction and another had South African parentage. Three members of the group lived in lone parent families with their mothers, one of whom was a student and the other mothers were unemployed. Of the three living in two parent families, their fathers occupations were self-employed delivery service, self-employed painter and decorator, publican. All lived in close proximity to an area having a substantial Asian population, three in Council and three in owner-occupied dwellings. All were
pupils at a local school. These young people had been involved in eleven violent racial incidents known to the study. These involved fighting, physical attack, verbal abuse, threats and spitting directed towards Asian peers, and took place in and near to school. Initially these incidents were seen as isolated, unconnected events by the school and the police. It was not until youth workers persuaded the school to scrutinise their racial incident log book that a pattern was discerned. Teachers confirmed this pattern which showed a consistent logging of involvement in racial incidents at the school for three of the group, that had been happening virtually since they joined the school. A key incident brought this situation to the attention of the police, who became involved when three members of the group attacked an Asian pupil’s home damaging windows then attacked another Asian youth with an Alsatian dog. An ongoing situation at school passed off as ‘bullying’ had escalated into the Asian community to affect not only individuals, but also their families.132

Fighting seemed a customary way of resolving trauma, and this group contained members that could be described as classic ‘philobats’ (see the discussion in chapter two), and who had considerable local reputations for being ‘fighters’. For example, one member had a reputation for aggressive behaviour towards Asians, and tended to instigate and lead attacks on Asian young people. Again, a pattern emerges of his having a record of fighting white youth and having a reputation as the ‘best fighter’ in his year. This pattern repeats itself in much of the data on young people, suggesting that racial violence is also associated with white intra-racial violence and fighting. As these young people matured, the ‘steadying influence’ of girlfriends, parental influence and leaving school were cited as factors in their reduction of violence towards Asian and to some extent other white young people. A youth worker said: ‘They (racial incidents) have again kind of fizzled out; whether that’s because they’re in the 5th year and doing exams and looking for jobs, or because I have become involved with them, I don’t know, but he [group member] is still involved with incidents with white youth …’. A third group member was attacked and badly beaten by two Asian young people while waiting for his girlfriend outside school. This incident engendered a change in his attitudes towards Asians as a whole. He became abusive and overtly racist, and this incident led to some attacks on other Asian youths, inside and outside school. In revenging his original assailants, this escalated to an attack on another Asian youth in the town centre. Finally, plans were discovered, apparently initiated by him, to instigate a ‘gang fight at a local YTS centre between Asian youths and group members’. These plans were prevented by youth workers. This illustration demonstrates the process of escalation that can occur from incident to harassment to group disorder. These types of racism can be intractable. A fourth member was considered by workers to be the most recalcitrant in his racist attitudes and behaviour. In comparing him to other members of the

132 This episode demonstrated that when agencies could gather different parts of a series of events that appeared unrelated, then the relationships between perpetrators and victims, and the repeat nature of such victimisation could be discerned, so as to better respond to the situation and youth workers could offer more appropriate victim support. The key to the conflict was found in the relationship between a group member and the Asian victim. Accounting for this type of racist motivation in a general sense is difficult. However, the discovery of a key motivating factor in this case, provided a basis to attempt to change the perpetrator’s behaviour. This knowledge later helped involved agencies dispel aggressive and hostile actions towards Asians. The main protagonist had been influenced in his attitudes and behaviour towards Asians by his older brother, who had a reputation as a ‘hard core’ racist and was generally feared by Asian youth. Their father had been killed in a road accident in which the other driver was allegedly an Asian doctor. These attitudes and behaviours were shared to a lesser extent by a younger brother.
group, the youth worker reported: 'He will not budge from that stance..(racism). He is keeping them (Asians) in the box and he is holding them there’. However, ‘because he has got to know them (two Afro-Caribbean and an Asian pupil at school)’, the worker has ‘kept alive this opening …this chink in his armour’: ‘I’m just keeping him within there and keep chipping away all of the time and whenever he does say something, because our relationship is really strong now I can come down really heavy, there will come a point where he might not say things, might not do things within my company but that will probably continue outside’. Again these views are subject to ‘splitting’ whereby ‘He openly admits that he doesn’t like Asians, he doesn’t mind [two school friends] who are Afro-Caribbean - mixed race, I think the reason for that he has got to know them a little bit. [The two mixed race young people] are good lads but they might have anti-feeling towards Asians’.

Interviews with youth workers in1989 when contact was first made with this group, revealed the range and virulence of some of their member’s racism. Another group member again said to be ‘the best fighter in his year’ by other group members was clearly influenced in his attitudes and behaviour by his parent culture: ‘[A teacher] did tell me that he made approaches to his father with regards [to his] attitude towards Asian pupils at the school and his father’s attitude was one of “they shouldn’t be here anyway”. Right from the start we began to pick up where [he] was getting his views from’.

The youth worker described a number of occasions in a mini bus when the group passed through or near ‘Asian’ areas: ‘We were travelling through Keighley and while we were travelling from North Street we noticed that there was an Asian wedding and there were a lot of cars and there was a person standing through the sun roof of a car with a cine camera, he was filming the parade of cars, etc. [A group member] from the minibus wound his window, shouting a whole lot of abuse which wasn’t heard by the group but needless to say he opened the window and shouted “black bastards”, “fuck off home”, “get out of this country”, of that nature’…. ‘[Another group member] said “you are really racist” and [his] reply to that was “I fucking am, now”. I think he was replying to when he was beaten up, due to that, he is actually racist. On a number of occasions on route to [a sports centre in Bradford] whenever we passed any Asians….I remember passing a group of young Sikhs, with the small turbans tied in the knot on the top of their heads, on opening the windows and shouting at them, it was obviously eyes towards them and he was making verbal suggestions, “black cunt”, “black bastards”, “they’ve got dicks on their heads”, “fucking Pakies”, all this, and again, there was a lot of anti-feeling towards [him] in the bus. The lads made him aware of that and that was just one of a number of incidents on route to [the sports centre]’. The worker mentioned that he was planning to show the group an educational documentary about the National Front but then decided that ‘I can’t use those types of videos because if I showed them any such video it would give them the attitude to go out and do it.’ There are on occasion discernible underlying factors in their racism at the level of individual meaning, invariably associated with insecurities about identity. Again, the youth worker related some information about the group member having South African relations: ‘…that is one part of the family history that his father wants to forget. He will not talk about South Africa, where he is from because [his] great
grandmother is black and he has a number of black relatives in Africa. [He] wants to go out there for a year. I was gob smacked when I found this out talking to [him], again it was on a one to one, this information did not come out within the group and I have not made it known but the lads do know something of his background because they call him “nigger lips” when they want to get at him, they say he is black because you can tell by his lips. He has some of the characteristics‘…. ‘I can see [him] putting finger signs and wanker signs towards black groups and individuals. When we go past black people you can see he zooms in straight away and whether he says things to gain acceptance of the group, whether they are his true feelings or not, I don’t know.’

It can be seen that this group possessed a virulent antipathy towards ‘Asian’ areas and the presence of Asians in public arenas. The importance and centrality of racialised territoriality to these young people’s sense of space was drawn to the studies attention early in the research (May 1989) when the youth worker assigned to this group made the following observation about the group: ‘it became very clear to me that there was definite territorial conflict within the park (Devonshire) whereby white youth had five-sixths of the park and Asian youths were only able to use one-sixth of the park and not use the facilities, the play area.’ I asked him ‘which sixth?’ to which he replied ‘The bottom corner, if you imagine the park is on three levels, three tiers, the top two tiers are looked upon as white ground, whereas the bottom tier, there is a football pitch which is classed as white, and just in the corner, lucky if its a sixth, there is a grassed area which is on North St. Asian youth actually play in that area. When I asked [a group member] if Asian and white youth mixed, he said “No that’s their area, they stay there”.’ Explanations of local racism and specifically, racial violence, seemed to lie in spatial processes of racial exclusion. This spatial factor of white territorialism seemed to be a key factor in understanding the underlying mechanisms of exclusionism and the whole range of data from the study supports this contention, whether anecdotal: ‘...in general, Keighley people are against authority and are very parochial and very territorial’ (Community Police Inspector), or based in observations like the one above. In pursuing this theme with the youth worker the following exchange took place:

Colin: How are the boundaries maintained or agreed?

Youth worker: It seemed to me that everyone agreed. While we were in the park no-one acknowledged anybody, the white lads did not acknowledge the Asian lads but I'm certain that if the Asian youth came onto the football pitch words would have been said. A strong statement was made - that's their area, they stay there - this is ours.

Colin: Were there other indications of this kind of apportioning of territory?

Youth worker: When the group and I began to go out in the minibus to the countryside or ferrying them from home to Swire Smith, we'd make many journeys through the town centre and every time we travelled through Lawkcombe Lane area, Swire Smith, Victoria Park area of Keighley [... all with
significant Asian populations], a lot of name-calling, jokes, mimicry, were taking place because we were driving through a predominantly black area and on a number of occasions quite racist terms of reference were used.'

The theme of intra-racial fighting was also pursued:

Colin: You have mentioned two or three occasions where the group were involved in trouble or fighting which wasn’t racial. Are there other incidents which haven’t involved Asians as targets?

Youth worker: There are a number of incidents without any Asian involvement and that’s normally happened on a Wednesday evening when they go to Champers which is an under-18 disco. The lads get themselves canned up, they get lager, they get spirits from an off-license and there’s been a number of incidents after the Champers or before Champers where they’ve challenged and fought with other white youth both outside Champers and on the way home from Champers.

The worker went on to list a number of such conflagrations in the town centre and with another group of white youth - a ‘middle-class’ white group called the Dressers. There is a su generis culture of fighting in which this group are invariably instigators and perpetrators against other white youth as well as against Asians. Their reputation as individuals and as a group rests on their prowess as ‘good fighters’. Their attitudes to the Police rest on the way they are policed in public space: ‘...they are quite anti-police, they see they can’t play in the park, they get chased from the town centre, they can’t do anything without the police being involved and telling them to move on... There is not a lot of trust.’

Colin: What about their attitudes to drugs?

Youth worker: Very anti-drug, but into alcohol, the whole group are into alcohol in a big way. One of the group’s father owns a pub in the town and he has access to drink...they are always smashed out of the bin.

Colin: Do you attach this drunkenness to any of the racial incidents?

Ray: No I see them quite divorced from that. With regards to the racial incidents, they would get involved in them without drink, they get more involved in conflict with other white youth, older youth once they have had some drink inside them.

Colin: How do racial attacks start?

Youth worker: One member of the group will say to another ‘that Pakis making eyes at you, giving you the eyes, he’s looking at you, he’s calling you names..’
Colin: What kind of reputation does the group have among Asian young people?

Youth worker: When I was actually talking to Asian youth while setting up the project in the town, the names [two group members] struck the fear of god into Asian youth. They really felt threatened and intimidated just by hearing their names.

Colin: What then generally are the groups attitudes - their feelings and behaviour - towards different racial groups?

Youth worker: They will say in one swift sentence, 'I don't like Pakis.' Typical stereotype thing - 'they come across here, they've took our jobs and that's why there is no work for us; living in shit houses', and they will hold that, and they will believe in that. They won't mix with Asian youth. We went across to an Afro-Caribbean youth project in Leeds in May 1988 and that broke a lot of barriers with the stereotypes they had in their heads - dress, drugs, all that kind of thing was dispelled and they had a relationship with some black youth as in a talking relationship. At first [the most racist member of the group] refused to leave the minibus to enter the project because in the immediate area there were a lot of black faces about or the lack of white faces that were about - he was afraid. That was the group as a whole, only two individuals got out of the bus and walked across to the project, but these two persuaded the others to come in and eventually they were happy to join in. They were in quite high spirits when we left the project to return to the town and it was then that we had quite a discussion about the [National] Front in the minibus, and although they knew what the Front meant and what the Front stood for, they said they would never partake in the Front because it meant violent attack on Asian households. [The most aggressively racist member of the group] said he didn't like them [Pakistanis] but he wouldn't go out and kill them, etc. I couldn't see him being drawn towards the Front but he is certainly aware of their activities - what the Front are, and what they are about. But he was still wearing his Union Jack shorts and he was still wearing his Leeds United tee-shirt and stuff.

The study pursued the themes of young people's involvement in far-right organisations, and their relationship to certain types of racially exclusive English nationalism on several occasions with both youth workers and young people in the course of the study. Generally young people were found to have no direct involvement in neo-fascist organisations in a local context where the British Movement and National Front had been active in the town in the mid-1970s but had since dissipated. There was a general dismissal of any kind of involvement in 'politics', although support for Leeds United Football Club somehow inferred a certain kind of association or commitment to white ethnicity.

Colin: What are their views of the police in situations where there is racial conflict or fighting?

Ray: They refer to the police as 'black bastards, do nothing for us'. If there was a skirmish
between a white and a black as in white and Asian 'the police would fall on the Asian side'. They see that the police would go out of their way to fall on the Asian side. They don't see the police are for the whites - much more against the whites.

The usage of the racial insult 'black bastards' in this context offers endless possibilities of linguistic analysis (see Hewitt 1986; Back 1991, 1996), but it is consistent with their general pattern of racial name-calling which conflates Asians, teachers, the police and the council as a bundle of signifiers of 'respectability' and authority conspiring to undermine their position. This distinction between who are considered friends and who are enemies demonstrates philobatic tendencies which distinguish between the 'friendly expanses' and freedoms of public space and the insecurities and violations evoked by the 'other'. The youth worker commenting on a member of the group: 'he's (a very aggressive racist) very friendly to those people he knows, but anybody else, anybody who threatens that, he comes out with his fists'. Finally, it was very apparent among the whole group the strong influence of their parents racism.

This group was interviewed again at the end of the cohort study in 1993, after leaving school and finding work. At this time they were older than other white cohort members. They seemed less overtly violently abusive in their behaviour toward Asian people than previously, although there was plenty of evidence to suggest that their racist attitudes were still negative and hostile. They indicated, among other things, that they still preferred to avoid leisure places where there might be Asians. Behaviours are more likely to change in the maturation process than perhaps attitudes.

The violent racists

The intractability of some forms of local racism is demonstrated most clearly when considering a third white group. This group became known to the study through youth workers who were attending a court case in which three white young people were appearing for assaulting a young Asian male, a particularly vicious attack. At this time these three were associated through friendship with seven others, and were aged 12-13 years except for two Asian brothers who were a year older. The presence of two (very 'tough') Asian young people in this group is quite remarkable and best exemplifies the 'splitting' phenomena mentioned earlier. Later on in the research this group expanded to embrace a further six young people. Most group members, confirmed by school, already had well established reputations of being involved in racial incidents and delinquent activity. Most of the group, except for the two Asian members, were from a large local council estate, again, adjoining an inner Keighley Asian area. Summarising their family backgrounds, eight members came from single-parent families out of the total complement of sixteen males in the group. All were from a working class background.

133 These two members present a complicated series of trans-cultural loyalties. They fought both other Asians and whites, and although being Bengalis thus belonging to the much smaller of the two minority ethnic groups in the town, they were openly contemptuous of Bengali youngsters because of their alleged inability or refusal to stand up for themselves, whereas Pakistani youngsters were held in more esteem as people who were prepared to 'stand up for themselves'. These complicated 'nationalisms of neighbourhood' are discussed more fully in the follow up chapter and conclusion.
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Two brothers had an adopted grandfather, the same father but shared different mothers who are also sisters. They were cared for by their adopted grandfather. A third member's mother died in 1987 leaving him under the care of a father who was thought to be an alcoholic. Another group member's father died in 1988 of alcoholism. One person lived in a single parent household of eight children, and another's single parent mother was a diagnosed schizophrenic. Thus a disproportionate number of this group were likely to have experienced acute family pressures and conflicts.

The whole group had been involved in various incidents involving racial violence. Two white members who were brothers had been involved in a number of attacks on, and fights with, both Asian boys and girls. According to school records, their bilateral agreement to target Asian peers, began early in their school careers. Whatever the sources of racist behaviours in their background, the consequences were felt directly through a lot of very aggressive abuse towards Asians. Attempts by youth workers to introduce this group to Asian young people did not meet with much success. These attempts were reported in the following way: ‘Asian workers took a lot of interest in the lads when they were in the centre and talked to them....there was just a little flicker and that would probably have gone the following day when they went into school and were hurling abuse back at the Asian pupils’.

The violent racists unlike the other white groups were extensive and persistent offenders.134 Their offending behaviour at school seemed to be on a continuum with their behaviour outside school: burning a pupil’s property; brought before school governors for selling ‘magic mushrooms’ to pupils; truanting; solvent abuse; unruly behaviour and violent attacks on Asian pupils; ‘intolerable behaviour towards Asian pupils’ (school record); aggressive and abusive behaviour towards other pupils. In 1990 out of the whole group only three were continuing into the 5th year. By early 1991 three group members had been expelled from school. All the original members of the group continued to be in trouble. In 1991 most of the group continued to be involved in fighting and offending; very few were attending school because they had been either suspended, excluded or expelled. The powerful influence of peer group pressure comes through strongly in the data. Educational mobility is unambiguously rejected as having anything to offer the group, but explanations as to why this should be are difficult to fathom, although a youth worker who had worked closely with the group expressed the prevailing culture of resistance and anti-academic values in the group: ‘Their view is survival of the fittest not of the intelligent. In their

134 Over a one year period from the end of 1988 to the end of 1989, two members received 12 month conditional discharges for actual bodily harm (on an Asian young person). They had started shoplifting and were cautioned, then received 18 hours attendance and a fine for receiving stolen goods. Two further shoplifting incidents for which the police did not prosecute were followed by a second conditional discharge for actual bodily harm. Finally, involvement in a burglary received no prosecution. One of them was cautioned for truancy by an Education Welfare Officer in 1989. However, this activity was shared by the whole group all of whom had routinely truanted over the period. Both young people had been involved in solvent and drug abuse ('magic mushrooms'). Two cautions for shoplifting in Summer 1989 were followed by a school report of terrorising and assaulting an Asian pupil at the end of 1989. A caution and threat of court action by Education Welfare Officers in 1989 coincided with counselling from a child psychologist because of alleged sexual assaults on girls at school. Turning now to other members of the group, they shared between them the following offences known to the study: appearance in court on three occasions on various charges including assault, receiving stolen goods and shoplifting; arson attack; numerous incidents, cautions and court appearances for shoplifting; four cautions for damaging property; indecent exposure; receiving stolen goods; assaults on white and Asian youths; caution for driving away and damage to property (at school); daubing racist graffiti.
three years at (local school) there has been no attempt to find any common ground with school, with the
authorities. It has been total resistance towards anyone in authority within the school. Race is mixed up
in that in a big way'. The implication here is that part of their complete rejection of school was their
complete rejection of Asians, and the school authorities were seen to protect and represent, or were
seen in some way as associated with Asian interests. This group more than any other were not only
white segregationists and exclusionists, their view of Asians encompassed Bauman's (1991) 'true'
racism - they were expulsionists and in some cases they supported the extermination of black and Asian
people. In this sense their highly focused violence against Asians was the expression of deeply felt
beliefs of white supremacy.

In terms of assumptions found in control theory about weak 'attachment' as a predictor of delinquency,
none of the group had regular or steady relationships with females, neither did they meet girls or
socialise with them, as one worker put it: ‘...nothing that would put the relationship with the lads to the
test....what was acceptable form of behaviour within that was very macho, very physical, very
aggressive. Their views were very apparent, their views have not changed very much over the time I
have known them’. The same worker was asked by the study whether he really thought most members
of this group are not likely to change. His reply was sanguine: ‘I don’t think so because of the
influences upon them. Not allowing that to change. There is no real form of peer group pressure within
that. It is the norm to be overtly racist and the norm to be aggressive....as long as they stay around
(their local estate). If they get jobs, it depends where the jobs are, what they do. I can see some of
them continuing to be criminally active’. This group perhaps best fits the profile of the high offending
group discovered in the survey cluster analysis discussed in chapter five. Towards the end of the study
there had been none of the age effects found amongst the other white groups, and offending was still
going on, as was overt, hostile and violent racism. An evaluation of the range of groups we have looked
at in the case studies leads to the important conclusion that the more offending that is going on among
white young people, and the more serious and persistent this becomes, then there is a likelihood of
greater involvement in perpetrating racial attacks, harassment and violence.

The Asian Cohort

We talked to a range of Asian young people, and youth workers working with Asians, in detail about
their experiences of interethnic conflict, racial violence and harassment, and whether these experiences
had changed. Some were subsequently to take part in the survey. For these young people the history
and lore of their victimisation at the hands of numerically, demographically and physically bigger and
stronger white youth revealed a longevity and intensity of racial violence and conflict, going back in the
minds of the older young people to a celebrated incident around one of the local Upper schools in 1985
when there were large scale fights and skirmishes between local Asian and white young people. For
them 1985 was a defining moment in local ethnic relations, and for some, began their resistance to
white racism.
Routine Victims

Asian young people’s experience of routine and repeated racial harassment and violence over quite long periods meant that these experiences held a central place in their lives. It was difficult to discover any Asian young person who had not been verbally and physically racially harassed. When experiences were probed, many told the study that their experience of racial harassment had not been once-and-for-all events or one-off incidents, but had been ongoing and sometimes brought in wider circles of family and friends:

'It was around three (pm), I was at East Parade, outside the train station near the (shopping) arcade, when a white lad called (...) who I had known from school asked me for some money. Because I knew him from school, at first I thought he was only joking until he started waving a knife at me and I realised he wasn’t messing around. I managed to get away from him without getting hurt. I reported the incident to the police and he was remanded for something like two weeks. Once he was released he saw me and my mum walking in the town centre, he got his friend to smack me in the face. I had words with (two youth workers) who supported me. I reported the incident again to the police, now with the youth workers helping me out. He was placed in custody once more. I know he (now) walks the street and that if he saw me he would attack me again. I would report the incident again, but now I would defend myself, I am not frightened of him, this is the only way to sort it out...’ (18 year old Bengali).

This young person and his family subsequently moved from the town because of fear from attack. Another Asian eighteen year old’s account conveys how criminal justice agencies misunderstand the nature of such attacks, a misunderstanding based in an inability to recognise the context of repeat victimisation:

'I have experienced both verbal and physical abuse many times. The worst time was when I was being taunted at school by a group of white youths who lived near me. The taunting which included being sworn and spat at continued outside school. One evening they followed me as I was walking to my house and then punched me in the face knocking me to the floor. I got up and walked to my house. I hesitated for a moment and then grabbed a knife in anger and chased them off. This led to court action being taken against me - I received one year conditional discharge. The white youths have not bothered me since. The most recent incident happened only a few months ago in Bracken Bank area when myself and a friend were walking and were suddenly attacked by three youths. I was punched in the face and kicked when on the floor. I struggled and put up a resistance but they seemed to have had their fun and walked off....I reported the incident to the police. It is now waiting court action'.
The ramifications of such attacks on other family members can be serious. Another young person, although having 'lost count of the number of incidents, both verbal and physical', recounted one incident when he and his mother were walking in the town centre, shopping, and 'this old woman came up to us and shouted, 'you Saddam Hussain's pakis!''. He said that this type of thing happened quite a lot. When asked if his parents suffered much abuse, he offered the view that the white young people gave the 'older generation mainly verbal abuse like black bastard or give 'em dirty looks'. This young person had an offending record and expressed the most negative views about reporting incidents to the police. This might suggest that Asian young people who are victims of racial harassment, who have been in trouble with the police, are least likely of all to report incidents. He said that if he had been involved in any racial incident, then he 'would go back and get the culprits'. He would not go to the police in case they decide to check up on him, because 'if we aren't perfect they [the police] drop us in it'.

Some young people pointed to the scale and unpredictability of incidents. One person related how in 1985 he was chased by over fifty white youths [confirmed by the research] to his uncle's house. The attackers were between the ages of sixteen and twenty three. 'They tipped over my uncle's milk float and broke some windows'. Such attacks seem perennial, create climates of fear, and there is an element of unpredictability, shown in the range of comments from different informants:

'I am dissatisfied with Keighley because of the racist attacks and feel bad about being attacked by white people....However, when there is no trouble I feel satisfied with living in Keighley....The serious problem in Keighley are the racist attacks, they happen weekly...I don't do it why should they?....When I was at school about one year ago in the sixth form I was worried about white youths approaching me, most youngsters do. Attacks would happen at no particular time, without any real provocation, this made me anxious'.

An Asian youth worker recalled, that in 1988: 'In...Street, where they live [an Asian family], when the pubs close, mostly at the weekends, piss-heads go up and down the streets kicking the doors and knocking and saying “wake up you black bastards”’. Many of the more serious incidents occurred at the end of the school day: ‘...it was a daily occurrence that when people left school at 3.15 p.m. there were hostilities. During the school day there was pushing and shoving, etc., and at one stage the Bangladeshi lads used to leave school earlier so that they could get home’. In interviews conducted in April 1991, Asian young people were asked whether they felt that all the whites they knew were racist or whether they knew whites who were not racist. The responses were mixed, ranging from. 'Asians are friendly, not the whites', and...I don't know any whites ...because I don’t know any who are not racist', to remarks like '55% aren’t racist, 45% are'.

The study was interested in asking the Asian cohort about whether and in what ways they had criminally offended to see what, if any, connections there might be between offending and racial
victimisation. Again the study interviewed Asian young people who had been involved in offending and some youth workers assigned to work with them. It became apparent to the study that it was sometimes difficult to separate out young people’s experiences associated with offending from their experiences of racial victimisation. Young Asians who had offended or were due to appear in court often approached the youth workers who would offer support, advice and legal representation. Sometimes, victims of racial violence and criminal offenders were the same people, or were in the same family. This happened particularly when inter-racial fighting had occurred, and the police or prosecution services view had been that the Asian young person was the perpetrator. However, other offending behaviours were in evidence, and in particular, those associated with what can be called ‘ethnic brokerage’ (see Werbner, 1991). This is described by the Asian worker as follows: ‘Asian people involved in crime were the victims of racial attacks because they could be used (by whites) to get cheap cassettes or cannabis, and the white community and white racists accepted them and could use them. Also, these young Asians could look after themselves….and rejected the police, their own families, and white racists’. Other offending involved the fencing of stolen property; shoplifting; ‘protection rackets called “VAT”, which is a “school tax”, mostly on other Asian kids. This extortion works through stopping people on the way to school and getting their dinner money’; ‘twocking’ [taking a vehicle without consent]; drug selling; and wounding. Young Asians who were involved in offending were likely to receive corporal punishments and beatings from family members. Some groups were involved in a lot of offending and tended to be repeat offenders. The issue of so-called ‘Asian’ criminality is explored in chapter nine.

School Responses

The nature of young people’s racial victimisation should be understood as complex processes involving the interaction of different agencies and actors, not only white youth. One Asian group comprised six males, aged 13-23. Five were born in Bangladesh, one in Pakistan. Two had fathers who were textile workers and two others have fathers invalided from textile work. The remaining two were brothers, whose family ran an Asian restaurant. Four of the six lived in an area with a significant Asian population and the two brothers lived above the family restaurant in inner Keighley, all in owner occupied dwellings. All attended the same local school except one member who was self-employed in the family business.

