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ANTI-RACISM TRAINING: LESSONS FOR ANTI-DISABILITY TRAINING?

A.
THE PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER

On the basis that most, if not all, oppressed people have in common the experience of discrimination and with it the denial of justice, this paper sets out to see just how far that 'commonality' can be extended when it comes to considering training as a means of effectively confronting the injustice of inequality. It is not the purpose of this paper to go into any great length about training in disability issues, nor to give an account of training already taking place in that field - that is the subject of another paper in the making. In addition, this paper does not set out to provide answers but rather focuses on various issues and questions that need addressing if training is to be properly considered. It is regrettable that, due to time and financial resources available, this paper is inevitably limited in its scope.

The self-organisation of black people into a Movement of Black Struggle and Resistance (which reached a peak in the American Civil Rights Movement), was instrumental to the birth of the Disability Movement. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to suggest that current initiatives by