One group member was punched and kicked leaving school resulting in him receiving hospital treatment. His assailants, two white youths, were older associates of one of the white groups discussed.135 The perpetrators received short school suspensions and both assailants were convicted for violent assault and received community service orders. Two other group members worked in a family

---

135 Although the police had become involved they expressed concern to youth workers about the Asian communities’ lack of faith in police action. Youth workers encouraged the police to keep the victim’s family informed of the outcome of the investigations.
restaurant that had been subjected to routine attacks and vandalism and the police had an extensive record of call-outs to this restaurant. A particularly vicious attack involving racial abuse, racial graffiti, theft from the restaurant and damage to windows, met with a police response that appeared to be too slow, allowing the culprits to escape. A fourth group member was a particular target of racial harassment - he had been threatened and abused, threatened with a knife at school, attacked outside his home, and all these incidents involved the same perpetrators. Although at first, teachers at his school assumed him to be the ‘trouble causer and aggressor’, however, scrutiny of the racial incidents log book revealed a pattern that showed him to be the primary victim over a long period of time. The victim’s father subsequently visited the school, apparently the first time a Bangladeshi parent had done so in relation to racial violence.

Other cases similarly illustrate how a vicious circle can be set in train, in which victims of racial violence may then be made multiple victims as a result of inappropriate responses by agencies. The following episode is not untypical: After a white youth was arrested for attacking and viciously assaulting an Asian, he was released awaiting possible criminal proceedings against him. Consequently, he and his friends attacked the original victim on a number of occasions. Although the police responded by giving a formal warning to the young people identified as responsible, ‘the word had been put out amongst certain white lads that if they see him [the victim], they have to beat him up’ (youth worker). A de facto situation had developed whereby the victim was no longer safe. The situation was compounded when it was realised some of his attackers attended the same school as the victim. The schools response was to revert to an earlier practice, of allowing the victim to arrive at school ten minutes late and leave ten minutes early. This action compounded the Asian youngster’s status as ‘victim’ for now he would receive less schooling than before and less than his attackers and clearly, this response did not inspire confidence that the problem would be tackled in a robust way at school. In effect all the responsibility was put onto the victim by the school. The point was that he would not go to school because he feared for his safety and had not attended since the first attack. The school then suggested he was not in a position to take his GCSE’s, because he had not attended school. In the same month he was chased around the town again and beaten up. Soon after this he and his family moved away from the area. An important factor in this decision was white hostility against both the young person and his family.

Increasingly though, racial violence at school seemed to be declining. Most young people interviewed by the study who were attending school agreed that levels of racial violence and racially motivated fighting at school had been ‘stamped down on’. Nevertheless one respondent attended school in an outlying white area and reported that ‘...white children throw racial insults which would often start fights between white and Asian boys’. At school, ‘...racism is tackled by the youths getting detention or lines for verbal abuse and an automatic suspension for physical abuse’. Despite some disagreement the group as a whole said that they always reported harassment to a teacher when it happened at school, but if it happened outside school, they did not report to anyone, except perhaps other friends. They
reporting at school because it was effective and offenders ‘...never say it again to us..’, but also because when at school they knew the perpetrator. However few told their parents: ‘...no my dad would kill me..’

Sadly, though, white young people at school ‘don’t want to mix’...and, ‘we don’t mix with them (whites)’. One person felt that the whites were two faced, ‘on their own they are fine, but in a group they are racist’. This segregation in friendship patterns at school was confirmed by teachers and youth workers. One worker who worked in a local Upper schools said: ‘...there’s just this ingrained Keighley attitude amongst all the white kids - they go to middle school and they have Asian friends and they pick up little bits of different languages and they can say one or two things and then they move on to their final school and it becomes really segregated - sectarian - they don’t mix with their former friends at all’. Although youth workers confirmed young people’s perceptions that things were better at school than they were before, because ‘when there are overt incidents the teachers stamp on it, and are much more ready to suppress any conflict’, they were sceptical about the ability and consistency of all teachers to operate this approach. One worker commented ‘I think some teachers would, I really do, I think some teachers would see, if it was a racist incident, they would see the black child as the trouble maker, as a problem’. Of course, on occasion this may be the case.

Leisure and Segregation

Leisure patterns between Asians and whites remained highly segregated both in the town, generally, and at Youth facilities. Ethnicity determined who used which clubs independently of area demographic factors. An Asian user felt that white young people did not come to the sessions because ‘...they don’t wanna mix some off them’, it’s the way they have been brought up, they go by colour not personality’, although another said that he knows both whites and Asians that do not use youth clubs. Most were agreed, however, that the reason for ethnic segregation in club use was the racist behaviour of the whites. ‘They call out racial abuse and are always looking for trouble’... ‘At (one centre used by Asians) the Asians avoid the white racists but at (another centre used by Asians) the whites avoid the Asian boys’.

Similar sentiments were expressed about the general area although younger Asians were more positive about local leisure facilities than older young people . The overriding concern was the lack of night life in Keighley for young Asians: ‘It is not an option unless we want to fight’...’If we have a car we might get out to Bradford, if not we do without’. The key factor which limited movement to relatively safe leisure places was the danger associated with using public transport. Most of the young people agreed that, ‘...Using public transport at night is difficult for Asians because the bus station is dangerous, especially if you are alone’. Another factor was the extent of parental control of leisure movements in that younger people in particular are not allowed out in the evening, especially when it got darker sooner. On Saturdays, during the day, the group got to the town centre and felt safe. Overall, though,
the leisure activities of the younger boys were restricted by parents who sanctioned where they went on
the basis of ‘is it safe for them to be there?’. It was perhaps these younger people who were therefore
protected from some of the racial violence that existed in the town. Youth centres were important to
young Asians: ‘The best thing about Keighley is the youth clubs, allows us to get together and talk. The
worst thing about Keighley is the racial attacks and racial abuse’. One particularly lucid twelve year old
Bengali youngster offered a related but different point of view, saying that ‘...the worst thing is there is
nowhere to go and meet friends and the job situation is poor...’, elaborating with the opinion that there
are few jobs and those on offer are poorly paid textile work. However, concerns with safety
underpinned leisure choices for most young Asians: ‘...best thing about Keighley is that it is a small
town that you can walk around quickly’. Significantly, it was felt there should be a youth club in the
Devonshire area, an area notorious for inter-racial fighting and racial violence, and the greatest need
was somewhere to go in winter.

Attitudes towards the police, and experiences based on contact with the police provide an important
framework of assumptions through which reporting behaviours were conditioned and changed. This
framework had to some extent been challenged, changed and compensated for, by some youth workers
attempting to influence the police and by the receptivity for these concerns found among community
police officers. An important effect of these assumptions, was that the choice of whether to report racial
violence to the police, in situations where the police had not been receptive or sympathetic to victims,
could lead to ‘rough justice’ solutions and responses to perpetrators. In general, young people had a low
opinion of the police, which included allegations of racism and relating experiences of poor police
effectiveness, particularly when the police dealt with racial harassment or a racial attack. One of the
more stark comments was that ‘..the worst thing about Keighley is the police and their racist attitude’.
Another that ‘...The police are very racist’. The general view, however, conveyed a more ambivalent
attitude towards the police, and many young people spoke highly of individual officers: ‘Inspector [...] is very fair’ ‘we go straight to Inspector [...]’ ‘changes have happened because of [a Community
Sergeant]’. However, other officers were less respected in the eyes of these young people, and seen as
two-faced’; ‘right attitudes, wrong behaviour’. This discernment towards community officers was
not extended to other beat or mobile officers - those most likely to arrive at an incident first, and
conduct the subsequent interviews were perceived to be least effective: ‘...the police took 8 hours to
come when they broke into our house.’, ‘...whites get better treatment from police than Asians’.

The following reasons were given by workers as to why Asian victims of racial violence may be
reluctant to report the incident to the police or others in authority: ‘Some families are wary of telling
the police because there always seems to be a backlash afterwards, they wonder if it is worth it’; ‘... children said that they don’t bother, “we don’t report it to the police, our parents don’t want us to”’;
‘They [young people and their families] don’t feel confident that the courts will do anything. The
probation service and the social service get them out on bail. That one lad [a white attacker] has been
arrested twice, he has been to court twice and is still out on bail and the case hasn’t come to court. He
is still attacking people'; 'Incidents like that [racial incidents] happen all the time but they are just not reported. Sometimes they [Asian young people] don’t bother telling me because they think that I might want to try and make them report things to the police'.

Although many Asian young people said that the police are generally ineffective in responding to racial harassment, they also employed other criteria in deciding whether to report an incident to the police. Victims and their families or friends were most likely to report if they considered the incident 'serious' enough to warrant contact with the police [that is, the young person received hospital treatment]. A sixteen year old stated the situation clearly: '..if he did get into trouble, of one type or another, he would tell his friends first, then maybe Youth workers or the police, depending on how serious it was'. On the other hand, reprisals against identified perpetrators can be enacted, either as an alternative to, or as well as, reporting to the police. In reply to a question as to whether the police had contributed in any way to the reduction in racial incidents, another informant answered, ‘..I know people say the police are racist and that they are not helpful. But in Keighley it's true, the police are a waste of time, we had to sort the problems out ourselves’. A twenty six year old said that an incident had been reported to the police, in which an Asian taxi driver was racially attacked and beaten. The victim reported the incident to the police, and the two alleged perpetrators were caught. However, 'rough justice' was dealt to them, by a group of Asian taxi drivers. This was by no means unusual and the idea was to firstly, report the incident to the police, see what happens, and then to ensure 'justice' prevails - 'you have to fight fire with fire'. This pattern repeated itself in more organised ways: ‘About two years ago there was a lot of trouble at Lund Park after a few of us were verbally abused and beaten up. Knowing who the offenders were and the police not doing too much we decided to dish out our own punishment to the racists who go round picking on Asians. We used to go out after dark looking for them. We called this honky hunting'. *(18 year old Bengali)*

Changes in the Temporal Patterning of Racial Violence

An overall impression gained from the interviews with Asian young people and youth workers was that the catalogue of racial victimisation described to the study had changed in character over time. The balance of power, intimidation and threat, between Asian and white groups and individuals, had changed over the period of the study in that Asian young people expressed a greater willingness to defend themselves and their localities, and in some cases, to actively retaliate against 'known whites' or whites who were known to have been involved in racial violence. Accounts from Asian young people suggested that prior to, and during the study period, they had begun to 'stand their ground and not run away'. The underlying logic was to apportion territory between white and Asian areas, then to defend ones own territory whilst avoiding trouble elsewhere by not entering white areas and avoiding the town centre at certain times. The following comments were representative across the range of interviews.
One young person told two recently arrived trainee youth workers (Afro-Caribbean and Asian males) in early 1991, that 'had you come to Keighley two years ago it would have been very difficult for you to walk the streets without being racially attacked. Two years on it is safe. We have our areas and they have theirs'. This theme, ‘We have our areas and they have theirs’, was to resurface again in interviews. This young Asian referred to his territory as Lawkholme Lane (considered an ‘Asian’ area) and 'theirs' as the area where the ‘racists’ live. A number of young people said that the town centre is seen by Asians as 'neutral ground' during the day and young Asians feel safe walking alone, but are more confident walking in groups. However, ‘...at night the Asian young men see the town as a no-go area, unless you are willing to fight’.

When asked to say why this change had occurred, one group suggested that it was because they decided they would not be pushed around anymore, ‘we were tired of being chased, you can only take so much shit!’. Responses to racial intimidation, attack and violence had changed from one of running away to standing their ground. Through experience and trying out different tactics, their confidence had grown and they had found that ‘...the white racists would run towards them and when they stood their ground the white racists would slow down, and walk past them’. This had encouraged them to stand their ground more often and even fight when necessary. All the Asian young people the study spoke to expressed a strong sense of ‘...defending your own territory, whilst not going into the white racist areas, because that is looking for trouble’. However, this defensive stance was not the sole response, at least among some groups of young Asian males, and that other, more offensive and aggressive positions were taken. In asking one of the youth workers with a local Bangladeshi Youth Organisation about an apparent development of more aggressive behaviours, she replied, 'I don’t know about actively going out and being aggressive - I don’t know - certainly the Asian people I know would be quite happy to get involved in violence and stand up for themselves - not take any racist abuse or whatever kind of abuse - all of them'. Nevertheless, these young people were categorical about changes in the relationship between themselves and the people they saw as perpetrators of racial violence: ‘Compared to two years ago the racists will not enter our territory’. Asked what would happen if they did venture into Asian territory, one person replied ‘... they only come for one thing, which is trouble and they would get it...if the racists walked into our territory they will not walk back out, the only way out is on a stretcher’.

This bravado had an objective basis in relation to changes in the power positionings between Asian and white groups. The periodization, location and frequency of racial harassment and racial violence were identified and experienced differently by young people according to age. Young people in their late teens and early twenties tended to cite the worst period of racial violence and inter-racial fighting as five or more years prior to the interviews (1984 - 1985), whereas younger respondents reported the situation as having been 'bad' up to the beginning of 1989, although all respondents agreed, across the age range, that things had got better in the two years immediately prior to the interviews (1991). Clearly it is important to separate area, age, maturation and other effects in deciding whether these
changes had actually occurred. Because among the young people and young adults the study spoke older youngsters were 13-17 years old in 1985, whereas younger ones had been 7-8 years old, it might have been that young people were simply describing change in terms of the ages they had been most vulnerable to victimisation. That is the periods they described as peak times of racial violence simply coincided with the ages at which they were most likely to suffer violence. For example, the self-report survey showed that young Asian males were most likely to be victimised at 15-17 years old, so that young people may simply be saying that prevalence was high in those years when they were in this age range.

Similarly, these different age related biographical experiences of victimisation might be explained because youngsters use space and leisure differently according to age. Clearly there is more likelihood of attending school or pursuing particular leisure interests or going out to certain places that carry more risks, at one age compared to another. Another explanation is there have been changes in the specific locations in which racial violence occurs which effects youngsters perceptions according to where they live. Put simply, different age groups are likely to be either more at risk or face different kinds of risks of being racially victimised at different times and in different places. Older young people cited the town centre and its association in their minds with older men and pubs, especially at night and at weekends, as a source of anxiety, whereas younger informants were more concerned about the parks.

Nevertheless, both age groups - younger and older - seemed to agree that the area was safer in 1991 and had been for two years, but before that there was a lot of fighting at school and in the town centre. These changes and perhaps some of the difficulty of locating them were confirmed by one of the workers: ‘The younger ones….especially, say there is no trouble [at school], the older ones say that the trouble happened at school - it’s moved out of school now, and has gone into the streets - the younger ones at school won’t see it as much, yet yesterday they (young people) were still saying that there are fights at school’. In any case young people are likely to ‘telescope’ experiences even when given a bounded time period to say what happened to them. These different temporal and spatial experiences of victimisation by age cohort were expressed by the over-16 age group as, ‘...two years ago it was hard, it is easier now...whites don’t come in our (Asian) area anymore...two years ago it started at school...young people fighting at school, but it has stopped now...older youth have helped the younger ones and offered a lead, an example... (to stick together)’. This ‘compromise’ or ‘settlement’ of the form of interracial fighting was described as ‘they (whites) stay in their areas, we stay in ours’, although ‘town is still a no-go area [for Asians] in the evenings’. Many of those under sixteen reported that at school, they didn’t know about or were not aware of racial incidents.

Youth workers felt that racial violence was still happening, even in Asian areas, for example one worker pointed to the movement of poor white families into Asian areas, ‘causing problems’. They also pointed to changes in the town: ‘I think it has changed, I don’t think attacks are as often as they used to be, and I think young people are more aware that they need to report it to the police...I think most of
lads do now, because they understand that need to report it because the police say the figures are going down. I think in a sense they are....I think there were more serious attacks when I first came to work in Keighley...there is still harassment but not by the same people'. Another worker stated that racial harassment: '...happens occasionally, not as much. It used to be a daily occurrence before. Some of them are getting older and they are willing to challenge people, they won't move off the footpath and walk in the road, they will walk on the footpath and if anybody challenges them they will ask why and carry on walking, whereas before you used to have kids walking on a footpath and they saw a white lad and they would go to the other side of the road or walk in the middle of the road to get away from them. It is not happening as much'.

Changes in the Local History and Geography of Racial Violence

This section is based on extensive accounts by some of the Asian ‘veterans’ - older Asians who had been involved in fighting white youth.136 The basic question was ‘Whether and to what extent the pattern and nature of racial violence had changed in their experience of living in the own?’

At the time of these interviews in 1992 it was said there were still ‘hostilities’ and that whites ‘keep to themselves, and we to ourselves’. Dangers for Asians lay in going to areas outside of their own and in excursions to the surrounding countryside. The Braithwaite estate to the west of the town centre was of particular concern to Asians because of the need among Asian young people to skirt by the northern perimeter of this estate on their way to a popular play area known as ‘the tarn’, and its proximity to the main passageway for Asians travelling out to the countryside. Asian young people’s fear of white estates was based on this kind of movement rather than any need to visit the estates themselves, although all estates were seen as sources for white racism and racists. Indeed all ‘white’ areas were perceived as unsafe for Asians, although middle class white areas were assessed as less dangerous than working class white areas and white estates.137 It was also suggested that ‘Asian’ streets and areas remained unsafe because there was always the possibility that whites might ‘come in’. The town centre was ambiguous because here violence tended to occur when either an Asian young person was recognised by whites as having been involved in a previous incident, or ‘on one of those days when an atmosphere builds up, and then sometimes it starts, sometimes it doesn’t’.

136 This was not tape recorded so relies on my notes during and after the group interview. The following relies on a more or less verbatim account of what was said but my prompts and questions are left out as are the usual vagaries and redundant clauses of ‘natural’ descriptive language, so as to save space and focus on important information.

137 All areas are unsafe, but the middle class white areas are safer than the working class areas and white estates. Even Asian areas and streets can be unsafe because whites come in. It’s important to know an area well - Asian areas like Dalton Lane and Victoria park - because you need ‘refuges’ in the area otherwise you don’t go there.’....’The Braithwaite estate [an outlying estate to the west of the town centre] is the most dangerous because Asians go past there to go to the countryside. It is dangerous to go to or to go near, although its safer during the day.’....’The town centre is dangerous especially at night because when fighting was going on before, you go to the town centre then they recognise you from the fighting before. It can be one of those days when the atmosphere builds up and sometimes it might start and sometimes it doesn’t.’....’Devonshire park and then Cliffe Castle are the safest areas for Asians because in the dark you know every single bush and can hide and not be seen. Whites stop at the edge of the park and don’t come in because Asians are hanging around there all the time. The situation has changed because these parks are near Holy family [School] which gave us most trouble during all the fighting in 1985 to 1989.’
Despite these cautionary tales things were said to have changed. According to young Asian males, from 1989 'drugs stopped the fighting’... 'drugs hit Keighley in one night’... ‘it was a white problem and they were causing it’... ‘they couldn’t be bothered with fighting because they were down town selling drugs’. These changes had begun at school where from 1988 to 1989 fighting and violence had declined: ‘The main fighting had stopped, but then there were smaller hits on people you knew, and this was both ways, Asian on white, white on Asian’... ‘it was around the streets that you’d have hits on them (whites)’. ‘This was also the time when you started going to town freely [during the day]’. A 21 year-old leader of a white group that attacked Asians was of Irish origin. He had connections with Leeds United which gave him his ‘backing’ and he was always on the front line: ‘if their front man stays and doesn’t run then the group wins...but ‘Paddy’ was ‘mental’, very strong. Whites had these strong men with experience of fighting, Asians didn’t - this put whites at an advantage. Paddy went inside, then got into drugs when he came out.’

It was said that younger groups in the past were much more involved in fighting when compared to younger groups later because the conditions that produced fighting had changed: ‘some younger ones have missed it or have seen it happening and not been involved’. It is still the case though that ‘Asians can’t go out drinking in town, especially as a black group’. It was said about girls: ‘a small minority of white girls will go out with Asian males in public, but they get a lot of shit and are very few. Then the white girls would have to stay under cover during times of white and Asian fighting’.... ‘white girls can go out with black guys in Bradford but not Keighley.’ Places and events were associated with particular periods of violence, so that although the Victoria Park/Showfield area was said to be safest for Asians: ‘Victoria Park would only be threatened when the annual fair came along - the fair was a “no-go area” for Asians’.. ‘there aren’t many attacks in the Showfield area, its only when Showfield kids get chased down there’. There were ‘hot-spots’ of inter-racial fighting: ‘Bored whites would come up from town to the Devonshire area and there was a lot of fighting up there and at Greenhead’...whereas ‘kids in the survey only experience attacks going to school or from passing whites going to town, its when whites have to go through Asian areas.’ However ‘when the fair was on all [Asian] areas [adjoining] town would get it.’

The local history and lore of racial violence found in young people’s accounts of the ways in which racial hostility has changed in the town in the course of their growing up proved to be remarkably consistent across a range of young people. A recurring theme in these accounts is the way that racial
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138 See the discussion about thrills and regression in chapter two for an explanation of the centrality of this event in the calendar of racial violence and inter-racial fighting.

139 Quite lengthy detailed accounts were sought and offered by Local Heroes and suggested that a long acquiescence by Asians to fairly routine white racial harassment and violence began to break down from about 1984 in the context of widespread fighting between rival white groups from different schools. However, this spilled over into widespread organised attacks on Asians: ‘It was a white group called the ‘Dressers’ that brought attacks on - something all whites could join in. This was 1986 and 1987 and there was a lot of fighting with Highfield (Devonshire) Asians. This was the main period of fighting when there was fighting everyday. The fighting was about giving and taking areas’. Some Asians began to defend themselves by pre-emptive attacks on whites from 1987 in Winter and at night: ‘It was 1987 when the Highfield Asians created ‘ninja groups’ dressed as ninjas - they started going into white areas to carry out attacks against whites at night... The ‘Ninja Force’ was for self defence against whites...’. Mostly whites attacked Asians, whereas Asians would attack whites as retaliation - only known whites were
attacks shifted their location from areas surrounding schools to some parks and the town centre, to a situation of a general reduction in the frequency of such incidents as the different areas became consolidated as defensible space. Asian youngsters increasingly made claims that 'the tables have been turned on the whites', in that whites are designated 'at risk' when passing through Asian areas, on their way to the town centre. Previously, the town centre was seen as a source from which 'bored' whites, especially on Saturdays, entered all the Asian areas adjoining the town centre. Of these Asian areas, Devonshire Park was considered a particular challenge by white youngsters making incursions into Asian territories. The annual Keighley fair however, continued to be a source of concern among young Asians and their parents. At this time there seemed to be a growing perception among the white population, to some extent reflected in the local press, that 'Asians' were becoming 'dangerous', seen in the alleged development of 'organised gangs of Asian youth'. No doubt this public anxiety reflected what was in fact a modest but organised vigilante movement among some young Asians. However, it was at this time that young male Asians began to be associated in the minds of the local police and other agencies with delinquency and crime. 1988 to 1989 saw the beginnings of an informal 'settlement' between some groups of young Asians and whites as inter-racial fighting began to decline through a process described as 'they (the whites) kept to their areas, and we (Asians) kept to ours'. There was less fighting at school and the form of the fighting changed from large group fighting to 'smaller hits on people you knew', Asian on white as well as white on Asian. This was also the period cited by male Asian young people as 'the time when you started going to town freely'. Another associated change was the increase in drug use among, at first, white young people which was seen to contribute to a reduction in white aggression. Drug use and the (rave) cultures associated with their use meant that whites were less 'bothered with fighting'.

There were also tactical changes that influenced the decline in racial violence. Violence and attacks by whites on Asians began to be countered by better organised and demographically better placed Asian responses. 'Leadership' and 'organisation' was important in influencing the outcomes of violence and fighting and were key factors in changes in the balance of power, intimidation and threat between whites and Asians. For example, a particularly notorious leader (of Irish origin) who led groups of violent white racists, was seen to have 'backing' because of his connections to the Leeds United football supporter's club. Leadership in this context was defined as 'always on the front line', and 'if the front
man stays and doesn't run, then the group wins'. For Asians, the issue was that this leader was 'mental....very strong', and whites were seen to have these 'strong men' with experience of fighting whereas Asians did not, and this put whites at an advantage. Instead some Asians, partly through a martial arts imagery, and partly through the mobilisation of older young people, fought by stealth against a numerically bigger and stronger adversary. Although it was often the case that Asians from different areas in the town did not organise between and among themselves, the overall effect of Asian young people's defence and retaliation was whites no longer went into Asian areas, except perhaps areas whites knew had a predominance of younger people (say, below 18 years), which were usually areas having a lower concentration of Asians, and where there were fewer places for Asians to run and hide. As more 'Asian' areas became defended, then whites required more and more resources of mobilisation to enter these areas. A good part of the success of this defence can be accounted for by the relatively small geographical size of these areas, and the fact that the Asian inhabitants all know each other and there was constant surveillance.

Different 'territories' change their status of being more or less dangerous, as a result of a 'war of position' between Asian and white young people, but as 'colour coded' areas become 'stabilised' through processes of informal settlements and 'agreements' between Asians and whites about who owns which area, contact and therefore violence declines. The conditional nature of white racism is spelt out by an Asian young person closely involved with much of the history we have described: 'You kick shit out of them, they kick shit out of you, then they are friendly - they come to sell you stolen goods'. Referring to one particularly notorious white group, the young person had this to say: 'I don't think they did it because they hated blacks, but because of something to do; they also caused trouble in white areas as well'.

Concluding the White and Asian Cohort Case Studies

This narrative of racial violence and fighting in the local lore of young people is reflected in the general youth population as illustrated in the survey findings in chapter five. Perceptions between minority and majority groups were structured by territoriality in which resentment and hostility towards Asians, 'Asian' areas and facilities by whites were matched by Asian perceptions of 'white' areas as carrying immense dangers for any Asian presence. This mutual exclusion however, was by no means 'equivalent'. Despite claims made by white young people that 'Asian' areas and facilities 'excluded' them, their hostile excursions and incursions into these areas had been considerable. Although schools increasingly reduced opportunities for racial attack, the street and parks did not. It was these 'leisure' spaces and places that had been the object of white challenge and domination. It was only recently that youth centres in predominantly Asian areas had changed from being exclusively white. These mutual perceptions of exclusion, violation and imposition were major impediments to ethnic integration in leisure and other places: '...whites can come but they don't come [into clubs where there were
whites and Asians don’t mix...because whites see it this way, so do Asians,...they do their thing, we do ours’. (Asian youngster)

A worker summed up the problems of any attempt to integrate young people in the context of the prevailing imbalance of power between Asian and white young people:

‘Okay, I may be wrong but it may be that Asian young people have more of a vested interest in resolving inter-racial conflict than white young people in that white young people see that their position as, they are on top anyway, they think they have the resources and that they can go where they want. Why should they be interested in integration. You can see it from the view of the Asian young people because in quite a lot of ways, despite what you have said about them not looking outwards, those are the ones who are denied free passage. How would anyone approach starting to bring them into shared activity?’.

Turning now to the white cohort of the three core white groups, two changed in their involvement with racial harassment and violence whereas the third did not. Because all these young people were participants in a detached youth work project which aimed to change their behaviour then some of this change can be accounted for by the project’s influence. However, leaving aside this project effect, the two immediate main factors determining whether they desisted from aggressive behaviour was the maturation process and the level and intensity of their involvement in violence. There were also likely to have been contextual influences such as school policies, a reduction in the availability of victims and the wider context of a greater willingness of Asian youngsters to defend themselves or exert retaliatory attacks, all of which may have played their part in reducing violence.

Focusing on ‘proximate’ (Eckblom 1996) factors, the ‘normal’ and ‘aggressive’ racists differed in their degree of racism and its violent expression, the former group being primarily involved in racist abuse, and the latter involved in racist abuse and some violence. What the groups had in common were certain internal controls related to peer norms and pressure which cast some racist expression as ‘over the top’ and ‘out of order’. That somehow racial violence was to a degree acceptable within the context of a quid pro quo of ‘fighting’ - of proving oneself through fighting which may or may not involve Asians within the context of a local culture of fighting and group enmity based in personal grudge, retaliation and territoriality. This is not to deny the vehemence of group member’s racist attitudes but to suggest that the expression of these attitudes in violence had limits. Although this violence threshold was more extreme among the aggressive group compared to the ‘normal’ group, nevertheless the expression of systematic gratuitous violence directed towards Asians solely on the basis of racial ascription was unacceptable to group members at least in terms of the group norm. Of course this does not offer much comfort to Asian victims of the violence that did occur, but it does suggest that members of these groups were not intractable violent racists but young people who were ‘good fighters’ or aspired to be or admired those who were. This culture of violence and fighting was widespread in the locality, as the
survey amply demonstrates, and its propounders and beneficiaries earned considerable status and acclaim among young people. One important and serious aspect of this 'local style' was inter-racial fighting and on occasion, racial attack. The aggressive racists did attack Asians within a context of generalised aggression, fighting and violence towards other young people. Significantly their delinquent behaviour was mostly minor, although sometimes violent, but something which they grew out of as they matured and made reasonably successful transitions to employment and youth training.

The third group, the violent racists, occupied a different position to the other groups on a continuum of 'seriousness' in the commissioning of racial violence. These young people expressed a prolonged, persistent and intractable violent racism towards Asians not so much within the generalised local culture of fighting, but within a subculture of persistent and violent criminality. Their violent racism was on a continuum with their extensive and violent criminality. This group contained some very disturbed and insecure young people who constructed 'Asians' as an important source and cause of their problems and difficulties. It is likely that members of this group will grow into a young adulthood in which 'solutions' to the incoherence of their lives will be found in a range of anti-social, criminal and violent behaviours including a highly focused violent racism. Unlike the racism found within the 'normal' and aggressive groups this racism was not mediated by territorialism or proving oneself through fighting, rather, in Bauman's terms it was a pure form of racism rather than contestant enmity or heterophobia.

Racial violence and harassment then, seems to be part of a continuum of antisocial aggression and cannot be understood outside of this context of generalised antisocial behaviour. The problem is that 'race' provides a vocabulary of motive for fighting between adolescents, without there necessarily being an exclusively or even partially racist motivation. The issue is one of how to separate 'racially motivated behaviours' from 'just fighting' or incidental abuse. Young people, Asian as well as white, differentiate their actions and behaviours between racial targeting - 'I attacked him because he is Asian and I don't like Asians', and a more contingent 'fighting' - proving oneself through fighting. These two explanations may exist in the same situation- alternatively youth may be quite specific about why they are fighting - attributing a racial motive in one case, and a 'proving oneself' motive in another. This is not to deny or bury racially motivated behaviours in pedantic obfuscation but to clarify, as far as possible, what is really going on. Racial harassment and attacks by white young people, goes on amongst groups who at the same time, also demonstrate other forms of aggression. Specifically, white young people who target and attack Asians tend also to be involved in fighting and victimising other white young people. Often it is impossible to isolate the 'racial' incident from the general aggression. Generally, though, among the groups studied, the more property and non-racial offending going on, and the more serious and persistent this is, then the more intractable and prevalent is racial violence and harassment. The conclusion is that in multiracial situations, offending and racial harassment are likely to be associated, and in this context general delinquency and offending is likely to indicate racial harassment and harassment, offending.
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The qualitative data from the cohort study is in many ways consistent with some of the findings and trends found in police statistics on racial incidents, and the findings of the self-report survey: that is the trend for white on Asian attacks to stabilise or decline, and for Asian on white attacks to increase, although the white self-report data is more indicative of fairly widespread Asian on white offences involving racial motivation, whereas the police data suggests a more modest rise. It seems then from the qualitative data that opportunities for white on Asian attacks have become less than they perhaps were and opportunities for Asian on white attacks have become greater due to three factors. Firstly, as Asian young people as a cohort have got older in quite large numbers, in certain areas, they have become more able to defend their areas. These demographic assets within the Asian community, have contributed to an increased confidence in their ability to defend certain areas and, when necessary, to organise retaliatory attacks. This has meant they have been increasingly able to define and control the conditions under which attacks happen or are possible. Secondly, tougher antiracist monitoring and policies at schools have narrowed the scope for interracial fighting and abuse in and around schools; Thirdly, there has been an increasing likelihood of Asian on white retaliation, that may be acting as a deterrent for whites. Although this is undoubtedly effective at the level of the street, there is the danger of Asians being criminalised, and consolidation of ‘ethnic areas’ and territorial boundaries - ‘we have our places, they have theirs’ - rather than challenging the very existence of spatial apartheid in the first place. Consequently, some whites have begun to feel the brunt of these developments in experiences of being ‘racially’ victimised. However, these developments need to be treated with caution in terms of whether they are as extensive as the survey of white respondents implies.
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE EVALUATION: REDUCING RACIAL VIOLENCE THROUGH YOUTH WORK

Background

Bradford Youth Service like other Services came under pressure to subsidise its shrinking local authority budget with central funding. Its Ethnic Minority Youth Officer applied for Department of Education and Science Education Support Grant funding which was tied to the development of 'innovative projects' that worked with delinquent youth. A condition of this funding was that such projects are evaluated as to their effectiveness in an area of youth work experiencing the most recalcitrant youngsters with the most intractable social problems. At the same time the Home Office Research and Planning Unit expressed an interest in funding an evaluation of the project to discover what role youth work might play in influencing and reducing crime. The project then was seen as a development project where innovative practice is test-run and simultaneously evaluated. Youthlink\textsuperscript{140}, as it became known, was established in Keighley in 1988, and initially comprised two full-time detached youth workers, one Asian, the other white. Resources were made available for part-time sessional staff, equipment and activities, and a minibus. The project's initial planned life was five years. The aims of the project were to influence and then to reduce racial tension and racial attacks between Asian and white young people, and to influence and to divert young people away from violence and crime towards constructive and legitimate activities. These aims arose from Youth Service assumptions and concerns about the prevalence of both juvenile offending and racial conflict in the area that the project wished to target. The project proposal saw these behaviours as associated with social deprivation and poor leisure facilities, and that racial tension arose from 'competition between Asian and white young people for scarce leisure facilities and material resources in the area'. Concerns were that this had contributed to a situation by which Asian young people were showing increasing signs of disaffection from institutions and family, and that there was increasing racial hostility of white young people towards Asians. Meanwhile, white young people, especially those living on the large council estates, were experiencing their share of deprivation, seen in high levels of youth unemployment and poor leisure and other facilities. It was observed that these two groups of young people, Asians and whites, did not seem to mix, and the effect was 'two separate and identifiable groups of young people competing for exclusive use of the same limited resources' (Bradford Youth and Community Education Service, 1987). For example, it was said that Asian young people seemed only to use one youth club\textsuperscript{141}, while white young

\textsuperscript{140} The project was promoted under the name 'Keighley Anti-Racist Detached Youth Work Project' but 'Anti-racism' or 'anti-racist' as terms lacked meaning and were found to be counter productive among the young people and agencies the project worked with.

\textsuperscript{141} What the Youth Service failed to say in its proposal for ESG funding was why this was the case - that the other nineteen public and voluntary youth facilities in the town were racially exclusive, although most were managed by the local Youth Service suggesting that the proposer (the 'Ethnic Minorities Officer') either was unaware of the situation, or more probably that the detached project was part of an informal agenda to shake the local service up.
people gravitating to the town centre in the evening or at weekend. These concerns and assumptions were to subsequently influence the methods, phasing and development of the project.

**Youth Work, Crime Prevention and Control**

The historical role given to the police as the mainstay of crime prevention in Britain has been supplanted by community-based crime prevention involving a range of agencies. In essence, community-based crime prevention employs methods that aim to manipulate local physical and environmental conditions to reduce opportunities for committing offences (situational crime prevention), as part of a broader, more systematic response to the problem of crime (social crime prevention) (Clarke and Mayhew 1980; Walklate 1996; Hope and Shaw 1988). Crime prevention through community development recognises that the nature of a defined crime problem and thus strategies to combat it vary from one estate, neighbourhood or local area to another. However community crime prevention measures can serve to reinforce local exclusionist perceptions of internal and external 'threats' by 'criminal groups' to the community (see for example Graham 1990). Home Office circulars during the 1980s (see Bottoms 1990) culminated in the Morgan Report *Safer Communities* in 1991 which advocated a 'partnership' or 'inter-agency approach' which came to define the method and strategy of community crime prevention: 'Community safety should be seen as the legitimate concern of all in the local community' (ibid.:13). The *Morgan Report* (1991) concluded that government inspired crime prevention initiatives had been *ad hoc* and had usually been implemented without any consultation with other government departments or with local authorities, and therefore argued the need for clear local authority involvement on the proviso that local authorities be given statutory responsibility for the development and stimulation of community safety and crime prevention programmes, and should work alongside the police service (Loveday 1994:183). These two developments, the shift from police-led to community-led crime prevention, and independent official endorsement of local authority involvement in crime prevention work, mark the context in which the role the Youth Service might play in such work came to the fore in the late 1980s and 1990s.

In funding the project evaluation summarised here, the Home Office were interested in seeing whether a local example of youth work practice explicitly aimed at work with offenders could offer clues about the national contribution the Youth Service might make to crime prevention and control. The evaluation suffered from tensions and contradictions between, on the one hand a Home Office 'national' policy agenda in which local evaluations are supposed to deliver national templates of good crime prevention practice, whilst on the other hand the very nature of crime prevention programmes and their evaluation requires that they attend to local contexts and mechanisms as a basis to judge their effectiveness. The relative success or failure of one programme inserted into a particular locality and youth work

---

142 The fact that the *Morgan Report* has not been endorsed by government can be explained by long standing conflicts between localist and centralist ideologies in many areas of social policy but this need not concern us here (see Loveday 1994). Shapland
jurisdiction, is unlikely to offer a panacea for effective crime prevention in another locality or jurisdiction given the dependence of the effectiveness of programme processes on local conditions. Similarly the role of the Youth Service in crime prevention cannot be abstracted from the crises and direction of the Youth Service. This characterisation of youth work as in crisis, facing possible demise, and faced with a situation in which its future direction and role is uncertain, has been a constant theme running through the literature of the late 1980s and 1990s (Tucker 1994; Paraskeva 1992; Smith 1988; Shaw, Jeffs and Smith 1988), although there is a sense in which crises of one form or another have been ubiquitous to the Youth Service throughout its history (Shaw, Jeffs and Smith 1988; Smith 1988). For example Tucker (1994) argues that the contemporary crisis of youth work is said to be of funding and of professional autonomy and identity. Indeed, the National Youth Association (1992) national survey suggested that over 40% of Youth Services were to receive funding cuts with another 43% having a 'stand still budget'.

It is this reduction in local public spending on the Youth Service resulting from increasingly parsimonious funding from central government, combined with a restructuring of its role and relocation within local authority structures, which has seen youth workers increasingly involved in specialised or task specific issues like community development or juvenile justice work. As Jeffs and Smith (1994) argue, because of funding crises the Youth Service is already heavily involved in crime prevention work as a means of financial and institutional survival. This has weakened any priority given to development and training, itself feeding a crisis about its direction, purpose and aims (Wiles and France 1995). This lack of clarity (see Love and Hendry 1994) by Youth Service Managers, workers and young people themselves, makes any evaluation of methods and aims problematic. Another major theme has been the evidence supporting claims of a centralisation of policy towards the Youth Service countered by arguments that the strength of the youth service lies in its diversity and ability to respond flexibly to local needs at local level (Jeffs and Smith 1994:18). However, retention of local control over the Youth Service remains problematic, although for historical and pragmatic reasons partial local and other forms of autonomy survive (ibid.:18,20,25,29; Shaw et al, in Jeffs and Smith 1988:102,111; Smith 1988:86-87; Davies 1986:10; Jeffs 1979). Jeffs and Smith (1994:29) propose that youth work can only be enhanced ‘by attending to the small and local’ in the context of ‘rebuilding local democratic

(1996:362) argues that ‘The suggestion in the Morgan report, that local authorities should be lead actors has not been implemented’ despite the fact that the ‘the Home Office is not organised to deliver locally.’

143 These predominantly inter-agency initiatives have been encouraged by a range of government circulars and Home Office reports (eg. Home Office 8/1984; Cooper and Lybrand 1989; Home Office 1990; Home Office 1991; Bright, 1993). See Stenson and Factor (1994:1).

144 The issue is more complicated than this suggests in that Ministers were already being persuaded that the Youth Service was ‘a lost cause’ from the point of view of imposing on it any central plan to increase its role in crime prevention and control. This ‘advice’ was coming from the Home Office and the DFE and hinged around the fact that Youth Services and workers ideology were entrenched within local authority control and to ‘extract’ them would not be politically feasible - private conversation with Home Office official. Interestingly Foreman (see Foreman, N. 1992 ‘Youth Service Must Reach Those In Need’, Department of Education and Science News, No. 182/92) in his speech to the first Ministerial conference on the proposed national curriculum for youth work, cited detached work as central to youth work with offenders or at risk youngsters. Jeffs and Smith (1990), have emphasised local autonomy and variation as resistant to centralising tendencies, and indeed that youth workers in their practice have long benefited from and exploited, the resulting lack of accountability. This has however also meant a lot of variation in the quality of youth work practice. Jeffs and Smith (1994:18; Smith 1998:1-47) have argued that an analysis of the history of youth work (and education and youth justice) demonstrates that it has consistently been the local, not the central state, that has initiated reform and innovation; a pattern replicated in voluntary sector.
institutions', and Tucker (1994:16) concludes that: 'The Youth Service currently stands at yet another significant crossroads', between social education, leisure provision or crime prevention.

A further set of tensions and contradictions concern the supposed reluctance of youth workers to commit themselves to crime prevention work with offenders because of the association in the minds of youth workers and in their professional ideology of this work with social control. This tension is between a crime prevention orientation and broader pedagogical approaches to youth work which corresponds to an historical tension in youth work between conceptions of youth work as social control, targeted towards marginal populations, and as a universal service for all young people, legitimised within educationist and welfarist conceptions (Stenson and Factor 1994:2; see Smith 1988:187-199; Tucker 1994; Jeffs and Smith 1994:17,20). The study will argue however that youth workers can be key actors working with the juvenile justice system as advocates, and as practical critics of discourses about 'youth criminality', through work supporting young people as victims of crime. As their social education role has declined in relation to other youth agencies so their advocacy role has increased, particularly as youth workers themselves claim they are best suited to work on behalf of young people as they are not agents of the state with statutory responsibilities. However where youth workers have explicitly involved themselves in crime prevention and work with offenders they have not fared very well (Graham and Smith, n.d.; Adams in Jeffs and Smith 1988). These dilemmas that are intrinsic to youth work's involvement in juvenile justice, crime prevention and control are summarised by Adams (ibid.:182, my emphasis):

'The juvenile justice system tends to produce dichotomies between the control of delinquents at its core and preventative work with those at risk towards the margin. The structural marginality of many youth workers in relation to the justice system processing many of the young people they know so well provides the starting point for a complex debate about if, when and how they should intervene in the system. Whose side is the youth worker on? Is the youth worker simply another social worker or police officer in disguise? The youth worker operates in an ambiguous territory between statutory imperatives and the informality of the street.'

This question of which side youth workers are on is the central practical and professional dilemma of youth work involvement in crime prevention work, especially when their work is conceptualised as operating within essentially two contradictory yet dominant discourses of 'control' and 'education'. Yet

---

145 Stenson and Factor (1994:1-4) locate this 'disciplinary control' within a debate not only about role conflict for youth workers but about 'governmentality', or 'the conduct of conduct. This operates in a multiplicity of sites, without necessarily cohering into a centralised apparatus of power. It refers, therefore to the whole spectrum of regulatory practices, ranging from self-government to the regulation of inter-state relations (Ibid.:3), and concerns that 'With minimal public debate, the new drift towards a crime prevention brief for youth workers would - in effect - redefine an increasing proportion of youth workers as adjuncts of the criminal justice system' (Ibid.:1).

146 See Adams, R. et al (1981: 315-6). Marker and Smith's (1988b in Jeffs and Smith op cit.) examination of areas where there is youth work involvement with the police conclude that the main policy issue is 'the accountability of the police and the relative powerlessness of youth workers and young people', therefore this is essentially about the ability of the police to exercise control.
the practical resolution of this dilemma may involve youth workers working out in their locality tactics which will enable them to intervene in the juvenile justice system without becoming identified as annexed to it (ibid.: 184). This dilemma was at the core of Youthlink’s work with young people when, for example, workers possessed the crucial information to transform a court report into a practical alternative to custody, whilst at the same time needing to communicate it without becoming in the eyes of young people tarred with the same brush as social workers. Similarly, the project’s role in relation to schools and disruptive pupils saw workers caught between the more custodial and formalised role of the school teacher and the youth worker’s appreciation of the experience of the pupil. The argument offered here is that the Youth Service and youth workers are faced with a number of opportunities to involve themselves in social crime prevention in ways that are not inconsistent with ideologies of ‘empowerment’ and democratic forms of ‘localism’ but which exclude ‘social control’ ideologies. The alternative of refusal to become involved may increasingly leave the Service open to its identity being reformulated within the crime control framework.

The ways in which this can be done are outlined as are some of the difficulties arising from youth workers holding a too narrow view of social justice and equal opportunities. This thesis has demonstrated first, that crime and experience of crime is an everyday reality for young people (Brown 1995b; Anderson 1994; Loader 1996; Hartless 1995); second, that it is possible for youth workers to engage with young people who are victims of crime and offer them support. On the other hand this victimisation is connected in complex ways with young people’s offending behaviour. Attempts by youth workers to reduce the extent to which young people are at risk of drifting into offending are consistent with an ideology of ‘empowerment’ which tries to offer young people alternative life choices. The extraordinary denial by some youth workers of the importance of criminal offending, witnessing crime and criminal victimisation in the lives of the young people they work with beggars belief. It seems that in inverting ‘official’ discourse about young peoples ‘criminality’, youth workers deny the real discourses or cautionary tales of young people themselves who are more worried about crime and being victims of crime than those adults who condemn them. An admission by workers of the normality and centrality of crime and victimisation to young lives suggests that the notion of unequal opportunities for young people covers areas of experience wider than unfairness in areas of leisure provision and employment opportunities, important as these are.

If the youth work project evaluated here demonstrated some strengths of detached methods in engaging young people who were victims and perpetrators of crime and violence, it also exposed some weaknesses which derived at least in part, from a prior ideological commitment to equal opportunities in the area of ‘race’. On the one hand, because faced with local conditions of territoriality and high levels of racial violence and group enmity, this prior commitment to equal opportunities served the project well in enabling it to address these concerns among young people. On the other hand, this

in any inter-agency co-operation (Ibid.:197).
ideological commitment became a hindrance to addressing problems of criminality associated with racial and other forms of violence. It was however able to develop victim support and an advocacy role analogous to the specialist role of defence lawyers in the legal system. The conclusion is that for workers not to engage in crime work in high crime areas where young people are disproportionately victimised is to deny the reality of crime in young people’s lives and their rights to be protected as victims and impartially represented as offenders.

Detached Methods

The project used detached youth work methods. However such methods are faced with a number of contextual pressures: first, the Youth Service generally has had to face a growing need to respond to fixed term programme funding, originating from central rather than local government, where a condition of such funding requires youth workers to identify how youth work can be used to achieve specified ends and also that they should evaluate the success of their work; secondly, the pressure to work with the most ‘difficult’ youngsters and particularly those that schools are not prepared to educate; thirdly, the resulting stress and difficulty of detached work can cause withdrawal into activities that avoid face-to-face work on the street; finally, detached work is not easy for managers to manage or measure and therefore it is not as easy as say, centre-based work, to demonstrate that it has a straightforward productive effect, which is precisely an increasing requirement of its funding. This is also partly a problem that poor evaluation is a function of the lack of clarity youth workers possess about how precisely what they were doing will have an impact on young people’s possible future criminal careers. This lack of clarity is compounded by a professional discourse that uses language vaguely in such concepts as ‘empowerment’. The ubiquitous question of ‘what works’ in crime prevention is undermined by the difficulty of evaluation of methods in relation to aims without a clear framework which links methods and aims.

Detached methods have perhaps been more associated with crime work with young people than other methods (Gillis 1981:116; Tucker 1994:5-6; Smith 1988:37; Jeffs 1979; Albermarle Report 1960). The Albermarle Report in particular was influential in expanding detached youth work and its integration into mainstream professional approaches to working with the ‘unattached’ and delinquent youth (Smith 1988). Whilst on the one hand detached methods have been more associated with ‘crime control’ than mainstream centre based methods, on the other they have also been associated with other ‘innovations’ such as equal opportunities. According to Tucker’s (1994:6) periodization, the 1980s and early 1990s saw ‘a significant expansion in anti-discriminatory work, promoted through a growing awareness of

147 Wiles and France (1995:12-13) clarify this problem in the following way: ‘Workers often find it difficult to distinguish between different methods, other than a broad distinction between street work on the one hand and club based work on the other, and even this distinction is often little more than the ideological pennants of the old battle about how one reached Albermarle’s ‘unclubable’ youth. Even worse is that there is little developed thinking as to how different methods relate to different outcomes. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that when faced with a requirement for youth work aimed at reducing the risk of offending very few workers were able to come up with more than general youth work practices and could not specify how these might achieve the required result.’
equal opportunity issues, whilst the developments of ‘alternative routes’ to qualifications, has helped to increase the numbers of qualified Black and women workers’. Youthlink shared this concern with equal opportunity matters such as the training of Asian youth workers recruited from the locality in a situation where there had been no Asian youth centres or workers. Yet the fundamental tension found within the project between a concern to pursue equal opportunity matters and a funding obligation to work with those at risk of offending was ingeniously resolved through the recruitment of part time young adult Asian sessional workers who had themselves been in trouble with the police.

In the case of white youth, those youngsters who were considered leaders and admired (or feared) by other young people were given a central role in the work of the project. It was these youngsters who were first asked to participate in the project and others were recruited through them. They tended to be regarded as the ‘best fighters in the school’ and were more often than not at the forefront of attacks on Asians. Some of them were involved in a range of delinquency and crime, but they all had reputations in the locality as fighters and as instigators of inter-racial fighting and as perpetrators of attacks on Asians. In some cases they were the younger brother of older young men who had reputations as notorious and violent racists. In the case of Asian youth, leaders who were similarly admired by Asian youngsters were recruited to the project with the inducement of offering them their own leisure places in a situation where there had been no where to go and meet. Although some of these leaders had been involved in delinquency and crime or had been in trouble with the police, this time they were recruited as part-time youth workers which offered a further inducement to their involvement. Many of them had a reputation for standing up to white racists in the locality and they also often had reputations for being good fighters and for protecting other Asian youngsters and Asian areas. Their initial involvement had the effect of attracting other Asian youngsters to the project.

This tendency for workers to enrol young people who were ‘admired’ by the local youth population enabled the project to target a clearly defined community of young people who were, had been, or were likely to be, involved in offending and/or racial violence and fighting, also made the project more effective in influencing the underlying contexts and mechanisms of racial violence found in the locality. However, the success of this approach, of recruiting some Local Heroes as participants and sessional workers, has to be judged in terms of the social education and ethnic integration aims which the project set itself.148

Evaluation Methods

the study has already mentioned some of the problems of evaluating detached work as a method of

148 The method contains a series of connected premises which essentially hinge on the notion of bringing the different ethnic communities together, and bringing both these communities closer to the local adult and mainstream community. This social participation and integration into both the local community and society at large is seen as central to reducing a young person being at risk of drifting into crime. The key to realising these processes is seen as social education which by helping youngsters gain information and skills that enable them to make ‘informed’ choices about their lives, and on this basis change their behaviour. Underpinning this approach, however, is the idea that tackling crime and particularly racial violence is the responsibility of the neighbourhood or community and not just about young people changing their behaviour, important as this is.
crime prevention. In chapter three it was suggested that good evaluation can be achieved by clarifying the *mechanism* by which the programme impacts on the crime problem, so that an *outcome* evaluation also requires specification of the *processes* and the *conditions* necessary for the mechanism to work (Bright 1996:369; Tilley 1993; Ekblom 1996:44). Ekblom (op cit) however continues to suggest that crime prevention evaluations focus on the *proximate* circumstances and causes of the crime, that is the *presence* of the potential offender and his interaction with the crime situation, rather than the *contexts and mechanisms* of the locality/community in which the programme is inserted. Other writers however, widen this situational approach to include notions of *defensive strategies* embarked on by actual or potential victims, victim groups, and even victim communities employing self-help and defensive community strategies (Bottoms and Wiles 1996:7-8).

The overall evaluation methods employed emphasised principles and methods more associated with environmental criminology with its emphasis on the idea that levels of crime and patterns of offences vary significantly between small geographical areas (Bottoms et al, 1989; Shapland and Vagg, 1988; Shapland, Wiles and Wilcox 1994:1). Specifically the evaluation was concerned to assess the likely affects of community contexts and processes on project outcomes and asked 'what were the unique characteristics, if any, of this particular geographical locality so as to produce such a different outcome in terms of these behaviours compared to comparable areas?' and therefore the need is to think about crime prevention at this very localised level. The evaluation focused on three dimensions of the project's crime prevention approach: first, its situational measure of taking actual and potential victims off the street and thus reducing the availability of targets; second, its work with offenders; third its social measure of mobilising communities of Asian young people themselves to combat the likelihood of people attempting to commit crime or violence.149 Crucially the evaluation sought to see if the ways the project had identified and understood the 'crime problem' was a realistic appraisal of the situation as understood by the youth population themselves.

**Project Aims and Methods**

The project began with a clear set of aims and objectives, and methods designed to meet these objectives, while being aware that the intended methods would change and adapt during the project's experience and development. An inter-agency advisory committee was established to manage the project whilst serving at the same time to take advice and reports from the workers that could influence and adapt agency practices towards the types of young people participating in the project. The workers were then to make relationships at street level with the hard core of racist White young people and with Asian victims of violence; to divert young people away from violent behaviour to constructive recreational use of leisure; to work towards and engender attitude change by social education; to incorporate and integrate young people who would not normally use existing institutions and facilities.

---

149 It is important not to jump to conclusions here. In meeting demands for a place to go the project indirectly contributed to processes that were already going on within the local Asian adolescent community.
into these provisions; to help create a better understanding between groups of Asian and white participants, so that they could establish non-aggressive relationships with each other, through an incremental and staged approach towards integration; from separate activity towards shared activity, and finally integrated activity; and finally through work with young people, to influence race relations in the rest of the community. This set of initial aims and objectives were mostly followed throughout the project's life, although some received more emphasis and attention, while others were only occasionally addressed as opportunities presented themselves to put specific aims and objectives into effect, and some, in effect remained intentions.

These objectives were addressed in a number of ways. Workers scheduling meetings at which a range of relevant agencies were invited. However, the Advisory Committee did not serve as part of the management of the project in the way envisaged. As will be seen, the workers themselves managed the project. Although young people were directly contacted on the street, the primary sources of contact were referrals through the Advisory Committee, the schools, the police and voluntary agencies. Nevertheless, following this initial contact through agencies, relationships and groups were formed at an informal level on terms established largely by the young people themselves. These terms mostly related to recreational and leisure activities that were felt to meet the interests of the young people, in return for a willingness by young people to be scrutinised and challenged on their behaviour. During the projects work, participants were introduced to the range of leisure and youth provision in the area and this extended their skills and ability to use leisure time and avoid boredom. However, in the key area of encouraging the use of youth clubs and centres, the white participants maintained their views about the irrelevance of this type of provision and refused to involve themselves, preferring a detached relationship to the workers. The Asian participants, on the other hand, fully endorsed centre based provision, although on a very different basis to what had gone on before. Reparation and reconciliation between Asian victims and white perpetrators was attempted in modest ways through individual counselling, group work, competitive sport, day trips, residential visits and international exchange trips, organised by the project to bring rival groups of white and Asian young people together. Community race relations was addressed through such strategies as advising the police on operational matters concerning local festivals and calendar events such as the Keighley Festival, notorious for racial conflict. Other approaches were through liaising with and involving both the parents of the young people and local residents and organisations. The most important aspect of this objective was the influence the project had on how local agencies tackled racial violence and conflict. Whether and the extent to which these aims and objectives were achieved will be considered in the Summary. Generally, then, the original aims of the project were adhered too, and the methods employed to realise these aims, and associated issues and problems, are outlined below.

The project proposal stressed the importance of long term and consistent contact with young people, contacting younger groups of 12 to 13 year olds and following them through to leaving school. Offering these young people support, monitoring their behaviour and intervening where appropriate, would
enable youth workers to influence them at a susceptible age to avoid a possible drift into delinquency later. It was on this basis that the phasing of the project would take place so that intensive contact with young people would reduce with the development of leisure activity and an expected increased involvement of the young people in existing mainstream leisure facilities. The project proposal also stressed some of the advantages of detached youth work methods compared to other methods of working with young people. In particular it was pointed out that detached work offers a more flexible and immediate response to young people's problems and crises; is informal and therefore less threatening to young people; and enhances access to groups of young people disaffected from mainstream youth provision and who would not normally have been reached until they were already in trouble. The developmental aims of the project had two purposes. First, to see a process of diversion taking place among young people towards more socially acceptable behaviour and activity in the areas of offending and racial violence, through attitude change and incorporation into available youth provision. The second purpose was to engender a process of diverting Asian and white young people from their preferred social and leisure patterns based on racial segregation towards shared and racially integrated activity. It was felt that there would be an incremental and phased integration in both areas of behaviour - offending and racial violence.

The actual practices and methods that were employed during the project's work in attempting to meet the aims and objectives were varied. The workers established a base from which to carry out detached work and co-ordinate contacts and actions. This 'base' came to have much more material and symbolic importance later on in the sense of it also becoming a base for, at first, Asian youngsters who were perceived as leaders in the Asian youth community, and subsequently became a large almost exclusively 'Asian' youth centre. The multi-agency Advisory Committee which met here was used as a springboard to network and form relationships and contacts with local agencies. The committee also served as a source of referrals of young people involved in crime and racial incidents. An expansion of the project base building took place through taking over the existing youth centre in which it was housed, so providing a room for older Asian youth and centre based activity for younger Asians as 'protected' environments for actual and potential victims. As this expansion took place, additional workers were employed - three full-time and five part-time sessional workers, two Whites, six Asians to identify and form relationships with the hard core of both offenders and victims. Further expansion took place through the employment of seven temporary full-time placement students, and two part-time workers to extend centre based work with Asian young people. This early and rapid expansion was a direct response to there being virtually no other place in the town for Asian youngsters to meet and socialise. Detached work with white youth, however, hardly expanded because the employment of an additional full time temporary placement student to work with white youth on a detached basis, sufficed only to compensate for the fact that original white detached worker became half time on the project due to promotion.
One of the most controversial aspects of the projects work was challenging the local Youth Service and what seemed to be its white exclusionist culture through challenging local youth club provision that, in effect, excluded Asian users, and offering alternative ‘Asian only’ sessions in a situation of considerable racial hostility. This type of questioning extended to other leisure agencies where racially exclusionary practices were challenged and advice was offered to local leisure centres in the context of inter-racial conflict and rivalry over use. Finally, and importantly, the project worked with schools and the police. The project worked directly with local ‘Upper’ schools (holding the 13-18 year old age range), who referred victims and perpetrators of racial violence to the project, and disruptive or truanting pupils participated in the project both within and outside school. The project successfully challenged the counter productive ways that schools had tackled racial violence (see chapter six) and advised them about their systems and practices for recording and tackling racial incidents at school. The project worked directly with the local Sub-divisional Community Policing Section, who referred victims and offenders to the project, which then offered diversionary activity and victim support. Importantly the project involved police officers in work with young people which enhanced the legitimacy of community officers in the eyes of victims and other young people. Young people were more likely to report incidents as the project challenged and influenced systems and operational practices for recording and tackling racial incidents. Finally, workers acted as advocates for young people appearing before the Court as witnesses, victims and offenders. This role developed into youth workers becoming more central to the court’s proceedings, as magistrates and court officials delegated responsibility to workers for advising the court and young people’s families, about the viability and nature of court dispositions in relation to the young person’s situation.

**Project Phases**

The project developed in distinct phases. During the first phase the project concentrated on contacting young people through interagency referrals, and establishing youth facilities in the area. At this time most local Asian young people were unable, and some groups of disaffected white young people were for different reasons, reluctant to use local authority Youth Service facilities in the area. Through the process of establishing itself, the project highlighted the racially exclusionary nature of existing youth provision. It also served as a focus for a new interagency forum to tackle racial violence and offending in which local forms of racism became the subject of debate among local agencies. In the second phase the project challenged lack of access of Asians to existing youth centres used exclusively by white youth and sought to establish alternative centre based provision for Asians in two areas with significant Asian populations. Meanwhile workers through referrals and peer contacts generated group and case work with young people. Through contacting young people and recruiting them, the project came into contact with other agencies, notably the schools and the police, and began working directly with these agencies. Project workers used interagency contacts to influence both the ways these agencies responded to young

---

150 Programme phases are represented diagrammatically in Appendix 4.
people and to influence the young people themselves. The Third phase was marked by a bifurcation of the project into centre based work with Asian, and detached work with white young people. The Asian worker supported Asian victims of racial violence and the white worker worked with white perpetrators. Although attempts were made to reconcile and repair relationships between victims and perpetrators, this largely failed so that workers worked with their respective groups separately. Centre based work with young Asians was adopted as a major aim of the project and fully occupied the Asian worker. At this time concerns with crime emerged as secondary to concerns with racial violence, access and equal opportunities. Centre based work with Asian victims of racial violence expanded compared to detached work with white perpetrators as victim support and the creation and running of a safe building for Asian young people increasingly absorbed the projects energies and resources. The fourth phase saw a change in emphasis from racial violence and equal opportunities towards influencing offending and school disruption among both white and Asian project participants, through detached and centre based work. Work in influencing juvenile delinquency was less successful than earlier work aimed at reducing racial violence and providing equal opportunities. This phase was marked by a lack of clarity of purpose and uncertainty over the direction of the project. This uncertainty was compounded with the promotion of the white worker resulting in a decline of detached work with white youth and further expansion of centre work with Asians. Work with agencies also suffered as key collaborators in schools and in the police left or were promoted. Nevertheless some agencies, partly as a result of their collaboration with the project, had been influenced to reassess and change their priorities and policies towards recording, monitoring and interpreting racial violence.

The decline in work with white perpetrators of racial violence compared to victim support among Asian young people was detrimental to the work with white youngster's at a crucial point in their development. This bifurcatory approach of a decline in detached work with whites and expansion of centre based work with Asians continued until the project was eventually mainstreamed as an Asian youth centre in 1992. The fifth and final phase of the project’s life saw an increasing concern with Asian offending whilst at the same time a diffusion of victim support occurred. In developing youth provision for Asian young people where none had been available, the project had reduced racial victimisation on the street. At the same time this contact with young Asians had placed the worker’s in an advocacy role, first in championing access to youth facilities in the area, then as offering victim support, finally attracting young people who were in trouble with the law. However, the expansion of the Asian youth centre, although clearly responding to real needs in the area, had happened too early and too rapidly in the project’s life resulting in drift from the original aims of the project. The workers became in effect youth centre managers rather than continuing their defined role as detached youth workers.
Process Conclusions

The project operated within fundamental assumptions and an ethos of youth work that had grown up since the 1970s. Bradford Youth Service had been mobilized, with the Education Service, as a key vehicle to implement Local Authority 'race relations' policies, interpreted as extending these services to address the needs of ethnic minority youth and opening up access. One of the effects was to provide an equal opportunities type of provision to Black and Asian young people, whilst ignoring the reception of this approach among white young people. The focus became one of responding to the needs of ethnic minority young people because they suffered racism. This led to some unintended consequences from the point of view of improving 'race relations'. One consequence was a relative neglect in tackling the sources of racism among white young people living in outer suburbs and white council estates, compared with providing compensatory youth and leisure services to ethnic minority young people living in inner city areas, who it was thought suffered disproportionately from social and economic deprivation.

In focusing its efforts on access and provision for the areas young Asian population living in inner Keighley, and not expanding its detached work with white young people living in the outlying areas, the project continued to apply 'race relations' assumptions to project tasks resulting in an unbalanced approach to its work with young people. The high priority given to concerns with victims of racial violence and equal opportunities, and the lower priority given to working with perpetrators of racial violence and offenders, seems to be a feature of the Youth Service both locally and nationally. These priorities and make projects that aim to work with offenders and perpetrators and victims, difficult undertakings. Although offending was addressed, project resources were overwhelmingly skewed towards support for Asian victims of racial violence and the provision of youth centre facilities for this group. The establishment of mainstream centre provision for Asian young people was won at the expense of the projects other aims of reducing crime and working with white young people, and this imbalance in relation to its aims was caused by the expansion of centre work. As long as there is an implicit ethos and pressure in the Youth Service that the success of practice be measured by the numbers who attend a centre, then specialist work with offenders and victims suffers as a consequence. The Youth Service’s ambivalence about working with offenders and perpetrators compared to working with ethnic minority groups and victims, is likely to continue to undermine consistency and clarity in projects like the one considered here.

The weak development of the interagency Advisory Group to the project, although a crucial source of referrals to the project at the outset, further contributed to this drift and diffusion of project aims. The management arrangements for the project were such that the worker’s themselves were left to manage the project over most of its life. This was in part because the project’s Advisory Committee was expected by the instigator of the project to take a management role from the outset. The Advisory Committee was unable to meet these expectations as it became preoccupied with defining its own role as an interagency forum for different and sometimes competing professional interests. In any case it was too diverse and unwieldy in its membership to accomplish this function successfully. This vacuum...
left in the management of the project, resulted in workers being over burdened with everyday management responsibilities leaving them little opportunity to stand back and reflect on the overall direction and development of their work, or to systematically plan methods designed to achieve project aims. This reflection and monitoring of project aims and methods became subsumed to the everyday crises, imperatives and contingencies of project work.

Work With Young People

The project pursued social education aims and methods at a time when local schools were increasingly suspending, excluding and expelling the most troublesome young people to meet their own increasingly competitive performance indicators defined by Local Management in Schools. As a result, the project subsequently became a ‘dumping ground’ for excluded pupils. Prior to this happening, often youngsters it already worked with who had been initially referred by schools through project-school liaison, were themselves expelled or excluded during the course of their participation in the project, thus the project became a ‘dumping ground’ by default.

The community conditions in which the project intervened were found to be ones of widespread group enmity between adolescent whites and Asians that parents, local agencies including the Youth Service, the police and schools had hardly begun to address. Indeed this racialised group enmity was compounded by parental and institutional racism. The project’s work in challenging this wider community and institutional racist discourse was at least as important, and took as much priority as its work with young people. This ‘unexpected’ discovery of pervasive white racial exclusionism, particularly within the local youth service and its youth facilities, had two important practical consequences for the projects work and development. First, face-to-face group work and case work with smaller numbers of young people became secondary to establishing and managing centre based sessions for large (150) numbers of Asian young people in a situation where safe club environments had not been made available by the local Youth Service. Second, a disproportionate amount of time was given to contacting and negotiating with agencies, particularly schools and the police, to get them to address racial violence and racial conflict in the area. This work was effective but it took more resources away from direct work with young people than had been anticipated in the initial aims of the project. However, and crucially, a centre based environment was created in which solidarity and contact between Asian youngsters could develop and offered a great deal of victim support to youngsters who had previously been isolated, caught as they were between the admonishments of their parents for being attacked and ‘getting into trouble’ and their persecutors on the street.

The actual day to day work of the project was much closer to social work than youth work in what is usually referred to as the social interventionist model or ‘welfaring’ (Smith 1988:56). This counselling or ‘case work’ orientated approach requires workers to be more involved in the lives of young people. This part of the projects work involved a focus on individual behaviour modification, and young
people's willingness to change their life. Initially young people were referred from agencies who defined them as a problem in terms that fitted with the projects overall aims, and then on this basis individual case work was developed. Youth workers then subsequently became advocates in helping young people negotiate with parents, schools and the range of agencies they came into contact with. These day to day practices operated within a framework that aimed to strengthen the main influences on children and young people so work with individuals centred on their family, school and their immediate peer group relationships as well as their relationship with the wider youth community to which they belonged. This kind of approach is described by Bright (1996:371-372) as ‘The aim is to reduce the risk factors associated with offending, such as poor parenting and school failure and enhance protective factors, such as good parenting and school success. The whole is greater than the sum of its part. The three elements taken together can help ensure that there is continuity (over time), reinforcement (of standards in different locations) and inclusion (of young people in the community.’ Much of the research that attempts to identify causal factors in predicting the likelihood of delinquency (see for example, Graham 1988; Rutherford 1992; Graham and Bowling 1995) has consistently identified common aspects of family life that increases the risks of delinquency such as poor parenting; harsh, neglectful or erratic discipline; parental conflict; a parent with a criminal record; low family income and social disadvantage. These factors in their extreme form create greatest risk of persistency. A detailed review of the literature on schools and delinquency (Graham, 1988) concluded that, through their capacity to motivate, to integrate and to offer pupils a sense of achievement regardless of ability, schools can have a significant influence on whether or not pupils become offenders. It was not surprising then that the project was led to work closely with the families and schools of the young people they came into contact with. Bright (1996:402) has recently emphasised the importance of working with both families and schools in social crime prevention work with young people.

The evaluation identified some gaps in provision. The project did not work with young women to any significant degree; it worked increasingly with younger rather than older users; work with white males declined; work with Asian males became more traditional after the expansion of centre work; and integration between Asian and white participants did not take place to any significant degree. The initial project aim of involving Asian and white young people in shared activity as part of a process towards integration proved particularly difficult to achieve. Racial segregation between Asian and white young people was central to the social context of the project. However the impact of the project on this aspect of local life was modest. In forming and consolidating friendship groups among young people from individual contacts, it was thought that racism could be successfully challenged. On the one hand group solidarity reduced the isolation of victim experiences that became shared, on the other group solidarity created out-group perspectives that were negative. This is considered below.

Influencing and Reducing Crime
Although there is a paucity of evaluation research findings on the effectiveness of youth work methods in reducing and influencing crime (see Graham 1990:42-53; Graham and Smith 1992), Graham notes the centrality of leisure supervision in the prevention of male juvenile offending as a means to integrate marginalised and ethnic minority groups into ‘main-stream’ social and sporting activities, through the recruitment and incorporation of local ethnic minority gang leaders as youth workers. Graham and Smith see a key role for youth workers as performing a preventative rather than a controlling, and focusing resources on areas with high concentrations of young people at risk, rather than on specific or potential offenders. They see a particular role for detached youth work in a multi-agency response to problems of young people whilst noting the reluctance of workers to get involved in crime work, suggesting that youth workers should develop an advocacy role in their dealings with the police. These findings are consistent with the type of approach evaluated here.

However, Youthlink’s work with offenders took less priority than work with perpetrators and victims of racial violence. There were however several ways in which the project did respond: it worked intensively with individuals and groups with whom offending or anti-social behaviour were priorities; it worked with agencies such as schools, police and the courts to influence offending behaviour; it worked with identified groups of young people, or responded to identified problems in the area, where there were concerns about offending or behaviour; and it made youth facilities available generally to actual or potential victims of crime and offenders in the project area. Many participants cited boredom as the main reason why they got into trouble. Fighting and offending were responses to a sense of having no where to go and nothing to do. The impact of the project was in getting young people off the street and away from the parks and estates and giving them somewhere to go and something to do. This had the effect of reducing boredom and offered worker’s opportunities to challenge young people about their behaviour. Finally, relationships to school and work aspirations were changed for some young people. Irregular and non-attendees were brought into a more stable relationship with their schools, and some young people developed a new interest in work opportunities and their own futures. The project succeeded in utilising the local knowledge and skills of its older participants and making them role models for younger participants to follow - in some cases these older participants had been involved with crime prior to participating in the project.

Several conclusions can be drawn from the examination of the project responses to offending. The range of evidence suggests that offending behaviour was moderated among those young people to whom the project could respond. However, the projects influence on offending behaviour varied between groups. Among groups where offending was most prevalent the less was the projects ability to moderate such offending. When there was a moderating effect on these groups it tended to be temporary. Although difficult to assess it is likely that the project made an important contribution in preventing a possible escalation of offending behaviour among some groups that had begun to offend when the project first contacted them. The range of evidence from the different groups suggests that to maintain a diversionary impact a continuing presence was needed and relationships with the young people needed to be established and maintained over time. The interrupted presence with the most intractable
offending group due to the worker becoming half time, and the lack of impact on this group suggests
that short term responses are unlikely to achieve lasting success. Responses to offending are likely to be
more effective if they are able to address broader needs and issues connected to school and family
relationships. A key approach successfully demonstrated by the project, is to work directly with the
families of the young people to include family relationships as a resource in influencing offending
behaviour. Where developmental work is extended to include work with the families of young people -
advising, counselling and mediating family conflict or helping to resolve problems faced by families -
then attachment by young people to their families is likely to be enhanced. Similarly, youth work with
young people in schools can engender more positive attitudes towards school, again demonstrated by the
projects successful influence on school disruptive behaviour. The project set out with a clear aim to
influence and reduce offending and antisocial behaviour. It was met with an equally clear need to
engage with young people who were primarily victims or perpetrators of racial violence. Its
involvement in addressing this need uncovered the fact that many hard core racists were also involved
in a range of other types of offending. In some cases victims were also offenders. It is in this sense that
the project’s work with offenders grew out of its concerns with racial violence. The project was able to
discover relationships between victims and perpetrators of racial violence and other types of offending,
and its work with young people was built on this basis.

Finally, a number of factors can be identified which will place limits on the effectiveness of this type of
response to crime. First, there is the problem of targeting the hard core of offenders, some of whom
will not make themselves available to an informal and voluntary project. If local agencies are relied on
to refer young people then there remains the problem of whether the agencies interpretation of need is
appropriate to youth work methods. Both self selection and pre-selection of participants risks distorting
project targeting criteria. Second, as the expansion of victim support demonstrated, any attempt to
extend coverage beyond a certain point will result in a diffusion of effective work and a loss of focus of
aims. In any case the intensive nature of the work will limit the numbers of young people that youth
workers can engage at any one time. Third, the existence of local cultures that legitimise racism and
violence create barriers to change which may limit what youth workers can achieve. Structural factors
such as high youth unemployment coupled with demographic pressures cannot be influenced by youth
work provision and will continue to define realistic possibilities and constraints on project participants.

Influencing and Reducing Racial Violence

In some ways project responses were complimentary in realising project aims. However, in other ways
these responses were counter productive, or occasionally served to inadvertently reinforce racial
divisions among young people.

A range of conclusions can be drawn about the work on racial violence. The work of the project
brought together some victims and perpetrators of racial violence and each learnt from and about each
other. Racial stereotypes became modified because of these meetings and shared activity. Work with Asian young people showed that successful victim support was possible. The Asian cases suggest that intensive victim support had met with considerable success in changing behaviour and leisure patterns from those more likely to result in victimising experiences to positive experiences of self-esteem and self confidence. The isolating nature of these experiences had been overcome as victims were encouraged to share experiences and leisure activities. In Keighley the presence of an Asian youth worker in previously exclusively white youth centres contributed to some modification of behaviour and attitudes among the young people. Moreover, the subsequent employment of other Asian youth workers has contributed to a greater acceptance of Asian people among the resident white population. Older users were transformed from being victims to helping other young people come to terms with their victimising experiences, through taking responsibility for youth provision as Junior Leaders and trainee Youth workers. This in turn widened access to youth centres in a situation where these centres were not available to young Asians because of the domination of these centres by whites.

A lot of the work of the project was geared to meeting the needs of Asian young people. However, the work with white young people had effects that were disproportionate to the project resources deployed in this area. Although both workers were very good, the white worker was of exceptional quality and this was demonstrated by his achievements with white youth. First, there was some evidence of revised attitudes between Asian and white participants - especially those who had taken part in inter-ethnic activity. Second, the work with both Asian and white young people helped move them away from situations where provocation and conflict may occur - streets, parks and public places for example. Third, by encouraging young people to think about their reactions to racist incidents the project workers could make a contribution to reducing violent responses. Young people who would have responded violently to provocation were less likely to do so, and the incidence of involvement in racial fighting was lower for many project users. It appears likely that the moderation of racial conflict requires youth workers to maintain a continuing presence working with the local young people. Fourth, they reduced the availability of victims on the street by giving them somewhere to go; they encouraged an awareness of ways of reducing the risk of becoming a victim; increased the confidence and solidarity of Asian young people generally and victims in particular who for the first time could share their experiences with others in the same situation as themselves; this resulted in effective forms of self defence. The project played a key role in influencing both attitudes and responses among Asian users towards the local police, fostering a more co-operative attitude and encouraging the supply of information to the police about racial violence.

Finally, in pursuing its aim of reducing racial tension, the project generated a good deal of conflict. Some effects were a raising of racial tension, and to some extent it reinforced racial segregation that had been there before. Arguably the project itself generated some racial segregation in creating 'Asian only' youth facilities as a response to white racism and violence in existing facilities; in working with white and Asian young people separately using different methods; and in the development of its own
building into an Asian centre. The project had acted as a trigger for tension and conflict in some agencies in the town because its objective of integration had clashed with agencies for whom practices in effect supported segregation. In attempting to open up a local racially exclusive Youth Service to Asians and challenge the community discourse of racial segregation, the project acted as a ‘Trojan Horse’ inviting Asian young people to use what had been an all white centres. This proved relatively easy on its own doorstep, in the building it made its base. This centre was in any case located in the most ethnically concentrated and longest established Asian area in Keighley, and local white flight bound to be reflected in the ethnic composition of the club eventually. The situation at another club on the opposite side of the town centre, was quite different. This centre was widely perceived among Asians to be a racially exclusive club within a transitional area situated between a predominantly Asian and a white area. The club had a reputation for harbouring an older long established white clientele, some of whom were known as notorious racists, and was identified as a source of racial violence in the area. Youthlink responded by locating separate ‘Asian only’ sessions. However, this incursion into ‘white territory’ resulted in a level of conflict that was only eventually resolved at the end of the project’s life.

These types of conflict, although pernicious in this case because racialised, seem ubiquitous to multi-agency approaches to crime prevention. Blagg (1987) has emphasising the importance of a co-ordinated between agencies in approaching social crime prevention policies for youth and a commitment to stimulating community networks of care and support. In particular that ‘Any preventive strategy requires the support of local communities and the participation of all the agencies which deal with young people’ (ibid.:16). There are however, inherent problems within this approach in that ‘different agencies may have quite different perceptions of what the problem is in a given area, based on the main tasks and priorities of each particular agency (Bottoms 1990:15). Sampson et al. (1988:482) found there was ‘the tendency for inter-agency conflicts and tensions to re-appear, in spite of co-operative efforts, reflecting the opposition between state agencies at a deep structural level. We have also found consistent and persistent struggles between local authority departments over limited resources, power and prestige’ (ibid.:488).

Outcome Conclusions

The outcomes were that of the four core White groups that the project worked with, two had reduced or ceased racially harassing Asian young people as a result of their association with the project. Another group that had been involved in a variety of offending saw some reduction in harassing behaviour, and some temporary reduction in school disruptive behaviour, but this was short lived. Meanwhile their offending behaviour continued. The fourth group showed a marked reduction in school disruptive behaviour. Compared to the general Asian population of their age group, Asian participants were more likely to have been victims and less likely to have reported incidents to the police. As a result of their involvement in the project they had become more likely to report and were more satisfied with how the
police treated them. They had also become more attuned to risk and risk avoiding strategies associated with going out. The project’s work with Asian young people demonstrated that the project had generated an ethnic and group identity among some groups of Asian young people. However, in April 1992, Youthlink become an ‘Asian / Black project’ thus relinquishing one of its main aims which was to work to influence perpetrators of racial violence and white racism. Nevertheless, the project was distinctive in that it worked with both victims and perpetrators of crime and racial violence, revealing in practice a more rounded experience of young peoples involvement in crime demanding a more holistic approach. The project was better able than criminal justice agencies, the police and schools to capture and address the processes and relationships involved over time that lead to repeated and entrenched offending and victimisation. The project, in its practice, was able to correct this type of understanding and provide methods of intervention that better addressed these conditions and circumstances of offending and victimisation.

From its beginning as an experimental and innovative project to its ending as a mainstream Asian youth centre consistent with equal opportunities premises, Youthlink had fulfilled a paradoxical role within the local Youth Service. Its existence and activity had been structured by an underlying organisational and community context which was a Youth Service jurisdiction that had as its defining philosophy and ethos equal opportunities and antiracism. Because this approach had come to be defined as addressing the needs and aspirations of deprived ‘inner city’ black and Asian youth, rather than working with white racist youth, white racism had not been addressed or tackled in outlying areas like Keighley. Here youth facilities were to accommodate white youth and their needs and aspirations resulting in racially exclusive youth work practices, despite the presence of a significant local Asian population, 51% of whom were below 15 years old. Youthlink was inserted within this contradiction between philosophy and actual practice in this locality, and seeking opportunities and discovering constraints, exposed and put into sharp relief an entrenched youth work and community discourse of white exclusionism. Because Bradford Youth Service was unable or unwilling to challenge local racism among its own workers, the project in effect deployed relatively independent central funding to accomplish what it was the business of mainstream provision to provide - Asian access to local youth clubs. Ironically, although the project was able to successfully challenge this situation because it was outside an entrenched local Youth Service, this also drew it into the role of main provider for Asian young people in the area. Central funding had been used to seed mainstream youth centre provision rather than an innovatory approach to tackling the sources of racial violence among perpetrators. This was an unintended consequence in the sense that the project simply responded to the needs, conditions and exigencies it met seen in high levels of racial violence in the context of local institutional racism.

Overall, the project reduced racial victimisation among Asian young people it came into contact with in the locality it worked, and reduced the commissioning of racial violence among many of its white participants. It acted as a catalyst for change in the monitoring and recording of racial violence among local schools and in the police to the extent that racial violence declined in and around schools, and
victims became less alienated from how the police dealt with their victimisation. Effects on white exclusionism among youth clubs in localities other than the project's own locality were mixed. In the end the project contributed to and reinforced processes of a downward trend in racial violence which were already happening due to Asian vigilantism. In taking considerable numbers of actual and potential victims, who were unable or unwilling to defend themselves, off the street, their availability and vulnerability was reduced. In creating a secure place for young Asians to meet and socialise, the project, perhaps inadvertently, reinforced a developing solidarity of victims, and enhanced the status and legitimacy of local heroes in the eyes of other young people whilst recuperating their violent defence of Asian territories. The informal leadership of some of these local leaders became channelled into more constructive and legitimate youth leadership activities through their involvement in the project.
CHAPTER EIGHT

FOLLOW UP STUDY: LOCAL HEROES AND THE DIFFERENT RESPONSES TO LOCAL RACISMS

Introduction

The follow up study is based on in-depth interviews with sixty five Asian and white males and female young people carried out in the summer and autumn of 1994. There were approximately the same number of males to females and Asians to whites. The purpose of the study was to talk to a different group of young people to those who had participated in the youth work project and the cohort study, although some had been involved in the survey, about the issues arising from the earlier research. This would serve to 'test' the conceptual structure that had arisen from analysis of the cohort and survey data: that racial violence was associated with young people's use of, and relationship to public space; the relationship of inter-racial fighting and territoriality; and whether racial violence had declined within a wider context and sequence of changes in the local conditions giving rise to violence. The study was particularly interested in apparent changes in the power positionings of Asians and whites that had occurred through Asian 'vigilantism'. 151 This meant asking young people for their observations on what the study thought had occurred without of course revealing to them the underlying hypotheses. This also offered an opportunity to explore with young people what they meant when they said a situation was 'racial' or 'racist' and to ask them to clarify their meaning to the study with practical examples of behaviour and action rather than with thought and opinion.

Young people were drawn from areas that had been highlighted in the study as difficult or dangerous for the different ethnic groups. The white males where exclusively from the Brackenbank estate which had been shown to be notorious among Asians as a source of white racism and racists, and many of these white young people were known independently (through local youth workers on the estate) as having been involved in racial violence. White females were drawn from Brackenbank and other estates, and the Asian females from the range of areas where Asians lived. The Asian males in particular were chosen like the white males, on the basis that they had not been involved in the youth work project so as to avoid any possible 'project effect', and therefore tended to be drawn from areas other than those proximate to Youthlink and its 'catchment' area. Many of them were from the 'Devonshire Park' area which had come to the studies attention as an area notorious for racial conflict and fighting. Finally, what was of particular interest given the paucity of young women and girls in both the cohort and survey was whether this groups experience in relation to the above questions and

---

151 In the sense of Johnston's (1996:220) criminological definition of vigilantism: 'Vigilantism has six necessary features: (i) it involves planning and premeditation by those engaging in it; (ii) its participants are private citizens whose engagement is voluntary; (iii) it is a form of "autonomous citizenship" and as such, constitutes a social movement; (iv) it uses or threatens the use of "force" (v) it arises when an established order is under threat from the transgression, the potential transgression, or the imputed transgression of institutionalized norms; (vi) it aims to control crime or other social infractions by offering assurances.
issues was different to that of males.

As shown in chapter six the study disaggregated white racists by the type and intensity of their racism, and so within the follow up the study different groups were identified hidden by what are often seen as sociologically and culturally homogeneous majority and minority ethnic groups. The categories ‘Asian’ and ‘white’ serve to hide highly differentiated responses to violent racism within and between the two groups. Focusing firstly, on ‘Asians’, the nature of their ‘defence’ and retaliation against white racism revealed distinctive groups. Importantly, these groups differed according to factors such as whether their responses to racism were ‘respectable’ or not; their involvement in drug use and criminality; their different rates of victimisation, and so on. They have been designated the Conformists, Experimenters, Heroes, Ethnic Brokers and Internalisers. It was primarily The Heroes who were responsible for setting up vigilante groups aimed at defending Asian areas and attacking some whites. The male and female white groups are considered last but the implication of what white young people told the study is that white girls and young women in many respects have more in common with Asian girls and young women than they do with white males in relation to issues of personal and community safety. The white male group seemed to confirm the findings in the cohort study and survey.

Asian Males, Territoriality and Community Safety

In summer 1994 Asian males stated that they felt safe at school compared to the past, whilst identifying dangerous areas in ways consistent with the survey and cohort findings. What seemed to have happened between the end of the cohort study in 1992-3 and these interviews was a continuation and consolidation of the underlying trends found towards the end of the cohort study. Fears were justified through the reputation of areas rather than necessarily any direct experience of going to these areas: ‘Well there’s most of English people living there and a lot of racists and I have heard stories that they don’t like black people there and if you go you get kicked in’; or another youngster: ‘It’s just people get around and talk, I don’t know whether its true though or its just rumours that I’ve heard for a long time now.’ This local lore however was supplemented with numerous examples of being attacked or chased out of these areas, and these white areas were considered to be impassable at night. Community and area safety is established through knowledge of the area, knowing people who come from there and their colour coding as ‘white’ or ‘Asian’: ‘Its that there are some areas where white youths who are ganged up, do you know what I mean, looking for trouble.’ In relation to the town centre, especially the shopping centre, another young person said: ‘They’re quite rough people down in the town, ‘cause, I mean the shopping centre, and everyone’s going by so you don’t know people, like,
and there's quite rough people, especially some white people, not white, they're Scottish and Irish, plenty of them, they can sometimes start some trouble.'

Asian young people continued to avoid white estates, areas near white estates, and the town centre in the evenings for fear of attack; worried about violence, drugs, crime and racism in the town; and they stayed in their own areas where they felt safe, and only tended to venture out if they had access to a car. Asian young people 'hang around in Asian areas, where you feel safe'...where 'we know each other and we stick together'... 'We avoid white areas, unless we've got transport, then we go and see what's happening'...I stay in Asian areas. No one will attack me, because they're the same people as me, they're normal'. Asked what would happen if they ventured into white areas: 'You wouldn't get out of these areas alive, if you went there at night'...'I've been to white areas [some estates], and I've been chased out, except when I've been up with white mates, and then they get weird looks like "what are you doing with that black bastard?"' Even middle class areas pose problems for young Asians: 'I feel uncomfortable going to the posh white areas as well, really, because they look at you as if they've never seen a Paki before', and necessary journeys into town offer little comfort: 'You walk through town, and people are giving you eyes, and you're just minding your own business. For someone of my age, 21, I notice it. When I was younger I didn't notice it'. Or, 'Its very restricted in town because of attacks and abuse, because of colour and people's attitudes'.

Asians had been attacked by whites, and some said that they had attacked whites. Attacks on whites were justified in the same way as whites justified their attacks on Asians, in terms of retaliation or self-defence: 'He (white) attacked me first, for no reason, so we attacked him. It was equal'. However, these retaliatory attacks on whites were much more conditional on the possession of information about the potential victims 'backing' - whether they could call on support from stronger whites. Asians, as whites had done, complained that whites were given preferential treatment at school and work, receiving more lenient punishment for 'twagging' (truancy) and fighting. However, an important difference was that Asian young people who were working were able to detail their experiences of discrimination and abuse - something that did not apply to white accounts which merely pointed to a generalised prejudice that Asians were taking away all the jobs that had previously been available to whites. In relation to attacks on whites, some of the reasons and explanations offered apart from the 'they attacked us, we attacked them' equation, were: 'They think that we rule the place, you see, which we don't really. They see a large group of people and they think were looking for a do, but we're just having a laugh.'....'The police are racist and we're just defending ourselves.'

Asked why violence had declined one person said 'There was a lot of racism, but that's died down now. There is still a lot of violence'...'Its the drugs that are calming everything down because white people can't find the drugs and its black people who tend to have 'em, so white people suck up to them...just

(15 year old); Another: 'Well they used to gang up and that, but as soon as school bell went there used to be fights and chases and all that, they used to be, like Asians used to be outnumbered; this time...its evenly numbered and nobody fights and that.'
certain drugs - black, cannabis. Heroin, only certain people do it, and they tend to keep a low profile'. There was general agreement that local parks near Asian areas had become much safer for Asians than had been the case before, and this was because Asians had fought back against whites, in the context of general dissatisfaction with police responses to assaults on them, and accusations of police racism. Increased community safety in or near ‘Asian areas’ and a reduction in racial violence and conflict was seen as contingent and it was not certain that this situation could last: ‘Well I can’t really be very sure, ’cause you never know it can just appear at any time, could be say that I might just go into Devonshire Park and there be some many white youth there and that’s it, you can’t really be sure of these things, it can happen anywhere, anytime, any place actually.’

Asian young people from the Devonshire Park area told the study that seven or eight years ago (1987-1988) whites had gone into the park and attacked and bullied Asian children and that this was a daily occurrence. This had however changed due to the mobilisation and widespread retaliation of older Asian youth who had fought white youth and claimed the park as their territory:

‘I think its easier for me ’cause I know quite a bit of people who live round these rough areas and they know you so they won’t do anything to you, but other people, if I was a white lad and I walked through parks like this, Devonshire Park, but late at night, on my own, I could almost guarantee that I would be attacked, because this park at night is full of blacks, you know, smoking cannabis, you know, drinking alcohol things like that.’ Besides, whites who come into the area ‘would get attacked…Almost guarantee it, definitely, because you know, they are just around here looking for a fight’.

These ‘rough’ response to perceived transgressions of ‘Asian’ territory was disapproved of by other Asians (those referred to in the study as ‘the conformists’) who avoided violence as a solution to racial conflict, and pointed to the risks of escalation that revenge or retaliation would invite:

‘I would personally not because, you know, now that you are in a group you attack them, but tomorrow when you are on your own, they know who you are, because, you attack them and they go attack someone else, some innocent, you know because like, our mothers and parents, just walking around and some English lads, whatever, go hit them, spit at them, things like that, nowadays teenagers they don’t seem to think that, they just seem to think that if we hit them, they ain’t going to do anything, but they go and hit some innocent, you know.’… ‘Some, you know, are organised, you know, they have their mates and all that ‘cause, just because we attack them, they might be, you know, tough as well, and so if they come and hurt us, if we’ve got mates with us, we’ll be backed up, backed up, but some just are disorganised and just come and hit you and leave you for no good and just go.’
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Nevertheless the consensus was that racial violence and fighting had declined and things had got better. The study was told that Asian parents were unaware of what had gone on, but that on the other hand white parents were an important source of racism in their offspring because 'their parents are racist, so you know, you can't like, you know, go out with them, you know like, if they're seen with you, by their parents or friends, you know, they get into trouble.'

Because Asians had 'agreed' a 'settlement' between colour coded areas the situation of racial violence had come to feature predictable and routine encounters, and with this stabilisation of relations between white and Asians adolescent communities: 'Only thing that can happened now is, either you'd go apologise, which I doubt will happen, or we go start make friends with them, you know what I mean, if they're willing to do that, you could go, you know like, at least offer it, you know, they'll come with fifty whites, you could go with fifty blacks, you know like peace talks, but you know, blacks think no, no we don't want that, we're big and hard and this and that, you know, teenagers, think this and that, we don't want to make friends, we want war.' On the other hand 'although it's whites turn really, we have attacked white, so you know, so it would be just right for whites to come back now, but if they don't, you know, don't attack nobody, then it will all be over, all over and done with really, in'it.'

These kinds of informal apportioning of territory though only apply to group violence and constant vigilance continues to be necessary for individuals in a situation where whites have numerical and cultural hegemony: 'they know [whites], that they won't be out numbered, they're all on their own at times, youngsters, we're not together every minute or every hour are we, so whites could be all over, so you know, we had better defend, well not defend...you know, attack.' What is being defended is an ethnic and cultural identity: 'I have defended myself because of what people say about our culture and that, of our religion and that'...‘To defend yourself, I would. To defend myself and my culture and religion.’ Young people themselves point to maturation effects whereby white adversaries of their cohort 'get older, the whites get older, you know them, you start knowing them better, so you start making friends...calling them friends or he's bad boy, your a bad boy, so you get on.'

Asian young people concurred in feeling that things had changed, 'because in the eighties...there was, you know, everybody used to be scared to go to next door neighbours, or a few doors up, you know what I mean, whites would be there, you would never know whether they'd be there just out looking to attack, you know, get attacked on main road 3 o'clock in the afternoon.'.... ‘Talking about the eighties, you know, we were really afraid then, but hopefully now, you know, its getting more, blacks and white are mixing more now.'

Racists, Racism and Racial violence

Conformists
Asian young people who were victims of white violence and abuse identified racial motive on the criteria of whether or not the attacker was known to them:

'I would say it was racist, racism first of all because I did not know the person, I had no knowledge of who he was or... A complete stranger, I had never seen him before. Secondly, thing was I had said nothing to him, he had said nothing to me, yea, and then when you get them kind of things together you think about why did he come up and do this and you think about it slowly you think yea its because of colour. I think it was racism.'

Other indicators were the attacker’s reference to the colour of his victim and/or derogatory remarks about ethnicity and claims about nationality: ‘They just say “you’re black, get out of our country”’...

‘what are you doing that for?”, basically what they said was ‘cause we’re white and your brown, that’s why’. Another young person said that although he had no direct experience of being attacked or harassed by white people, and that racial fighting and violence had virtually disappeared from its height in 1988, Asians were still abused and Asians are still frightened. He told the study that when he gets a bus to Bradford to see friends and relations ‘I don’t see any Asian people on the bus. You see I sit on the top deck and not a lot of Asian people sit on the top deck’... ‘they feel threatened... they’re all frightened of fights with these white people’. At the same time there is disapproval of the antics of the local heroes - those Asians who fight back:

Q. So when Asian youths do get into trouble, what do they do?
A. They provoke trouble. These Asian youths are being racist to the whites.
Q. So what do you think was happening?
A. I think the Asian tough guys were sticking up for their community.
Q. But the Asian toughies were involved in beating one of the white youths...
A. You could, in one sense, call it racism and in other it is not racism.
Q. What would you have done?
A. Well, it should have been left to the police.

The issue of what constituted ‘racism’ was pursued further:

Q. What do you mean by racist remarks?
A. Like if they show signs of racism.
Q. What do you understand by signs of racism?
A. Well.. you know they give you like dead eye looks you know.. dead eyes, that’s the way I see it.
Q. I see... So if an Asian man gives you a dead eye look, what would you call that?
A. Well, you don’t know what his intentions are, you know what I mean.
Q. So why do we call the same behaviour racism when white people are included?
A. Well.. they run the country like John Major and parliament. They can say things to us but we can’t say anything to them. Because they have the power. White people have the power.
Q. I’m still not sure what you mean by racism. What does a person have to do to be racist?
A. Well… they have to show signs of racism like dead eyes.. straight face… nothing in their eyes.. but hate, no blinks.. angry look.. eyebrows joined together… and they say abusive remarks.
Q. If that is the case, and an Asian person did the same to you, what would you call that?
A. The way I see it that if an Asian person does that to me right… I think that I’m in the wrong that’s why the Asian person does it.
Q. What if the white person thinks you are in the wrong and he looks like that at you… then what?
A. Well… hmm… I think the white man would say so. In my experience it is not the individual who has given me dead eye looks and abusive remarks. It has been in situations where they are in groups that one of them will show signs of racism… you know what I mean. Individuals don’t do that. They do that in groups.

‘Racism’ and ‘racists’ are understood as a form of group expression within which there is an objectifying hatred of the victim without reference to the immediate situation of the interaction or context or there being any declaration of intent or relationship other than white domination. Areas are avoided and movement is always in groups of three and never alone. The young person went on to say that he never crossed a certain road which itself was seen as a provocation to whites in that area, and so on. These avoidance strategies were based on parental advice rather than direct experience of having been attacked because strategies had not been followed. A twenty year old said that racism was that white people have the power so when they are abusive they can get away with it, and that he did not get involved in fights and blamed the Asian as much as the white participants: ‘Back in 1989 I realised there were gang fights in Devonshire park. I never got involved in the fights but… I witnessed them…knives and bats were used. Terrible stuff’… ‘These Asian guys were as wrong as the white lads. Both were to be blamed. Because the reason being that all of them were trying to prove who was the toughest. Who was the cock of the school. All were school boys.’

The Conformists generally kept out of trouble and avoided any situation in which there might be violent racism. They identify with and defer to community elders and traditions of ‘public propriety’ (see Cohen 1979: 124), honour, prestige (izzat) and shame. They prefer to take the advice of their Elders to ‘turn the other cheek’ in situations of racial provocation.

‘Well, when my father came from Pakistan he was 50 years old and he had a lot of trouble with white people and he used to say to me that “stay on the safe side .. and don’t get mixed up with fights or anything like that”’.

This strong sense of propriety within the Muslim community which relates in complex ways with the more devotional aspects of Muslim culture and its sense of izzat (honor) and Biraderi (the social
network of friendship and kinship relationships) (see Hippler and Lueg 1995; Lewis 1994), institutes the split between 'respectable' and 'rough' responses to racism within the community. The conformists respond in 'appropriate' ways, that is to ignore violent racism or even deny that it is happening, whereas the heroes are its 'rough' challengers (with its charge of latent criminality and disorder - see Jefferson 1993). The conformists, like their parent culture, tended to blame and implicate other Asian young people for their involvement in violent racism, suggesting that those 'who get into trouble with white youths' have 'problems with their attitude'.

Unlike the Conformists the Experimenters expressed curiosity about their town and its goings on, conveyed in their willingness to take risks and move around different areas in the town. As a consequence they experienced much higher rates of racial victimisation than conformists. They were likely to rebel against their parent culture and its public proprieties, and demonstrate a fierce independence from their parent culture. Their cultural preferences and tastes are for those elements of music and video culture that emphasise fusion and hybridity - 'modern' Hindi films and 'Indie' music, Bhangra, and a 'pick n’ mix' orientation to drug use. There were some young people (both Asian and white) who, because they possessed a range of cultural registers and repertoires, were confident and at ease across ethnic and racial boundaries. These 'go-betweens' or ethnic brokers (see Werbner 1991) tended to act as 'fences' and dealt drugs. In spite of widespread racial hostility, participation in local drug cultures brought them into extensive contact with whites. These moments of contact, although fleeting and ephemeral, become de-racialised amidst widespread distrust and almost well managed hostility. Recreational and/or dependent drug use seems to allow a relaxation of rigid and fixed racialised positions. This should not be read off as 'Drugs Against Racism'. It is purely functional in the sense that social drug use alters the rules of engagement, temporarily suspending conflict in the situation, without this altering wider racial animosities.

The Heroes

The study asked those who had been directly involved in the fighting what they understood by the terms 'racist' and 'racism' and in what ways these terms were distinguishable from 'fighting'. One seventeen year old said that he used to have a lot of fights with whites at school 'You stick with your own lot. You have a do and you stick with your own lot. That's what we've always done.' The following interview with a twenty year old Bengali male is an extended example of the ways in which young people construct 'racism' through their experience of difference and exclusion. He told the study that he smoked a lot of cannabis and has been in trouble with the law for which he received six months custody. He mixed socially with some Pakistanis, but mostly with whites.

Q. When some Bangladeshis say to you 'You hang about with white guys and that....
A. I don’t like it, me. It does my head in. Because I’ve grown up with them. When I were younger and that and I couldn’t hang around with the Bengali guys so I made new friends. I used to get funny looks
and that, could hear them talking behind my back and that, but I used to be annoyed, but if they say 'owt, now I just, dunno, probably kick off with them, beat them up 'cos I've had enough of 'ethnic minority. All they're good for is gossiping, spreading rumours around which some of them aren't true. It's not on.

In the course of the interview a trans-cultural perspective emerged in which genuine cultural exchanges seemed to occur:

'I mean we feel comfortable when we’re hanging around with mixed race, white guys and half caste guys because it’s, I mean like the people we hang about with they’re not racist...They see us as humans. That’s it. Human beings, whether they’re white, black, they’re not racist, they have no grudges, they’re not prejudiced or anything like that. Fair enough, we might have disagreements but we’d be able to sit in a room and somebody would be able to say “Look, don’t think I’m grudging you but this is the way I think, this is the way I see things”. We’re not thinking about “right, this is our religion and you see things differently to me” and all this shit, yeah, but it’s not like we’re gonna get a grudge against them and starting fighting with them and stuff like that....We talk about stuff like that.’

Q. So in one sense you feel as though you move in and out of the communities quite easily?
A. Yes, we can do. We can mingle with anybody really. It’s just other people. They’re not as open and they don’t, you know, like us as we are.

‘Racists’ are seen as permeable to influence and as changing, and are to be distinguished from ‘racism’ which is perhaps seen as more intractable to change and socially organised:

Q. What’s a racist anyway?
A. It’s when they don’t like the colour of your skin, your village and ‘owt like that, because your different your black or...I mean we used to hang about with an atheist which - he doesn’t believe in any religion at all. He used to be a skinhead, he used to be a bit of an NF shit, but I mean we’ve hanged about with that guy a fair bit now but he’s, like, he’s had his differences, yeah, but even he’s hanging about with us. He hasn’t come up to us and said “This is my difference, I don’t like this and I don’t like that.”'

Q. You did things together and yet you thought he was a racist?
A. He was when we were young. He used to come picking on us and that, but we grew up and that, he can’t be arsed fighting or ‘owt like that.

Q. Let me clear this in my mind. By ‘racist’ you mean people who don’t like your colour and your religion. So what’s ‘racism’ then?
A. They think we come here, we take their jobs, drink their beer, shag their women and things like that. That’s what they don’t like. That’s why the white guys they don’t like us. That’s what I think racism is, because of what we did and who we are. That’s why they don’t like us.

This local hero transcended ethnic origin by the final ‘proof’ of belonging - being a good fighter. Again it is the local culture of fighting, its rules and hierarchies, that can override other divisions and loyalties:

Q. When you were younger, when you were at school, did you feel uncomfortable with whites?
A. Not really because most of them were scared of me.

Q. You’re a big man.
A. Every school’s got to have a cock of the school, and at first school I was a bit of a bully, at the middle school I was a bit of a bully and then when I got to upper school there were people above me, people harder than me but as I worked my way up...

Q. Did you actually experience racism?
A. Oh yeah, we’ve had it done to us, called ‘black bastards’, ‘black cunts’, what have you. We’ve been chased and all that.
A. I’ve been jumped by about four or five guys.

Q. And how did you deal with it?
A. I dealt with it first by going to the police. Now’t happened so you took the law in your own hands just with getting back.

Q. How did you get back then?
A. Basically taking them out one-by-one.

Q. And did it happen again?
A. No, not after that. It probably wouldn’t happen now because a lot of people know me in town, white guys all around Keighley know me and if they don’t know me they know my brother so its like if it did happen now they’d know what to expect. It’s either, if they jump me now they’ve got to think right, we’re going to jump him but there’s consequences to it.

Q. But there are many Bangladeshi youngsters who are not like you and your brother and they get picked on quite regularly.
A. But they don’t do ‘owt about it. If they did something about it, stuck up for themselves, they’d think twice.
A. There was a time when Keighley was racist, there was a lot of racists about, a lot of white guys beating up black guys, big fights. Pakistani guys coming down from Bradford, but you never saw no Bengalis....I mean I remember a time when we used to walk around the streets with metal bars, hammers, things like that and beat a lot of white guys up, split their heads open, cracked them with the metal bars...we used to go round chasing white guys as soon as they come out [of their areas], whether we knew them or not, that’s it, they got a good beating because of what happened to us....you used to get big crowds coming down from Brackenbank, coming down and smashing Asian windows and that,
because of colour....No, not because of colour. I mean basically it was because at that time everybody wanted something to do 'cos when it came to fair [the annual town gala] there'd be loads of us ganging up, we use to get metal bars and cricket bats and stuff and that and we used to wait for white guys coming down the street and just bash them. Just something to do, we were so involved in fighting. I mean I know social workers now, you know, guys that are doing Youthlink work at this present time. At that time they was with me with metal bars bashing white guys over their heads. But now they're helping youngsters getting jobs, do this, do that.

Q. Why do you think they're doing that?

A. 'Cos everything's changed from when it was, they just thought 'I need to do something else'.

A. Well, because things have changed, the community and that.

This discourse typical of the accounts given to the study by those who were directly involved in inter-racial fighting - the local heroes - demonstrates most clearly the problem of some youngsters at one moment identifying colour or racism as the cause of inter-racial fighting, whilst at the same time suggesting that the real issue was the excitement and enmity of adolescent fighting rather than racism.

Case study: A Local Heroes Account of Changes in Racial Violence

A twenty three year old Pakistani ‘veteran’ of inter-racial fighting described to the study the changes that had occurred in the town through relating his biographical experiences of growing up. From being a child ‘there was a lot of barriers, and I think slowly they have been broken, but not, to that extent really, they are still there.’ Keighley is compared unfavourably with Bradford which ‘is more like a multi-racial town. I think there are certain areas in Bradford which are nearly all white or nearly all black, but overall the centre of Bradford is more multi-racial.’, something which Keighley town centre is not. The overwhelming theme continues to be restriction in mobility and horizons caused by the threat of racial violence: ‘I will be restricted from certain things. If I go up towards Brackenbank, Braithwaite area, Guardhouse [white estates], I know I wouldn’t be able to walk, safely, I will have to be cautious or something, to go through.’ The costs to Asian young people of this climate of fear are clearly spelt out:

'I remember when I was fourteen, I was chased with a group of friends, coming back from a five-a-side tournament at the youth club. And we were chased, down Hardings Lane, for a good half a mile, by groups of white people aged 19 and 20 and we were only 14, 15. Even a car chased us down Lawkholm Lane area, and we had to run, right, and the car was really behind us we were very lucky, I was lucky we could easily have been hit by the car, that was one of the frightening moments for me in those days, really early about 13, 14 being actually chased. That has restricted me personally from a lot of things. I was keen at football...Many years. I was keen on football, I wanted to play in eleven-a-side. I wanted to go join teams and stuff but I couldn’t. I would have gone there, in fear of my own safety, because there used to
be all groups of white people, even the people you knew who were causing the bother, who used to be in there, so you knew you was restricted, you couldn’t do ‘ownt, about it.’

Much of this young persons recollection is remarkably consistent with the cohort accounts of the periodisation and geography of local racial violence - ‘Your talking about 87, 88, 89 that it actually took place, I was among the actual fighting that used to take place in those days’ - and that the ‘areas that were mainly attacked in those days, were mainly black areas and the people who attacked them were mainly white. And some used to beat up other people, some used to like, mixture of status within the white people as well, from different areas of Keighley, and they actually used to come down in areas where black people used to lived’... ‘That’s what actually happened, and for years it went on, like, people used to be attacked, you know, fighting came around. But always, to me, it was that, where black, black people, were based, where they lived, in those areas, that’s where it all took place.’

Defence and then resistance ‘wasn’t arranged, but it ended up head to head. That was like one of the biggest breaks through actually stopping groups actually coming down [to Asian areas], making them think twice, and that was quiet violent and my experience of that was, like blood, it was quiet, violent and…’ This kind of resistance was frowned upon by respectable responses to racism: ‘...at the end of the day we used to get stick from our families “why do you cause all this, you’ve done something wrong for this to happen”. I remember a lot of my friends used to get into trouble because they used to get beat up, and if they ever did something about it, their families used to like get on top of them, because they used to say “what the hell were you doing there”. So we used to lose out both ways, but we never fought. But actually later on people came over that, they did actually, in a sense fight back.’... ‘when you’re talking about fighting back, there was incidents where, like when you’re talking about going out, going into other [white] areas, where you wouldn’t go in before…and you know the groups of white people who are doing it, and then you would mainly target them white people.’ For this young person, in facing the dangers he had overcome them: ‘In the past I have [been afraid], but...you overcome that fear as you grow up and I know young people who do still have that fear of actually going into the centre of town and that’... ‘Now it doesn’t, because, I freely go where I please...That’s about me, yea...My ordeals in the past and my experiences and everything and, overcoming all that, and actually coming forward, and actually going places...[My friends]...Yea. They have overcome that, they do it, but there again, they will still find it difficult.’ Again, these kinds of resolutions - fighting back, coming to a settlement with whites, overcoming of fear, are always qualified by the continuing need for constant vigilance: ‘I think, overall, especially black people, always have to be careful anyway of a white person, groups of white people coming through, they always have that fear thing, I think anybody will have, if they go in different areas, somebody else’s territory, a group of people, they will have that bit of fear. I think that goes generally for everyone.’

These Heroes are older and experienced combatants - ‘veterans’ - admired by some younger Asians for their capacity to provide protection and defend Asian territory. It is this group more than any other
among Asians that are held responsible for defending Asian territory and attacking whites, and have
influenced young white perceptions of Asians as a threat in ways disproportionate to their actual
numbers in the Asian youth population. These loosely organised vigilante groups are lead by ‘toughies’
- physically strong, big and ‘hard’ Pakistani youth who regulate or patrol given or claimed areas or
territories. They can be called upon to defend shops, property and younger youths who are attacked
either by whites or even other Asian youths. Heroes were more likely than either conformists or
experimenters to be involved in criminality. At the height of inter-racial fighting, they were associated
with marshal arts and weight training cultures - groups called themselves Ninja Gangs, and were
responsible for carrying out attacks against known white racists, and going into white areas to
intimidate whites. The toughest of the gangs was called MAFIA named after the initials of the core
member’s names. More recently, however, it is said that gangs ‘.. don’t go looking for trouble. Its only
when trouble comes to them’, that they mobilise.

Heroes oppose the authority of the Muslim parent culture because of what is seen by them as its mealy-
mouthed and hypocritical response to violent racism and harassment. In turn, Asian elders chastise this
group for bringing dishonour upon the community. Increasing violent racism in the 1980’s saw an
increasing frustration among Asian youth about the ability or willingness of the police to tackle violent
racism. Some groups, especially as they got older, responded to this situation by committing themselves
to a retributive form of ‘rough justice’ against white aggression. This growing self-reliance to protect
themselves from attack, depended on a level of organisation based in area and ethnic group, and more
recently, the communications technology offered by mobile telephones. This enabled rapid responses to
racial incidents through a well established network. Heroes or ‘veterans’, in particular, reported marked
improvements in levels of safety in the area as a result of their imposition of a settlement between
Asian and white protagonists which had identified and apportioned territory, a settlement increasingly
recognised and respected by white youths. Compared to the past, white ‘Viking’ raids had become less
and less indiscriminate, almost, it was said, non-existent. Although the occasional forays by individual
white ‘braves’ into Asian areas continue, they are late at night after drinking and are associated with the
use of Pakistani take-away shops. Nevertheless, younger Asians maintained a residue of fear and were
still anxious about being attacked or ‘looked at’ offensively by whites.

Internalisers and Witnesses: Asian and White Girls and Young Women

Asian young women and girls had a different relationship from young men and boys to racial violence and
public forms of racial conflict. This relationship was that they were both beneficiaries and indirectly
victims. Asian young women felt that partly as a result of the fighting young Asians are more aware of
their rights than before and that this gives them more confidence to stand up for themselves. Other
sources of this increased confidence among young women were educational: ‘When you’re at college
you learn about equal opportunities and I think that builds your confidence up - at least you know what to
do when there’s problems. It gives you more confidence to go out and about. A few years ago I wouldn’t
have come to a youth club’. At the same time they felt restricted from using leisure facilities by their own community. The study spoke to a group of young Asian women and although they did go to a local park to meet young men, they were afraid ‘of gossip going round. You’re just friends with them but people don’t understand, especially our community - the Asian community’. There were a number of places that they considered to be unsafe, and they considered that night time was more of a problem, particularly for women. Although they were not allowed out at night time other than to visit friends houses, they did not really wish to be out because they felt there was a real risk to personal safety. The interview moved on to issues of tension and conflict in Keighley. Many of the young women had observed and experienced trouble in the town. They had seen many fights between young white and Asian men usually sparked off by racist comments or abusive language. They had also been subjected to racist abuse. One group member said that she had been subjected to abusive comments about her sexuality, appearance etc. from an Asian boy.

In contrast to males, Asian Muslim girls and young women were afraid of what they perceived to be increased racial harassment, abuse and in some cases physical attack on them because Asian young men were better able to defend themselves. White racism that had previously been directed towards Asian males had become redirected towards females who become ‘easier targets’ for white male and female perpetrators:

‘They [the white youth] are shit scared of the Asian boys. They can’t pick on them anymore as they fight back and beat them up and stuff. So they take it out on us ‘cos we can’t fight back, so we get all the shit and verbal abuse now. It didn’t use to be that bad before for women, ‘cos most of the fights used to be between Asian and white boys, and now in schools even, Asian girls sometimes get beaten up’ (Young Asian women).

Asian girls and young women become less risky targets for perpetrators of racial harassment and abuse. Their victimisation is compounded by a situation whereby they are neither able to fight back or report incidents to male friends or relations because of the rules of public propriety that apply in what is a close knit patriarchal Muslim community. Consequently they are left with little choice but to internalise abuse and attacks against them in the context of powerful informal pressures and sanctions that are applied to discourage any public display of impropriety associated with resistance or defence against racial abuse, harassment and violence. Many young women felt that if they reported these incidents to others then they would be placed in the position of being blamed for inviting or provoking such attacks. On the other hand reporting to young Asian men would be seen as complicity in provoking fights, and in any case young women fear the retaliation from perpetrators that might follow from such actions. They are therefore positioned in a classic ‘double jeopardy’ at the precise moment of a worsening situation of racial harassment directed towards Asian females. They have not been able to respond to their fear in the way that male youngsters have and are isolated in strategies of disavowal of racial harassment so as to ‘survive’ both in their own and the white community:
In [the] town you will not see many Asian girls walking on their own, like you do in [a larger neighbouring town]. You just don't feel safe. We never use toilets in town, we think, we might be attacked. Never walk past a pub or where there is a group of white boys sitting. You can bet that they are bound to say something like “Paki’s” or something like that” (Young Asian Women).

As one young Asian Women said, in summing up the isolated and impossible situation of facing two ways at the same time, ‘If you fight you cry’.

Young women, both Asian and white, seemed more sanguine about racial tension and violence than young males. Nevertheless there was a lot of agreement between females about areas considered safe and dangerous, which tallied with males and depended on ethnic group membership. However, white young women’s sense of safety in terms of where they could go and at what time was influenced by the fact that they were female as well as white. Although females also use certain parks, they tend to avoid areas where there is fighting between Asian and white males. Some of the females seemed as much involved in fighting other females as males were involved in fighting males. Overall, gender influences young women’s perceptions of safety and is both reinforced by perceived threats from Asians/Asian areas, and by males.

One young woman when asked about why she considered the parks to be unsafe she said: ‘I’ve known people who have been attacked in Cliff Castle and Devonshire Park - knifed and that. But then again not by Black people, by white people. I think that’s mainly what it is’. She went on to say that she thought peoples attitudes regarding space was influenced by what other people say about certain areas. She thought that there were race issues but that there were also issues about being a young woman and feeling safe or unsafe in these areas, particularly when alone. She went on to say: ‘I wouldn’t say I feel really, really safe anywhere. If there’s loads of us then I feel safe. I don’t like walking home by myself. I think that because I’m female’. Females invariably tend to be witnesses of racial violence and fighting, and their own involvement tends to involve verbal abuse rather than fighting. The town centre is considered safe for females except in the evening, generally however, young women felt the time of day was an important factor where safety was concerned, and whether you were part of a group or on your own. Men, were thought to have fewer problems over access to public space and perceptions of safety, because ‘If you’re a man you wouldn’t be scared’. One white young women thought that peoples impressions of safety in public spaces was linked to personal experiences but there was also an issue about the history of events in certain places in the town.

An unemployed seventeen year old when asked about areas in Keighley she would avoid, she mentioned a white estate, but felt generally that racial issues were not the main cause of tension or conflict, rather that these problems occurred as the result of something inherent in the population of Keighley. White young
women generally were rarely directly involved in racial violence or fighting although they were aware of its centrality in the lives of young males. Parks were felt to be significance as places where young people could meet, but that groups of young people using the parks mixed in terms of age and gender but not in terms of race. Young women tended to avoid white estates other than their own and Asian areas. A 14 year old from the North Dean estate area said: ‘...people think Asians mainly start fights’.... ‘Most people are racist, but it’s not right being racist against other people.....It will just cause more fights and quarrels. There should be a mix’....‘If people are being racist against Asians its bound to cause trouble - something is going to happen. Like it could be a big fight. You don’t know who started it. They blame it on each other. It happens often. I think its awful. I think a lot of people in Keighley are racist’. A 17 year old told the study: ‘I’ve got to say I was pretty racist myself. I got followed home from work by two Asians who really scared me - one Saturday night. It was still light. I didn’t trust them after that’. She felt that racial incidents didn’t happen often - but recognises that where you live would make a difference and could create tension: ‘There are different places in Keighley where white and where Asian people live’.

Many of the white young women and girls the study spoke to, negatively evaluated Asian males as a source of ‘trouble’ and fighting but tended to contextualise this more in terms of general fighting between white and Asian males. All the young women and girls confirmed that whites and Asians did not mix or get on, as a fifteen year old confirmed ‘I think its ‘cos we don’t get on. It always gets back to fighting and calling each other names’, and she thought that geographical area made a difference to how people ‘fit in’. Talking to these young white women the study felt that their relative lack of immediate involvement in the fighting compared to males meant that they possessed a certain kind of objectivity about the causes and conditions of racial violence and male fighting and attacks. A sixteen year old living on Braithwaite estate for example offered an explanation of why fighting took place claiming that there are distinct groups on the estate which correspond to specific areas and there is little mixing between these groups. She saw tradition as being important and talked about a sense of ‘territory’ as passing from generation to generation, group to group. The group agreed that racial violence happened less now - ‘things have calmed down’ - but the memories live on. One young women who said she was gay thought that changes of attitude, about things like race, amongst young people was having a significant impact on racist behaviour. However it ‘Depends if their brought up to dislike Asians. The parents might really be prejudiced and insist that their children don’t mix’. She went on to say that her experiences of conflict and tension where directly related to her sexuality. She had been subjected to verbal abuse on a number of occasions when out with friends. However, she felt that this kind of abuse could happen to anyone who was ‘different’. ‘You only have to have the slightest bit wrong with you and people - narrow minded people - will come and slag you down. It doesn’t take much’.

Two young women of 14 and 15 years both living on the Braithwaite Estate, said they avoided a rival white estate and parks. Asked why she avoided the estate one said she didn’t like the people there because they had called her ‘Paki shagger’. Both young women had been out with young Asian men. It transpired that she had felt physically threatened by men on a number of occasions. She had spoken to her mother
about what had happened, but felt that people blamed her because she went out with young Asian men. They also talked about fights occurring between young white and Asian women, they saw this as being the result of jealousy: 'They don’t like Asian boys going out with white girls. They’re not allowed out - we are allowed out and can do what we want'. Both these young women have had Asian boyfriends and do have some understanding of the impact of racism on the Asian population of Keighley. However, they also recognise that a proportion of the conflict is instigated by young Asian males. The issue of white young women going out with Asian young men was raised by the group and individuals on a number of occasions and the result was felt to be extreme ostracisation and marginalisation by other whites. This would often involve these young women in fights with other white girls and young women.

Overall the general impressions from the interviews with white young women was that Asians and whites did not mix and that young women saw Asian males as much a threat to their sense of security and well being as they found white males and females from areas different to where they live. Virtually all the girls and young women told the study that they did not mix with or have male or female Asian friends. Young white women often complained about being intimidated and abused by Asian males. They describe fights between girls as well as witnessing a lot of fighting between males. Sometimes fights between girls are about white girls going out with Asian boys. A lot of them emphasised that being a woman was an important factor in personal safety, and that young women are required to monitor their own behaviour in terms of activities and participating in the life of the community. This meant that they avoided using a lot of public facilities and also “keeping their distance”. Young women’s concerns about being safe in relationship to their use of public space tends to focus on being called names, abused and sexually harassed. Most of our interviewees had routinely experienced harassment and although most of the time this was verbal abuse and innuendo, sometimes young women told the study they had been ‘touched up’.

White young women and girls then usually shared the ‘normal’ racist outlook of white young men living in the locality, but the consequences of this in terms of perceptions of personal safety were complicated by gender and sexuality. Although some of the white women said that they had been chased and abused by groups of Asian males, race, sex and local geography conspired to place interminable constraints on the freedom of young women to use public space at certain times. Not only did they, like white males, perceive ‘Asian’ areas as ‘no-go areas’ and thus out of bounds, but that all public space was potentially dangerous because of men, white and Asian. Young white women and girls in the town seemed imprisoned within their own immediate areas, or when leaving these areas felt anxious about their personal safety. Of course they ‘went on’ with ‘going out’ and presumably resigned themselves to the kind of discomfort and abuse they received from males, but this carried for them certain requirements to be more or less constantly vigilant. Those young women the study spoke to who had gone out with Asian males faced an extraordinarily difficult situation of having no security whatsoever - they were without any of the protection of ethnic or territorial loyalties, and were literally without territory - they were ‘out of place’ in all the dimensions of geography, sex and race.
White Males: Racism as White Victimisation

Fifteen white males aged 13 to 21 years were interviewed individually on Backenbank estate. The study was able to establish from local youth workers that they had all perpetrated attacks on Asians. The older end of this group had routinely used drugs and they said that there were a lot more drugs available than there had been previously, and a wider range of drugs, both on the estate and in the town generally. They had all used 'draw' (hashish and marijuana), and some used variants of Ecstasy and LSD, and some had tried 'smack' (cocaine and heroin).

The main theme that repeated itself was the almost universal involvement of this group in fighting and abuse, although more for the older than the younger age group. They had all been involved in fighting, abuse and attacks as either perpetrators or as victims or as both. The centrality of physical violence to their experience cannot be overestimated. This usually took the form of fighting with or being chased by other white young people on the estate; fighting with or being chased by other young people from the rival Braithwaite Estate; or fighting involving young people from outside the town. Some were more worried about fighting between whites and rivalries between 'gangs' from different white estates, especially Braithwaite, than they were about Asian attacks or Asian areas. The most frequently mentioned fighting and abuse, however, was inter-racial fighting between themselves and Asian young people. Many stated that they had been abused and attacked by Asian young people, and when asked provided details of their experiences, and what they were saying seemed to be borne out. Nevertheless many said that white young people also attack and abuse Asians. The source of this racial hostility seemed to be territorial in that these young people pointed to areas they avoided because they were unsafe and these tended to be areas where Asian young people live. The overriding theme was that 'they have their areas, and we have ours', and there is only trouble when white and Asian people step out of their different areas. The town centre, particularly the shopping centre, however, was felt to be 'owned' by the whites and Asians wandered into this area at their peril. They confirmed that racial fighting at school had ceased, in ways, they felt, that were unfair to whites. Schools and teachers were said to always blame whites in situations that could lead to punishments, suspensions and expulsions.154 Many expressed their dislike of 'Asians' although some did not. Nevertheless those who did were careful to point out that they knew and liked some Asians and that these Asians were 'all right', but that they disliked either other Asians in general, or, some Asians who it was felt were 'troubleshooters'.

154 White 14 year old: 'You can’t fight in school, you just get chucked out, so you do it outside. A couple of years ago there used to be loads of fighting, but not now. Older youngsters use to cause it all. It was mainly fighting Asians, but then you got Asians fighting back again. Teachers couldn’t do anything. Some people were clipped with a knife and that stopped the fighting for a bit.'...’If Asian and white fight at school, then its the white person that gets suspended. Whites get more punishment...Teachers think it’s racial all the time. The coloured person could have started it, you just don’t know....There’s a racial discrimination book, they don’t have a book for us, just for them.'
In pursuing these and other themes many of the findings from the cohort study were confirmed (also see the discussion in chapter five), but these young people placed considerable emphasis on their fear of 'Asian' areas. The following are representative of the range of replies:

'It's dodgy to go there (to an Asian area) because there are a lot of dodgy Asian people'...'We were down at fair, and they (some Asians) were calling us "white bastards" and that, because we were down there, down in their area, and they didn't like it'....'A few years ago we (whites) could go down to Asian areas - it would be mellow - but if we go down now, we would be expecting a kicking'....'I wouldn't go to (Asian) areas because you get your head beaten in by a load of Pakis'.

One young person who has a mixed parentage brother of Afro-Caribbean/English origin said: 'I don't mind black people, its just Pakis. Its just if you walk through their areas, they start shouting "white bastards"'. Another, 'There are loads of Pakis all around the park (an Asian area), and they just want to kick-off with you all the time'. And another, 'It's mainly Asian youngsters, they think its their area, so if whites are there, there's fighting'....'They (Asians) feel safe down there, we feel safe up here'...

'When I fight a white lad I know when to stop. But I wouldn't go to Asian areas because you get attacked. I've been attacked in the Highfield area by a gang of Paki's and there was no provocation.'

Consider the following exchange:

Q: Are there any areas in the town you feel worried about going there?
A: Paki areas, I don't like going there.
Q: Why do these areas worry you?
A: I just don't like Pakis, half of them start trouble for now't don't they.
Q: You dislike Asians?
A: I don't dislike them. I've got some friends who are Asians who I talk to. I don't dislike them, I just don't associate with the ones that I don't know, but I've got friends who are.
Q: You said you get on with some Asians, but you don't know others. Earlier you said that you didn't like Asians.
A: I just don't associate with 'em, they won't associate with us.

The convoluted ways in which racism becomes coded as 'some are all right, it's the rest I don't like' is illustrated by the above exchange where at the moment of the questioner's use of the term 'Asian' against the respondents term 'Paki', the respondent changes tack, evoking friendship with 'some Asians' as perhaps a way of warding off the obvious interpretation of 'I don't like Pakis' as racist. Alternatively and less likely, the respondent uses the routine but derogatory term 'Paki' to distinguish those particular 'Asians' who 'start trouble'. When individual young people offered examples of being attacked by Asians they were asked how they knew the attack on them was racially motivated. Very
few of the group mentioned colour (being white) instead saying that dislike between Asians and whites was the indicator of an incident being ‘racist’. Being ‘white’ is simply not problematic to these young people in the way that colour is for Asian young people. Some of the interviewees went on to say that whites ‘own’ and control the town centre, and that in effect there is a curfew placed on Asians, although others pointed to the fact that Asians don’t use the town centre anyway because they don’t use the pubs.

White males wish to neutralise white racism and its effects by attempting to make an equivalence between white on Asian and Asian on white attacks, the paralogic of which is to then invert racism and racial violence to apply to themselves. In this aspect the follow up study confirms the processes demonstrated in chapter five and observed among the white cohort study of ‘normal’, aggressive and violent racists. The white young men interviewed in here could be designated the neutralisers in so far as they disavow their own involvement in racial violence, condemn the condemners (victims) and invert racial victimisation to apply to themselves rather than their victims.
CHAPTER NINE

IMPLICATIONS: THE DISCOURSE OF ASIAN CRIMINALITY: Victim, Vigilante or Delinquent?

Introduction

One of the major threads running through this study are the ways in which Asian local heroes resisted racial violence and fought white groups through what can only be described as vigilante activity. The implications of this are noted here in relation to a wider discourse about Asian criminality. ‘Vigilantism’, in popular discourse, has pejorative connotations because of its association with extra-legal responses to police ineffectiveness. Indeed it will be argued that this term has come to inhabit an important place in the lexicon of a discourse about alleged ‘Asian’ criminality. Although there is virtually no empirical research on vigilante activity in Britain, Les Johnston has proposed a conceptual framework within which such research might be undertaken. Johnston (1996) draws a distinction between two kinds of vigilantism, one having a focus on ‘crime control’, the other being concerned with ‘social control’. Although these are not mutually exclusive, social control vigilantism is concerned with the ‘maintenance of communal, ethnic or sectarian order or values’ or communal control (ibid:228). The mode of vigilantism found in Keighley encompassed both crime control, or the control of racial violence, and communal control seen in the assertion of ethnic identity through boundary drawing and territorialism. According to Johnston ‘neo-vigilantism’ may employ a ‘rhetoric of transgression’ directed at religious or ethnic groups. It is a ‘popularly initiated strategy’ to resist transgression and ‘minimize objective threat to persons, property, or values and to reduce associated fear’ (ibid:231). Vigilante movements, which attempt to offer ‘guarantees’ of security ‘both to participants and to other members of a given established order’ give rise to ‘premeditated acts of force - or threatened force - by autonomous citizens. It arises as a reaction to the transgression of institutionalized norms by individuals or groups - or to their potential or imputed transgression’ (ibid:232). Finally, ‘vigilante engagement is most common in socially and ethnically homogeneous communities, which facilitate communications and trust between participants and which encourage identification with the victim’ (ibid:234). On this basis the study argues that a form of communal vigilantism came to structure the conditions under which racial violence was enacted and became possible in the study area.

Over the period studied, from 1988 to 1995, there was observed the construction of a popular and public discourse about young ‘Asian’ masculine criminality said to reside in certain British localities. An important source of this build up were national and local press and television reports and representations which have focused on areas having significant Asian minority populations155. The

---

155 Malone and Foster in an article titled ‘Asian Youth Rebel Against Good Image’ (Sunday Times, 21.8.94) blame the alleged development of Asian gangs and rise in Asian crime in Oldham on the disintegration of Asian family life and youthful
characteristic feature of the discourse was the ways in which ‘Asian’ young men were reassigned a ‘subject position’ (Keith 1995a), from being categorised as primarily law-abiding and/or victims of crime, especially racial violence, to being associated with criminality, drugs, violence and disorder, and that the roots of this alleged criminality was said to lie in generational tensions brought by the breakdown of Asian family controls on young people. The sources of these racialising and criminalising discourses are found not only in the control culture - by which is meant the media, the police and the criminal justice system - but also among white and Asian young people on the street and among certain sections of the Asian parent culture. The study found a readiness on the part of young whites to attribute to Asians the source of their own victimisation. Within the discourse itself, we need to disentangle the various representations of ‘Asian’ criminality from their sources in local and national media, the police and parent cultures. Although this theme runs throughout this chapter, some connected supplementary arguments will be used, the most important of which is to question the usefulness of ethnic and cultural attributes such as ‘Muslim’, ‘Asian’ or ‘black’ for comparing or predicting victimisation, delinquency and crime. These categories are misnomers that contribute to and construct stereotypes of victimisation and criminality in police, public, and criminological discourse. They rest on cultural essentialism of one kind or another, that is ‘disregarding, essentializing, denuding the humanity of another culture, people or geographical region’ (Said 1991:108). In other words they deny the fluidity and variety of cultural identity and human behaviour.

Explanations about crime among so-called ‘Asians’ rely on ideologies of ‘Asianness’ that impute binary attributes of both discipline and disorder. These popularist ‘Orientalist’ ideologies are premised on an homogenising and unchanging idealisation of ‘Asian’ family life and community structure. The form of disobedience, and cite police concerns about drug dealing. The same article reports incidents of Asian gang violence against whites in Camden, North London and street disorders in London’s Brick Lane as evidence of ‘the breakdown in law and order among some young Asians’; An article in The Times, 22.2.93 about alleged Asian criminality is headed ‘Family Chains Begin to Give’; ‘West Yorkshire Police’s Assistant Chief Constable Norman Bettison, commenting on Asian young people in Bradford suggested ‘The youth seem to be rising up as much against society and elders as against the police’ (Guardian, 17.6.95); Disturbances involving young Asians in the Alum Rock district of Birmingham in April 1996 were blamed on Asian - police conflict in a local newspaper article headed ‘Riot Police called to Inner City Disturbance’ (The Birmingham Post, 10.4.96). The same disturbance was headed ‘Mob Rampage on City Street’ in another local paper (The Evening Mail, 10.4.96); In an article headed ‘Divided Loyalties’ Martin Wainwright in The Guardian (12.6.95) ‘looks at the deep roots of cultural conflict’ lying at the heart of the Bradford Asian community. Although reporting a local community worker’s view that the Asian parental generation are constantly voicing concern about drugs - ‘They feel strongly that drugs are a danger to their community. The police know that some people in that community are involved, yet they can’t get information out of the community about it’ - and inferring that ‘The trouble, from the police’s point of view, is that evidence against the Asian community’s own rotten apples is very hard to get; a tight community closes ranks more tightly’. Wainwright concludes ‘there was scant evidence of any split between older, more patient members of the community and the younger generation’; A BBC Panorama programme in 1993 which profiled the Bradford Muslim Community portrayed this community as an ‘Underclass in Purdah’ where drug abuse and crime was rife; Chadthary in an otherwise interesting article titled ‘Enter the Rajamuffin’ (The Guardian, 15.9.95) quoted a criminologist David Smith (of whom more later) as saying ‘We will have young people of Asian origin not being so locked into traditional ways and communities.’ (The Birmingham articles were brought to my attention by Fozia Sadiq who has recently completed her BA dissertation ‘Angry Young Men: A Study into Asian Criminality’, University of Central England).

156 Following Miles (1989:75) ‘racialisation’...‘refers to a process of categorisation, a representational process of defining an Other (usually, but not exclusively) somatically.’ In other words the attribution of certain behaviours and traits to particular groups of people defined by surface physical features such as skin colour. ‘Criminalising’ processes emphasise those aspects of certain groups behaviour which can be defined as criminal hence reinforcing the likelihood of members of such groups coming into contact with the police and criminal justice system. Of course, racialisation and criminalisation can operate together (see Keith 1993).

157 My own study has been quoted in the press, radio and television in an attempt to construct Asian criminality and disorder. Its specific contextualisation in a local history of racist targeting of Asians by whites has been consistently ignored in favour of moral panics about Asians creating ‘no-go’ areas for whites and so on.
these essentialising ideologies is that family and communal-based informal controls on youth are said to have produced an essential capacity for law-abiding behaviour and delivered low crime levels. However, so the argument goes, external threats to the community posed by the secularisation and westernisation of its young people, has created a situation whereby both accommodation and resistance to this threat generates tension between and within generations causing widespread cultural alienation, loss of community controls, disorder and crime. This study, however, has coincided with the replacement of narratives of racial attacks on the Asian community with stories of ‘Asian’ juvenile delinquency. The danger is that the type of defensive collective action by Asian youths described by the study becomes reconfigured and re-framed so as to construct them as perpetrators of racial attacks, and as associated with street disorder and crime.

Public Discourses about ‘Race’, Crime and Young People

A long and often dishonourable tradition of official and popular discourses about race and crime (see Hall 1978; Fryer 1984; Pitts 1993) was recently extended by the contributions of two senior police officers. The Metropolitan Police Commissioner Paul Condon announced Operation ‘Eagle Eye’ aimed at targeting ‘black muggers’, in summer 1995 (see the Guardian 8.7.95, 30.11.95). In commenting on the disorders in Bradford, West Yorkshire in June 1995, Keith Hellawell, Chief Constable of West Yorkshire Police, identified the roots of these disorders in a widening cultural and generation gap within the ‘Asian’ community stating ‘Cultural and religious leaders have been worried for the past ten years or so that the younger generation don’t follow their teachings and feel that they have great difficulty in controlling them’ (quoted in the Independent 12.6.95). The key, if implicit, effect if not purpose of police strategy however, is to institute a split between respectable and disreputable criminal elements within the black community and urge black leaders to defend their community against its criminal elements158.

In the area studied, this split is instituted between the Asian community leadership and parent culture, who are constructed as proprietious and respectable, and it’s youth who are said to be out of control. The pattern that applies to police discourses about young black Londoners begins to repeat itself only this time in relation to an altogether new folk devil - the young Asian criminal, drug pusher or rioter. At the same time police discourse becomes joined to a wider discourse of community leaders159. Now, although there are important senses in which this police and popular discourse reflects what is actually going on, it serves at the same time to amplify and exaggerate popular racism in the wider context of a

158 Chief Inspector Dalton McConney, the most senior black officer in the Met and one of the key architects of Eagle Eye, said ‘We believe that the only way that the black community can rid itself of its criminal image is to recognise the problem and get rid of it’ (quoted in the Guardian 12.8.95).

159 Mohammed Ajeeb, the former Lord Mayor and deputy leader of Bradford Council, explains that ‘Gradually the cultural and religious values and parental control are being eroded and being replaced by Western standards and values. This means the community no longer has the influence it once did over the actions of some of its youth’. Max Madden, the Labour MP for Bradford West adds ‘[Asian young people] are finding conflicts within the Asian family and are no longer accepting the traditional hierarchy. They are leaderless and there are no longer the conventional community elders for the police to communicate with. (both quoted in the Independent 12.6.95).
demonization of Islam, accompanied by stories of Islamic fundamentalist youth groups like Hizb ut-Tahrir, of Asian ethnic inter-gang rivalries, vigilante groups, drug crime, 'no-go areas' and the like. Where this has happened, we can expect to see, eventually, a corresponding change upwards in the police statistics of Asian arrests, delinquency and crime rates.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the police, in their operational decisions, are constructing Asian criminality with the co-operation and collusion of Asian community elders who wish to tighten their rein on what are seen as 'uncontrollable' and 'disruptive' elements among Asian youth. This is designed to elicit support and crime intelligence from the parent culture mobilised so as to reassert discipline and control over uncontrollable elements. Tacit police-community co-operation is meant to solve an alleged crime control problem for the police whilst solving cultural and religious control problems for elders and community leaders arising from conflicts within Asian, and particularly Pakistani and Bangladeshi Muslim communities. These conflicts and tensions are found between traditional and modernist versions of Islam, between Islamic and Muslim social identity and westernisation, and tensions arising from very high levels of youth unemployment and low levels of educational achievement. This control strategy however is unlikely to meet with success because, Asian young people as a whole come to feel racialised and criminalised by the police as the 'rough' and 'respectable' split only succeeds in 'painting them all with the same brush' which in turn backfires on the police as the parent culture withdraws its support for police actions as these are increasingly perceived as the police 'picking on' their young people. Neither the police or the parent culture are able to address or rationalise to Asian young people their cumulative and persistent 'failure' to take up educational and employment opportunities against the background of a decline in the demand for unskilled labour at the same time as there are demographic pressures on the local labour market.

The overall conclusion of this section is to ask whether the Bradford disorders mark a watershed in what seems to have become an unofficial and cumulative construction of 'Asian' criminality which began in earnest in the late 1980s and early 1990s, in the sense of affirming in the public and official mind an already pre-established readiness to target young Asians as a potentially criminal population. Representations of Asian criminality have almost invariably focused on youthful masculinity and the public streets through which 'the youth problem' becomes visible. A white audience 'knows' these stories, which accounts for the high levels of receptivity within local and national media. They appeal to a knowledge that predates the moment of representation (Keith 1995), because a racialised repertoire is already in place. Here again we see the emergence of a new 'folk devil' that replicates in significant

160 See note [1]. The advent of a militant Asian youth movement in Southall and Bradford in the 1970's began the process whereby a different set of images began to emerge about Asian youth as being more combative, less deferential and, more 'crime-prone'. This continued in the 1980s occasioned by highly publicised demonstrations surrounding the Honeyford affair in 1986 and the the Rushdie Affair in 1989. Since the Gulf War and in the wake of the Rushdie Affair there has occurred a demonization of Islam (see Hippler and Leug 1995; Lewis 1994).

161 It is likely that this is more a reflection of the parent culture's alarm about the maintenance of control within communities, than about the threat from a non-Islamic western secular world without. (see Lewis 1994; Hippler and Leug 1995). Meanwhile Muslim young people develop vigilante forms of self defence against racial attacks and public displays of impropriety - white drunkenness and prostitution - on the basis that they are under-protected and over-controlled by the police.
forms the alienation of Afro-Caribbean youth from the police and criminal justice system in the 1970s, rehearsed again in relation to South Asians.162

Criminological Discourses about ‘Race’, Crime and Young People

Criminological discourses, at least from an empirical perspective, have tended to complement rather than critique official media and public discourses about ‘race’ and crime. This study has noted the discrepancies between police and self-report data on ethnic offending (Webster 1995; Bowling and Graham 1995; Graham and Bowling 1996). Yet some writers argue that there is a demographic time bomb within the Asian community (FitzGerald 1995) so that there is likely to be a trend of rising crime in the future among Pakistani and Bangladeshi young people because the two groups are much lower in age structure than other groups and are about to hit the peak period of offending163. Fitzgerald goes on to warn about the danger of a new moral panic. Although local figures from the study area suggest that the size of the mostly Muslim population falling into the peak offending ages of 14-20 is set to double over the next decade, and population projections suggest that Asian young people will be 25-30% of the total youth inner city population at the current peak offending ages in five or six years time, this means there will be a rise in the numbers of Asian young people offending in particular localities rather than a rise in the proportion who offend compared to whites. However, this demographic profile may be compounded with a continuing decline in the demand for poorly qualified youth labour, and high youth unemployment among young Pakistanis and Bangladeshis (BMDC 1995; Jones 1993). The social significance of this demographic boom (through the timing and pattern of family reunion) of young Asians is the increased visibility of young British Asians on the streets in specific localities that both lack facilities that are an alternative to the street, whilst at the same time these streets are inscribed with racial danger (Keith 1995a).

The few studies that have looked at crime and delinquency among Asian young people (Mawby & Batta 1980; Wardak 1995) stress the cultural attributes of Muslim communities which inhibit law breaking as compared to white communities. Although Mawby and Batta emphasise positive reinforcements such as family support and the ‘quality of family life’ among Asians compared to non-Asians, the implication is that the conditions which sustain these cultural attributes may not last. In a similar vein Ali Wardak’s study of young people’s offending in the Edinburgh Pakistani community set out to refashion control

162 Evidence from elsewhere seems to support this conclusion. For example, Keith’s (1995) study of Bengali youth in the East End of London relates how a series of disturbances in the East End of London, loosely connected to fights between ‘gangs’ of young Bengalis were luridly reported in the local press, and the ways in which these representations create and constitute a racialised link between Bengali masculinity and the streets of the East End. He concludes that Bengali youth ‘have become increasingly seen through a lens of criminal danger, by the local and now the national press, by the police force and by the collected institutions of the British state.’ (p562). Specifically, in both newspapers and political debate, ‘it is possible to find the displacement of narratives of racial attacks on the Bengali community with stories of juvenile delinquency and gang violence. In the local press and national press, increasing coverage was given to the phenomenon of Bengali on white ‘racial attacks’, a term increasingly used by journalists to describe cases of delinquency involving young Bengali men with white victims’ (p560).

163 Fitzgerald argues ‘In 1991, 19% of whites were aged 0-15, compared with 22% of Afro-Caribbean, 29% of Indians and 43% and 47% respectively of Pakistanis and Bangladeshis’. With a fifth of whites compared to over half of Asians belonging to this age group, ‘inevitably we are facing a likely upsurge in criminal involvement among these groups.’
theory so as to apply to the culturally specific informal controls which inhered in this community\textsuperscript{164}. For these types of cultural essentialist criminological arguments the key question therefore is whether and the extent to which Muslim young people are socially bonded, attached and so on, to the cultural and social institutions of a specifically Muslim parent culture, which is seen in unitary and homogenised ways.

**Differential Racism: Orientalism, Propriety and Disorder.**

It has been suggested then by commentators on Muslim communities that they still have a strong sense of ‘public propriety’, honour, prestige (\textit{izzat}) and shame. General discourses about the prevalence of crime have relied upon the notion of public propriety (see Cohen 1979:124) applied to a given population. ‘\textit{Propriety}’ is defined as appropriateness: seemliness: decency: conformity with good manners: conformity with convention in language and behaviour: and so on. This notion institutes the split between the ‘respectable’ upholders of public propriety and its ‘rough’ challengers (with its charge of latent criminality and disorder). This distinction is implicit in Hellawell’s comments about respectable conforming Asian Elders and an unruly Asian youth (see the \textit{Independent} 12 June 1995). But such assumptions of collective guilt are resented by Asian young people, yet become a self-fulfilling prophecy, with all the consequent alienation from the guardians of respectability - Asian elders and the police.

Jefferson (1993) argues that racism directed at Asians by the police and criminal justice agencies is different to that directed at blacks - the stereotypical and racist connotations of ‘Asianness’ are different to ‘blackness’. Taking this further, Asian Otherness has been constructed around a more deferential set of images within a neo-colonial discourse about ‘Western’ perceptions of ‘Easternness’ - Orientalism: Asianness as feminine, devious, untrustworthy, rigid, unproblematically rooted in communal and family life, etc. (see Said 1991; 1993)\textsuperscript{165}. Whilst these constitute a mixture of positive and negative features, they do not lend themselves easily to criminalizing discourse, quite the reverse - Asians are seen as intrinsically law abiding. The particularity of the Asian stereotype, with conformity and controlling

\textsuperscript{164} Wardak (1995) shows how these relatively ‘closed’ communities are socially organised, and how social and moral order is maintained. This is essentially a question of social control and the specific informal social controls that inhere in British Muslim communities. These are the institutions of the family, the Biraderi (the social network of kinship/friendship relationships), the Mosque, and the Muslim Association (whether Pakistani or Bangladeshi). These institutions operate as mechanisms of social control through informal processes of honour (\textit{izzat}), prestige and shaming - expressed through an ideology of ‘public propriety’ or ‘respectability’.

\textsuperscript{165} According to Edward Said (1991) the orient has helped define Europe (or the West) as its ‘contrasting image, idea, personality, experience’... and is ‘one of its deepest and most recurring images of the Other.’ (p 1-2). Historically and contemporaneously, for the British, this contrasting and imaginary Other has been the South Asian (Indian orientalism), the Muslim and the Arab. In popular and official discourses about crime and criminality this contrasting imaginary Other occupies a position within a complex array of ‘Oriental’ ideas about those ‘without’ and those ‘within’, from the ‘modern’ view about the pious law-abiding Asian to a demonization of Islamic fundamentalism, in contrast to ‘older’ ideas about Oriental or ‘Asian’ backwardness, despotism, splendour, cruelty and sensuality. ‘...the Orient and Islam are always represented as outsiders having a special role to play inside Europe.’ (p 71)... hence the vacillation between the familiar and the alien.’ ( p 72). These are the results of ‘imaginative geography and the dramatic boundaries it draws.’ (p73) The ‘Asian’ becomes both the conformist and criminal Other within. In particular localities the ‘Asian’ is a surrogate for an absent ‘law’ and ‘disorder’. The Orient was the source of Europe’s ‘strength and identity by setting itself off against the Orient as a sort of surrogate and even underground self.’ (p.3)
familial and community ties central to it, militates against invoking the discourse of criminality. That is until recently. A discernible shift has taken place whereby Asian masculinity has come to be associated with the criminal other, demonstrating how racial stereotypes and their mode of operation shift over time.

**Implications from the Empirical Case Study**

In illustrating the mechanisms and processes through which racial stereotypes of Asians changed in the locality from being victims to perpetrators of racial violence through young Asians challenging the territorial preferences of young whites and white racist violence, this change must be contextualised within the wider discourse discussed so far. Specifically, in that certain streets and areas came to be seen among whites as feared signifiers of dangerous Asian territorialisation (see Keith 1995: 297), this occurred within a local and national climate in which young Asians were increasingly seen as associated with violence, crime and disorder. A growing perception began to be shaped in the minds of white youngsters, the police and local agencies, which associated Asian self defence and territorialism with street disorder and criminality, through white perceptions of an Asian ‘offensive’ and experiences of being attacked by Asians. A further consequence was a growing perception among the police and local agencies of Asians gangs, involvement in drug abuse and criminality.

In reality, close study of ‘Asian’ communities revealed widespread differences and variation within and between such communities - multiple identities (see Lewis 1994). This does not describe Hellawell’s ‘alienation from every aspect of society including their own community’, but a healthy reinvention of different forms of Muslim identity. What is certain is that the omnibus ‘Asian’ implies a sociologically and culturally homogeneous minority ethnic group. However the study revealed highly differentiated and distinctive groups. These groups differed according to factors such as whether their responses to racism were ‘respectable’ or not; their involvement in drug use and criminality; their different rates of victimisation, and so on. The Conformists belong to the mainstream of Asian Muslim culture and are both adaptive and distant from secularised British culture. In contrast Vigilantes or Local Heroes opposed the Asian parent culture’s ‘respectable’ response to racist violence, preferring direct action. Islamists consciously identify with a version of Islamic ‘fundamentalism’ and distinguish a merely ‘Muslim’ from an Islamic identity. Some of this group supports a local ‘Asian’ band named Fun-damental (this is actually ‘fusion’ music and connotes self parody and an ironic theme) which are more political rallies than gigs in which PLO dressed musicians evoke samples of Louis Farrakhan, Malcolm X and Enoch Powell’s ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech. This group and its following are rejected by community elders and were recently banned from two Asian music TV shows in Bradford (Lewis 1994:180). These and other groups described by the study imply that any notion of ‘community’

---

166 As Keith (1995a) argues: ‘The placing of non-white masculinity on the street is a constitutive feature of the process of race formation and the manner in which racialised identities are linked to processes of criminalisation’, but also evoke ‘common sense geographies of racism’ - ‘the racialised masculinity of the dangerous street’ (p 306).
(having shared values, something in common) predicated on the identifier ‘Asian’ or any other ethnic attribute is dubious because of cross cutting religious, regional and class factors. Specifically, ethnic attributes such as ‘Asianness’ that are held to be responsible for low crime levels (or potentially high crime levels), homogenise highly dynamic and differentiated cultures, and are not good predictors of either law abiding or criminal behaviour.

Police and public discourses ‘explain’ Asian criminality by it is claimed the loosening of control of the parent culture, where parental control is always seen as the panacea. What is pernicious about this idealisation of the ‘Asian’ family is not only, as has been suggested, the ways in which a generational split is instituted between a respectable, proprietous parent culture and unruly and unrespectable youth culture, but also between deserving and undeserving minority ethnic groups. As Pitts (1993:112) argues ‘The denigration of Afro-Caribbean culture finds its corollary in the idealisation of Asian culture’, through the device of contrasting the imaginary Afro-Caribbean and Asian family. Thus ‘the fantasy of the Afro-Caribbean family is of a rudderless ship pitching and tossing in a turbulent sea’, by contrast to the fantasy Asian family seen as ‘a tranquil house built upon the solid rock of tradition’ (ibid.: 112).

However, it is the quality of parents relationship to their sons and daughters which predicts the likelihood of delinquency not the ethnicity of familial or parental culture (Graham and Bowling 1995). Further, parental and family controls themselves require to be understood in the wider social context of a ‘crisis of the family’ (see Dallos and McLaughlin 1993). What is striking about the Muslim communities studied were the very high levels of cumulative and sustained relative deprivation and poor educational performance. To paraphrase Mawby and Batta, educational ‘failure’ and unemployment cannot any longer be rationalised away and justified to young people in ways that neutralise their debilitating effects, as each age cohort sees in the next its hopeless prospects. Meanwhile, Muslim parents themselves explain this loss of control by pointing to western secular pressures that compete for their young people’s attention and allegiance. Another interpretation is that pressure for change is coming from Muslim young people themselves and that many Muslim parent campaigns (Honeyford, Rushdie, etc) reflect alarm about the maintenance of control within the communities, more than about the threat from a non-Islamic world without (Lewis 1994:73). It is fear of loss of control that animates Muslim parent activity.

Although these substantial Islamic communities share common concerns, they are also marked by enormous differences. ‘Islam’ as such cannot explain how Muslims behave, or how they might/ought to behave. Other factors outside of ‘Islam’ must be invoked. The resort to an all-explanatory ‘Islam’, Muslim or Asian category is therefore circular. Moreover, these ‘Muslims’, as much as the rest of us, have multiple identities, the relative character and balance of which change over time (Lewis 1994:75). The racialised habit of describing British Muslims as ‘fundamentalist’ presupposes a unitary notion of Islam. The same can be said of the category ‘Asian’ in terms of a unitary notion of ethnicity. These categories simply do not hold out any promise of the type of community and parental controls that are envisaged as solutions to delinquency. The geographical provenance of these communities from the
poorer regions of Azan Kashmir, Mirpur, Syhlet of the South Asian continent has meant low levels of parental education and skill from which there has been a transition from status as immigrant workers to underclass which no idealised notion of cultural support will compensate.

The overall conclusion, sadly, is that the Asian parent culture like the police and other control agencies, have been unable to address, accommodate or engage with the social and cultural experiences of large sectors of their young people, caught as they are between essentialist and fixed notions of cultural tradition, and the realities of Muslim cultural flux and experimentation. Meanwhile those Asian young people who are persistent offenders are so for the same reasons as their white counterparts: the ubiquitous age-crime curve falls on Asian, particularly Pakistani/Bengali, youngsters; cumulative relative deprivation over a generation in the context of a failure of the education system to credential the majority of these youngsters; the continuing doldrums of the youth labour market; an inability of social institutions to address the needs and desires of young people, cut adrift and left alone to make sense for themselves of the conditions which surround them. Vigilante responses to racial violence found in the study was one aspect of this social isolation.

167 To the extent that there is a growing generational tension, then this is exacerbated more by a growing linguistic gap between English-speaking youngsters who are not fluent in Urdu - the language of the faith, than 'cultural alienation' and the like. In terms of the hope of religious leadership, the 'ulama (preacher/teacher of the faith) are remote from young British Muslims who are only fluent in English, whereas the majority of 'ulama are not bilingual and don't have informed understanding of British culture or dilemmas facing young British Muslims. Meanwhile, Muslim parenting is often experienced as oppressive, erratic, over-harsh and unsympathetic. Institutionally, Mosques do not provide for youth nor address their needs, whilst elders and Council of Mosques reject bhangra music, unlike Islamic youth groups who have realised that a more nuanced view towards music is likely to win them a hearing (Lewis 1995:181). Many aspects of new Muslim culture simply bypass the 'ulama. The social control religious leaders can exercise is diminishing, yet youngsters retain a Muslim community identity (Ibid.: 202)
CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUSIONS

Racial violence creates a perception within minority ethnic communities that they are under protected and over controlled by the police and the criminal justice system. The response of policy orientated research has been to measure the reporting, prevalence and patterning of racial violence, yet little is known about its causes or the contexts in which it is sustained or reduced. In attempting to redress this imbalance between description and explanation the study found that racial violence declined in the area studied, and this was partly explained by the different responses of victims including the development of vigilante forms of self-defence against perpetrators. This did, however, produce unintended consequences that on the one hand white young people perceived themselves rather than Asians to be victims of racial violence, and on the other that young people’s ‘colour coding’ of areas as ‘white’ or ‘Asian’ were confirmed and reinforced.

Whilst attempts to measure the size of the problem have been important, this approach has contributed little to our understanding of why and under what conditions racial violence occurs. On the other hand the few studies that have explored the historical and social context of racial violence (Pearson 1976; Husband 1989, 1993; Hesse 1995; Keith 1995; Panayi 1993), have pointed to the specificity of local conditions for explaining its occurrence yet have paid little attention to the nature and character of perpetrators, or relationships between perpetrator and victim groups. The history of racial violence has shown how locally contingent factors precipitate violence and conjoin with underlying anxieties and insecurities derived from periodic crises in white ethnicity. Racism can only be fully understood if we are able to see how it works in specific social settings. Within these historical settings it is important to look at the interaction between perpetrator and victim groups in deciding the outcomes of racial violence and racist effects. In particular it is unlikely that victim groups are passive recipients of racial hostility seen in the emergence of communal forms of self-defence and retaliation against perpetrators. White racism and its expression in racial violence has often taken the form of territorial defence against the perceived invasion of the ‘other’. Neighbourhoods become defended and this racist response is rationalised within local community discourses of economic and community decline said to be associated with the arrival of the ‘other’. However, there has been a tendency in the literature to assume that white racism alone, rather than anything else, explains situations of inter-ethnic conflict and violence. This has encouraged a blanket labelling of all incidents in which the parties are different race as racially motivated because all whites are seen as potentially or essentially racist. The notion of ‘racism’ itself, presumed to be the basis of inter-ethnic violence, is seen as an unproblematic given which describes the subordination and domination of black people by white people. On the basis of the empirical findings in this study unitary categories of ‘white perpetrator’ and ‘black victim’ understood as binary, simple and fixed categories, are unsustainable.
Although many young people in the study, and especially Asian young people, agreed that violence occurred because of 'colour', whites were more likely to say that violence between whites and Asians was an extension of a fighting between young people in general. Now although this in a sense reflected the fact that for whites, their ethnicity or 'colour' presented much fewer problems than it did for Asians, there was nevertheless, a widespread local culture of fighting and violence as a way of resolving disputes. These disputes and the consequent fighting were over territory, or more specifically, about the exclusionist ways in which young people use public space. It was young people's particular relationship to public space, realised through the defended neighbourhood and construction of sharp territorial boundaries policed by vigilante peer groups, that defined the nature of adolescent racism. It is in these senses that racism and racial violence has to be set in the context of other forms of localised group conflict and young people's concerns about community safety.

These, and other findings placed doubt on the efficacy of mainstream theories of racism as a basis to conceptualise racial violence. In reviewing these different theories it was found that; firstly, theories disagreed in their conception and definition of racism but that this had not prevented a stretching of the idea to cover a wide range of disparate phenomena; secondly, and connectedly, theories had not taken sufficient account of either the specificity and range of different racisms, or the complex ways in which racisms interact with other factors to create not only racist but other effects. Violence and conflict which on the face of it, because involving different race victims and perpetrators, seemed to be about racism, and yet other conceptually and practically distinct processes of boundary drawing and territoriality were also present. These processes arose from group enmity, which in some situations was racialised and in other situations was not. This is not to deny that racism was an important, and at times the most important, factor in these situations, but to argue that it wasn't the primary cause of what was happening. Instead violence and conflict among young people was better explained by recourse to their ideologies of localism and their particular shared relationship to the use of public space which was manifested in drawing boundaries around territories, and defending neighbourhoods from incursions by others. One aspect of this was a subordinate racism which colour coded certain areas in exclusive ways as 'white' or 'Asian. Racism was situated within this community discourse of general group enmity and fighting, and racial violence was the outcome at the point of contact - at the boundary - between ethnic groups. Young people in defining, transgressing and crossing these boundaries became an important source, not only of racial violence, but of the assertion of, an albeit racialised, group and ethnic identity. In calling on different theoretical traditions to show how they might be useful in providing a theory of adolescent racism, there was revealed considerable unanimity between the theories about what processes and mechanisms might be at work that give rise to such racism. Boundary processes served to assert and reinforce ethnic and group identity - 'us' and 'them' - in self-defining ways as well as in defining others as 'enemies' or 'strangers'. Boundary processes involved border skirmishes which fulfilled psychological needs among some for thrill and transgression, felt in the leaving and rejoining of security, of home territory and home. They involve both heroic actions by some, and withdrawal into
the safety of home territory by others. In the last instance, they delineate imaginary adolescent communities which draw from and then condense a wider nationalist imagery to the level of locality. These neighbourhood nationalisms arise from all established-outsider group figurations, that are then heightened and intensified by race or ethnicity. They are based on the twin ideas of ‘who came here first?’ and ‘who rules around here?’, ideas that young people belonging to both groups are uniquely placed, unlike their parent culture, to pursue in practice. However, when the outsider group is a minority ethnic group, its outsider status is likely to remain permanent.

In choosing multiple methods in the conduct of the study it was hoped to overcome the methodological narrowness and weaknesses of previous studies of racial violence. However, to argue that surveys of victims need to be complimented with surveys of perpetrators to show their relationship, and that there is a need to collect more qualitative data, do not necessarily in themselves take us much further. In aiming to explain variation in the expression of racial violence, why it occurs and why its nature and character changes over time, the research had also to address causality. The main problem in previous research is not to have recognised that racial violence can carry totally different meanings for people in different social contexts, and that the attribution of racism and racial motive is highly contextual. Few studies of racism and racial violence had investigated either the instances of its use, or the significance of context on actors use or deployment of racist discourse and terminology. Therefore an important aspect of this study was to ask young people themselves why they acted in the way they did, rather than just assume ‘objective’ victim and perpetrator groups. As a result racism and racial motive was found not to be as isolated, simple and fixed as is often thought. In following a scientific realist methodological approach to the study of violent racism, the study sought to examine violence in a range of different local contexts and at different times to see if any observable regularities were produced that might offer some clues as to why racial violence was happening and whether it changed in character and prevalence. These community contextual controls of the data revealed some underlying causes - contexts and mechanisms - that suggested that spatial relations were activating the causal processes leading to violence. It was this community context of spatial relations among young people that was generating racial violence, and these were the relations that would have to be addressed in any attempt to intervene in the locality to reduce the commissioning of racial violence. It was activity at the boundary of given territories that was the underlying mechanism which brought about particular sequences of events. These ‘events’ are the components of the local system of neighbourhood nationalisms which is the community context in which causality has to be understood. It was this rather than anything else that both encouraged and then discouraged racial violence.

The characteristic feature of the study area that resulted in its deserved reputation as a hot spot of racial violence was its relatively homogeneous community structure which generated sharp recognition of ethnic difference. Areas that exhibit relatively closed local economies and experience little in- and out-mobility to work tend towards the evolution of stronger localist and ethnic principles. Here boundaries can be seen as having a structural basis in the local economy and in local employment patterns where
adaptation to economic change or population movement is weak. This creates local social networks of established and exclusionist access to local resources like jobs and leisure facilities and a defensive, insular and parochial outlook. Often this type of relatively ‘closed local system’ generates a belief among inhabitants that they belong to a homogenous population group going back many generations. This finds particular expression among young people. Although there was little evidence of a coherent unified racist ideology, young people did express a strong sense of local belonging, invested with a myth of origins and supporting what Cohen (1993) calls ‘local patriotisms and prides of place’. Through maintaining strong external and internal boundaries against those perceived to be outsiders, white as well Asian, threat and violence seemed ever present in their lives. Where this found expression in racial forms of violence, it was particularly pernicious and did victimise, but as was discovered, the putative victims were not passive in the process, they resisted.

Another characteristic of the area was high levels of public incivility, victimisation and offending among its young people. There were particularly high levels of offences against the person, particularly abusive, threatening and violent behaviour. Indeed on the basis of what young people told the survey it could be argued that the defining feature of the area is its culture of everyday violence as a way of resolving differences and disputes, and as the primary means of earning both notoriety and respect, status and power. It was unsurprising therefore that racial violence was closely associated with other forms of violence, and criminality among perpetrators. Much of this was reflected in the cautionary tales told to the study as ways in which young people talk to each other about crime and as ways of coping with crime. Young people demonstrated high levels of fear of crime and routinely deployed coping strategies of avoiding certain people and places. The readiness on the part of young people to associate crime, violence and racial violence in terms of stories about their own victimisation came through strongly in the data. More whites than Asians said that they had been victims of racial violence and abuse, and that the same proportion of Asians as whites said they had perpetrated racial violence and abuse. Much of the study sought to clarify this and other findings through a triangulated approach to data collection, but it is likely that crime and victim surveys will lack efficacy and their findings may be bogus if they are not closely integrated with qualitative investigation of perpetrator-victim relationships and processes, and investigation of local histories and geography’s which provide the mechanisms and contexts within which survey findings are to be interpreted. It is almost certainly unnecessary to continue to administer surveys of young people’s victimisation when all recent such surveys demonstrate such unanimity in their findings, and when what is now required are contextually sensitive qualitative studies of victimisation and offending. In particular, and as the cohort study showed, there is a need to disaggregate offender and victim groups on qualitative as well as quantitative (prevalence, persistency, desistancy, etc.) criteria to gain a better understanding of victim and offending processes. The cohort study showed how local patterns of racial offending and victimisation changed over time and across localities because of the changed interaction between offender and victim groups. Among perpetrators and victims were found quite different and distinct groups in terms of both seriousness and persistency of offending and victimisation. Both ‘normal’ racists and ‘routine’ victims
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were likely to mature out of their predicaments, although for normal and particularly 'aggressive' racists this was more likely to be a maturation from abusing and attacking Asians rather than from racist attitudes. Violent racists on the other hand did not desist as they got older, and violent racism seemed part of their general repertoire of increasingly persistence and serious violence and crime.

Crime prevention programmes that want to work to influence and reduce racial violence among young people will need to take cognisance of the community context in which they are inserted. But there is also another context which is those aspects of young people's lives that centre on experiences of crime as witnesses, victims and offenders. The detached youth work project evaluated here, worked to influence and reduce racial violence, although it was only dimly aware of the spatial and community context of its work. It did however, succeed in influencing and reducing racial violence, and offered victim support, among the young people it came into contact with. It was less successful however, in reducing crime, especially among groups of more persistent and serious offenders. In responding to the needs of Asian young people for security and influencing white perpetrators, it became a conduit of changes already happening among young people, rather than a proactive intervention that caused these changes. It is likely that some of the perpetrators it worked with would in any case have matured out of overt racist abuse and violence, although the project in influencing these young people short circuited and truncated this maturation process, guiding and quickening it to a satisfactory outcome. It experienced less success with serious and persistent perpetrators partly because inter-agency cooperation and support was withdrawn, particularly in schools, as these young people's behaviour became increasingly unacceptable and their trajectory into the criminal justice system deepened. The clarity of the project’s work was diverted and hindered somewhat by two factors; first, it became drawn in to challenging institutional racism in the local Youth Service that excluded Asians from using youth centres; second, youth work ideology shows a marked reluctance to get involved in crime control, instead emphasising 'equal opportunities' and 'empowerment'. This prior ideological commitment served the project well in it being able to offer security and support to victims of racial violence, but biased the project away from giving the same priority to, and expending the same resources working with perpetrators, although where this did happen the work was exemplary. This bias was reinforced and structured by a community context in which the mainstream local youth service had not offered safe youth club provision to Asian young people, a gap which the project was forced to address. The reluctance of youth workers to involve themselves in crime work is unjustified given that this and other studies have shown the normalcy and centrality of crime and victimisation in young lives. For youth workers to ignore or deny this central component of young people's experience is negligent.

All that remains is to summarise the main arguments and findings of the study. Contrary to expectations, and the findings of other studies of racial violence, more white than Asian young people said they had at some time been racially attacked and abused by Asians, and that at the time the victim survey was administered this was likely to an extent to have been true. This alleged Asian on white violence, as the study has argued, cannot be explained solely in terms of whites rationalising and
justifying their violence towards Asians. However, the qualitative nature of these victim experiences - their frequency and intensity - were different for the two groups. Asians were much more likely than whites to have experienced repeat and cyclical victimisation - that once victimisation had taken place it was likely to reoccur and escalate in frequency and seriousness - a factor that the survey could only partially pick up. Despite having been racially attacked by Asians, whites reported lower levels of fear than Asians. This discrepancy between prevalence and fear of attacks within the white group pointed towards different historical experiences of the intensity and longevity of racial violence between the Asian and white population.

Over the study period there was a decrease of white on Asian violence, and this can be explained in several different ways. First, a clustering of high levels of criminal offending with high levels of perpetration of racial violence within certain groups meant that persistent and hard core offenders were also likely to be those most involved in racial violence as perpetrators. However, both local agencies and young people concurred in suggesting that it was precisely in these perpetrator groups that a recent availability, and use of recreational drugs had first made itself felt. This change in pattern and type of drug use, particularly away from alcohol use, had tempered and reduced the commissioning of racial violence and attacks. Decreasing alcohol use, always associated in the experience of Asians with white violence, compared to other drugs, had moderated the more overt forms of racial violence perpetrated by young whites. The extension of drug use, it was said, among a wider youth population had influenced race relations through a linked chain of use, supply and sale among certain Asian and white young people. Second, the decline in racial violence coincided with a change in the ethnic participation of two large youth clubs situated in predominantly Asian areas which had previously been used almost exclusively by whites, and instead became almost exclusively used by Asians. This change in use was an important factor in creating a sense of ethnic solidarity among young Asians in a situation where there had been few safe leisure outlets available to them. These developments arose from the detached youth work project mentioned earlier and had the effect of taking Asians off the streets in some areas, reducing their availability as victims, and reducing important sources of white racism found within Asian areas. Third, older Asian (and white) young people had become more knowledgeable about where and when racial attacks were likely to take place, and had created avoidance strategies which reduced their vulnerability as victims. Victim experiences had evolved a kind of 'topographical' knowledge about the 'lie of the land' in terms of foliage, lighting, refuges, ethnic residential concentration, and community surveillance, and this had also reduced victims vulnerability and therefore the likelihood of violence. Fourth, any displacement effects of more robust policies towards racial violence and, more effective monitoring and recording practices, in local schools and within the police, were offset by the other developments mentioned here. Fifth, Asian youngsters became increasingly adept in establishing, maintaining and extending 'safe areas' through loosely organised self-defence groups that deterred white incursions into their areas, and particularly public places like parks. This was supported by an increasingly disproportionate presence of older Asian males in longer established areas of Asian settlement, where these demographic assets meant they were better equipped.
to defend their localities. Previously, younger Asians had been intimidated and attacked by older whites in or near ‘Asian’ areas. This proved decisive in explaining the reduction of white on Asian attacks.

At the same time as there was a decrease in white on Asian violence there was an increase of Asian on white violence. In mirroring Asian experiences and perceptions of racial victimisation, whites claimed an ‘equivalence’ in the ‘positionings’ of Asians and whites. Whites pointed to the fact that Asians had come to ‘own’ their areas which had become ‘no-go areas’ for whites, and sources of Asian on white violence. These cautionary tales hide changes in the local patterning of racial violence which began towards the end of the 1980s, and it was these changes that enabled whites to exaggerate Asian on white violence, although this also worked the other way around - Asian exaggeration of white violence. It should be noted however, that Asians were and remain ‘ghettoised’ in four inner areas surrounded by an overwhelming dominance of white spatial hegemony. Normally, both groups avoid each others areas through fear of being attacked, but the respective meaning of racial violence to the groups changed as their relationship to territory changed, so that ‘racism’ came to be understood as whites being victimised by Asians. This understanding becomes predicated on Asians contesting white territorialism. The sequence of events over ten years - putative cause and effect - were that some whites, initially felt in control of their areas, and felt (and continue to feel) unrestricted in their movements compared to Asians. Inter-area and inter-school rivalry between whites became displaced into an increasing anxiety about Asians and ‘Asian’ areas, particularly as some schools in inner areas of the town came to have a significant Asian presence (through demographic factors working their way through the school feeder system). A discourse of ‘white flight’ conjoined with a growing resentment and hostility towards Asians within the white working class community. Young whites sought to invade certain streets, parks and areas considered to be ‘Asian’, in attempts to intimidate, attack and ultimately, to drive out their inhabitants. These sorties by young whites into Asian areas began to meet increasing resistance to their destabilising effects on Asian areas. In limiting the scope of these incursions Asians carved out defensible spaces through which they were able to cope with a hostile racist environment. Racial violence, as a result, substantially declined in some ‘Asian’ areas.

A situation was thereby created, which offered conditions where whites were able to construct a discourse in which they defined racism in terms of their own status as victims. Often these post hoc justifications served to neutralise white on Asian violence, to the extent that whites saw themselves as inhabiting small white enclaves surrounded by a hostile Asian environment. Not only were Asians ‘coming out of their areas’, and that ‘things had gone too far the other way’, but they were ‘taking over’ (public space, leisure facilities; institutions like the Council, schools; they were favoured by the police, etc.). Whilst inverting the ‘real’ geography’s of power and position between Asians and whites, this ‘imaginary’ geography had a basis in fact at a particular time - some whites were being attacked by some groups of Asians who created for themselves a ‘nationalism of neighbourhood’. The real geography of the town changed through changes in the territorial patterning of racial violence in ways that resulted in a territorial settlement between Asians and whites based on a relatively stable and
agreed racialisation of areas. Racist restrictions and exclusions placed on Asians by white territorialism, had by extension incubated a culture of solidarity and resistance among Asian young people. Over the period, what began as aggressive white territorialism, ended as the establishment of ‘safe areas’ through Asians challenging the territorial preferences of whites. For Asians the intractability of their victim experiences was overcome as their social isolation - an important cause of racial violence - was reduced. Whites, on the other hand, developed a growing awareness of an Asian ‘offensive’ and experiences of being attacked by Asians. White territorialism inadvertently generated an Asian challenge aimed at ‘turning the tables on whites’, which created those very conditions that whites complained about to the study - that attacks on Asians had declined and attacks on whites had increased, enabling white young people to portray racism as something that black people inflict on whites in the form of racial violence and abuse aimed at whites, and that Asians demand special treatment. An unintended consequence for Asians was that their loose defensive mobilisation had the effect of establishing safe areas and extending colour coded areas on different and more favourable terms than was the case before, at the expense of reproducing and consolidating already predetermined ‘ethnic areas’ and territorial boundaries - ‘we have our places, they have theirs’ - rather than challenging the very existence of spatial apartheid in the first place. It was this territorial context and these social mechanisms found in the locality at the time of the study, which demonstrated that whites were indeed being threatened and attacked by Asians in the context of an unfolding story of Asian defence of their territory, and retaliations against whites they perceived to be racist, and against some who were not.

Resistance to white racism was founded on a particular local form of working class Muslim community and young British Muslim identity, which derived from a parent culture having a common class and geographic provenance. Its relatively homogeneous close-knit social structure and cultural isolation was also its strength in containing and ultimately resisting white racism through mobilising networks and solidarities based in Biraderi. However, the absence of an Asian middle class in the area meant that ‘respectable’ responses to racial violence through local political influence were not available to the parent culture. The highly differentiated responses to white racism among young people found in the study was arguably, conditioned by this fact. It was the Local Heroes, operating as much against the common wisdom of the parent culture and its ‘respectable’ sense of public propriety, as they were resistant and retaliatory towards white racism, who were left with little choice but to ‘stand and fight when the time is right’, sometimes meting out rough justice to whites.

The likelihood is that racial violence has stabilised in the area at relatively low levels compared to the past. Territoriality has as its aim a reduction in ambiguity and an increase in community safety. Because this requires constant vigilance - the need to remain constantly on guard, to take care about one’s every move, it is an exhausting process and consequently, in the long run, Asian and white protagonists apportion home and away territory so as to ‘settle’ and agree safe areas which approximate to colour coded residential areas. The ‘agreement’ was that the town centre, remain under the control of whites, at least during the evening, and particular residential areas, housing estates, parks or public
amenities are apportioned as 'white' or 'black'. The cost of cleansing the area of risk through the creation of these 'defensible spaces' is to compound racial segregation but on safer terms than had been the case before. The study pointed to the extent to which whites and Asians were separated by highly contrasting social, employment and leisure patterns, and that there were no spheres of activity in which whites and Asians met or co-operated. The centrality of the 'safe area' to everyday life then, is predicated on, and seen as the remedy for, a situation where ethnic groups simply do not mix. This is compounded by 'white flight' whereby a substantial number of white parents of school aged children seem to be actively choosing schools for their children on racial grounds, and/or leaving certain areas. In a situation where those social and economic inter-dependencies that can temper conflict, continue to be weak, it is likely that racial conflict and racial violence will erupt again. Whether or not those 'cultural exchanges' said to be happening elsewhere between young whites and Afro-Caribbeans, happen between Asian and white adolescent communities, remains a hopeful and open question.

It has been shown how a binary understanding of racial violence involving white perpetrators and black or Asian victims does not always apply. Studies about racial violence assume that Asian and black people alone are victims of interethnic violence. This ignores the ways in which racism is constructed by whites so as to attribute 'victim status' to themselves, and the ways in which racisms are constituted by racially defined spaces within which social practices of community defence and challenge can 'become the spaces from which resistance and transformation are to be launched' (Goldberg 1993:203). It is to the specificity of local histories and spatial forms of racism that attention needs to be drawn so as to explore the plurality of racisms existing both within and between localities, and indeed nations.
APPENDIX ONE

CHARTS

Chart 1: Recent Delinquency in Six City Samples Compared to Keighley (Males) %

Chart 2: Cumulative Offending in Keighley Compared to England & Wales %
Chart 3: Recent Offending in Keighley Compared to England & Wales (males) %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense Type</th>
<th>Keighley</th>
<th>England &amp; Wales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Offense</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti/vandalism/arson</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against the person</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All violent offenses</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offenses</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public order/smearce evasion</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All offenses</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 4: Spread of Racial Incidents in Selected Police Sub-Divisions, 1985-1992
Chart 5: Victim / Offender Analysis: Change over Time (No. Incidents)

Chart 6: All Racial Incidents in West Yorkshire 1985 - 1992 (Nov): Analysis by Type of Incident, as percentage of all incidents

Chart 7: Racial Incidents by Location: West Yorkshire Police Sub-Divisions, 1985 - 1991
Chart 8: Victim / Offender Analysis of Racial Harassment in West Yorkshire 1985 - 1991 (Mean %)

Chart 9: Asians: Things Seen as a Problem in the Area %

n = 216
Chart 10: Asians: Things Seen as a Problem Locally %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Tension</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Facilities</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abuse</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 216

Chart 11: Avoid Certain People (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Often</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Often</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 395

Chart 12: Avoid Certain Streets (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Often</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Often</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 394
Chart 13: Go Out With Company (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Asians</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairly Often</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Often</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=392

Chart 14: Asians: Worried About Going Out at Night

- Not at All: 31%
- A Lot: 11%
- Quite a Bit: 26%
- Not very Much: 32%

Chart 15: Fights and Disturbances in the Street? %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Asians</th>
<th>Whites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Common</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the Same</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Common</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=396
Chart 16: Racial Attacks? %

- Asians
- Whites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Common</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>Less Common</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=396

Chart 17: Afraid To Go Out Alone After Dark? %

- Asians
- Whites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More Common</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>Less Common</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=396

Chart 18: All Cumulative and Recent Offending %

- Ever
- Last Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Offenses</th>
<th>Graffiti/vandalism</th>
<th>Violence against the person</th>
<th>All violent offenses</th>
<th>Drug offenses</th>
<th>Farc/breach of probation</th>
<th>All offenses</th>
<th>Trusty/transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 19: Asians: Recent Self-Reported Incidents of Racial Violence by location.

- Town Centre: 25%
- Work: 3%
- Outside Keighley: 2%
- School: 23%
- Outer Keighley: 8%
- Parks: 39%

Chart 20: Asians: Recent Self-Reported Incidents of Racial Violence in Parks

- Victoria Park: 50%
- Cliff Castle Park: 29%
- Lund Park: 13%
- Devonshire Park: 8%
Chart 21: Asians: Recent Self-Reported Incidents of Racial Insults By Location

- Town Centre 42%
- Parks 17%
- Home 1%
- Skipton Road 5%
- School 17%
- Outside Keighley 2%
- Highfield 5%
- Lawkholme 5%
- Outer Keighley 2%
- Other Inner Keighley 4%

Chart 22: Asians: Recent Self-Reported Incidents of Racial Insults in Parks

- Devonshire Park 36%
- Victoria Park 21%
- Lund Park 14%
- Cliffe Castle Park 29%
Chart 23: Racial Insults: Location For White Victimization

- Lawkholme 4%
- Outside Keighley 3%
- Highfield 7%
- College 2%
- School 23%
- Braitwaite 1%

n = 108

Chart 24: Racial Violence: Location For White Victimization

- Parks 31%
- Outside Keighley 4%
- Lawkholme 3%
- Highfield 2%
- School 27%
- Braitwaite 3%
- Town Centre 12%
- College 2%
- Youth Club 3%
Chart 31: Whites: Reasons Given for Avoiding Areas (Frequency)

Chart 32: Asian Male Victims: Has Anyone of a Different 'Race' Recently Done These Things? Was the incident Racially Motivated?(%)

Chart 33: White Male Victims: Has Anyone of a Different 'Race' Recently Done these Things? Was the Incident Racially Motivated?(%)

n=153 (averaged, weighted)
n=172 (averaged, weighted)
## Table 1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holbeck</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keighley</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toller Lane</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewsbury</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batley Spen</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dudley Hill</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huddersfield</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pudsey</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapeltown</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weetwood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gipton</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odsal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manningham²</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals       | 371  | 434  | 418  | 322  | 250  | 196  | 221  | 167  | 2,379  |
| Median       | 20   | 21   | 21   | 19   | 18   | 10   | 11   | 10   |        |
| Mean         | 25   | 29   | 28   | 22   | 17   | 13   | 15   | 11   |        |

1 Up to November 1992.
2 Includes Eccleshill from 1991.

## Table 2

All Offending in Keighley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Ever</th>
<th>Last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property offences</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti/vandalism/arson</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against person</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All violent offences</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare/licence/insurance evasion</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All offences</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy/running away</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Offending and Family Arrangements (Whole Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender</th>
<th>Both Parents</th>
<th>Mother Only</th>
<th>Mother &amp; Another &amp; Father only</th>
<th>Father &amp; Another</th>
<th>No parent household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never offended</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>49 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever offended but not last year</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>77 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-racial offending last year</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>246 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial offending last year</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>409 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Offending and Family Arrangements (Comparison of Asians and Whites)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender</th>
<th>Both Parents</th>
<th>Mother Only</th>
<th>Mother &amp; Another &amp; Father only</th>
<th>Father &amp; Another</th>
<th>No parent household</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never offended</td>
<td>86% (81%)</td>
<td>14% (14%)</td>
<td>0% (0%)</td>
<td>0% (2%)</td>
<td>0% (0%)</td>
<td>49 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever offended but not last year</td>
<td>83% (90%)</td>
<td>10% (8%)</td>
<td>0% (0%)</td>
<td>0% (2%)</td>
<td>7% (0%)</td>
<td>77 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-racial offending last year</td>
<td>82% (89%)</td>
<td>9% (5%)</td>
<td>4% (3%)</td>
<td>2% (0%)</td>
<td>0.7% (0%)</td>
<td>246 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial offending last year</td>
<td>83% (95%)</td>
<td>6% (0%)</td>
<td>0% (5%)</td>
<td>11% (0%)</td>
<td>0% (0%)</td>
<td>37 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>409 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Asians are in brackets.
APPENDIX THREE

THE SURVEY SAMPLE

The Sample

The survey asked 412 Asian and white young people aged between 13 and 19 years, male and female, in interviews lasting, on average, 40 minutes, to report to us whether they had been victims of a crime, and also, whether they themselves had committed any crimes. There were 216 Asian young people of whom 194 were males and 22 females. The white sub-sample comprised 178 males and 17 females. Further, within the Asian sample there were 77 Asian males who were selected for the survey because they were involved in a project aimed at working with offenders and supporting victims of racial harassment. These are referred to as the 'participants' in the study. The survey attempted to generate a similar sub-sample for whites participating in the same project but were unable to do so. The reasoning was to generate booster samples of young people who were more likely to be either victims or offenders than would be expected in the general population of the same age so as to gather sufficiently detailed information from adequate numbers of young people about these behaviours. This also allowed comparison within the Asian sub-sample. This sampling exercise, it was thought, would generate a better picture of repeat or persistent victimisation and offending.

The survey interviewed 22 Asian young women (all Muslim) and 16 white young women as a pilot sample to test whether the same or different victimisation and offending behaviours were found among young women compared to young men. In these interviews, we included questions on sexual harassment, but the small sample produced inconclusive data. Because of the small size of the female sample, and its different patterns of offending and victimisation, the results are not discussed in this thesis. Young women's experience was explored in more detail in the follow up study.

The thesis makes clear throughout when these sub-samples (male/female; participants/non-participants) are disaggregated and when they are not. Overall then because of these sampling issues it was expected that the Asian male sample would contain higher prevalences of offending and victim behaviours than would be found in the general young Asian male population.

Socio-economic Information

The socio-economic or social class background characteristics of Asians compared to whites in the sample are so different that they need to be treated separately. Social class background has been calculated on the basis of father's current or last employment. The proportion of the white sample belonging to Senior Management/Managerial Professional backgrounds was 24% compared to 1.5% of Asians. Thus among whites this background is over represented in the sample as a proportion of these occupations found in the general Keighley population (11% according to the 1981 Census). 7% of whites and 1% of Asians belonged to routine non-manual occupations, and 8% of whites and 9.5% of Asians belonged to the category of small proprietors, self-employed, supervisors and technicians. 28% of whites compared to 5% of Asians belonged to a skilled manual working class background, and 26% of whites compared to 75% of Asians belonged to the semi/unskilled manual working class. According to figures from the 1981 Census, Keighley is still primarily a manufacturing town, with a disproportionate number of its population belonging to the Skilled Manual (44%) and Semi/Unskilled Manual (36%) working class. The sample, then, has under sampled working class whites on the basis of what is known from the 1981 Census. However, the 1981 estimates will be outdated and in any case uses the Register Generals Social Class categorisation which is not strictly comparable to the Hope-Goldthorpe scale of occupations. What is striking is that Asians almost constitute an 'underclass' within the town, being overwhelmingly semi/unskilled working class and currently having very high levels of unemployment. No less than 52% of fathers of our Asian respondents were unemployed at the time of the survey compared with only 11% of white fathers. The figure for white unemployment is consistent with officially counted average white unemployment in the town. Figures for Asian adult unemployment are hard to come by. The situation is even worse for Asians when mother's employment is taken into account with 94% of Asian mothers not having a job compared to 24% of white mothers. According to the survey's estimates Asian male adults are five times more likely to be unemployed than white male adults in Keighley.

Asian and White Sub-samples

168 The study also asked young people about mother's occupation, but this is not the place to involve the reader in a complicated debate about whether the inclusion of mother's occupation is a more robust measure of social class background. The survey used the Hope-Goldthorpe social class categories to derive social class position from occupational position (See Goldthorpe 1987).
Of the male and female Asian sample ($n = 216$), 53% were still at school and 47% were not at school. Of those not attending school 37% were employed and 63% were unemployed. Among male participants not at school 61% were unemployed compared to 63% of male non-participants. 67% of Asian females were unemployed. The ethnic background of the Asian young people is that 81% were Pakistani origin, 15% Bangladeshi and 4% were of mixed parentage, proportions similar to the general 13-19 year old Asian population in Keighley. These high levels of unemployment are partly accounted for by respondents designated being on YT as 'not in work'. However, the take-up of YT places by Keighley young Asians is extremely low. Both the ethnic and age profile of the Asian sample was reasonably representative of the general Asian youth population with some skewing in favour of the older age groups. 49% of the white male and female sample were at school and 51% had left school. Of those who had left school 58% were in employment and 42% were not employed. 67% of the unemployed whites had never had a job.
## APPENDIX FOUR

### YOUTHLINK: PROJECT PHASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Key Events</th>
<th>Project Objective</th>
<th>Project Actions</th>
<th>Effects, Changes and Behaviours</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Contact and Referrals (January - May 1988)</td>
<td>Asian White</td>
<td>Advisory Group meeting, Liaison with the BYO, Racial at local schools</td>
<td>a), b)</td>
<td>Project base established, Networked local agencies, Identifying local problems</td>
<td>New interagency forum to tackle racial harassment and offending</td>
<td>Acceptance of project aims and methods among local agencies, Interagency collaboration, Referrals of young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting and Recruiting Young People (March 1988 - &gt;)</td>
<td>Asian White</td>
<td>Conflict at Central Youth Club, School visit, Checking school log book, Court case, Relationships between perpetrators and victims identified</td>
<td>a), b)</td>
<td>Provision of social facilities at Youthlink, Family Visits and support, Work in schools, Informal Behavioural contracts with young people agreed</td>
<td>Antisocial behaviours begin to be challenged, Asian young people taken off the street</td>
<td>Three White groups and one Asian group formed and trust established, Two additional White groups formed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached Youth Work (April 1988 - &gt;)</td>
<td>Asian White</td>
<td>Local teacher resigns, Exchange trip and integration of White and Asian participants, Work experience, Racial and offending incidents, Residential, School expulsions</td>
<td>a), b), c), d), f)</td>
<td>Collaboration with schools-interagency work, Conflict resolution, Leisure activities, Social education, Interracial games, Court advocacy, Careers and training advice</td>
<td>Racial victimising behaviours begins to decline, Racist attitudes remain the same, Offending begins to moderate, Trust builds up between workers and young people</td>
<td>Better understanding of offending and victimising processes leading to more effective intervention, Success in integrating second white group and Asian core group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Centre Work (May 1988 - &gt;)</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>New Community Inspector, Local Asian community endorses Youthlink but worries about its association with Asian offender's</td>
<td>b), c), d), e), f), g)</td>
<td>Encouraging young people to report racial incidents, Case work on racial victimisation and victim support, Integrated activity and trips</td>
<td>Core Asian group becomes support group, Reduced Asian victimisation and offending</td>
<td>Victim support and creation of safe building for Asian young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Young People Impacted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of Detached Work (1988-1991)</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Tougher school policy toward racial harassment at school</td>
<td>Young people from first White group become employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tougher school policy toward disruptive behaviour at school to one of exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Community Inspector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local teacher resigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More white detached worker's employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detached meetings with young people regularised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Court work increases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work outside school increases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Racial victimising behaviours decline or cease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Racist attitudes remain the same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offending is moderated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian-only sessions begin at Holycroft</td>
<td>Core Asian group become Junior Leaders and Worker's in Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tougher school policy toward racial harassment at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tougher school policy toward disruptive behaviour at school to one of exclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holycroft Incident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keighley Festival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youthlink challenges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Holycroft practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swire Smith amalgamated into Youthlink to form one centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian-only sessions begin at Holycroft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victim support continues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Court work with Asian offenders and victim's begins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian residentialss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Centre staff increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Victim support declines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offender support and advocacy increases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youthlink becomes mainstream Asian centre provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youthlink comes into conflict with Holycroft staff and users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline of Detached Work (1991-92)</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Tougher school policy toward disruptive behaviour at school to one of expulsion</td>
<td>Young people from third White group are expelled from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White youth worker becomes half time on the project</td>
<td>Young people from second White group become employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with second White group ends</td>
<td>Some young people from third White group become unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Third White group breaks up and contact becomes individual case work</td>
<td>Influence on offending and racial harassment becomes a function of the frequency and quality of contact with the third group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Diffusion of Centre Work (1991 - >) | Asian | Community Inspector transferred from Keighley | g), e) | Court work continues  
Some girls work  
Management of a large youth centre | Work with Asian offender's and victimised  
Asian's continues in the context of expansion of centre work  
Youthlink becomes a victim of its own success in opening up access, but losing sight of its original focus of working with offenders and victims  
Becomes an 'Asian' centre | Youthlink is mainstream centre provision for Asians  
Original aims lose their focus  
Project almost exclusively concerned with Asian centre work |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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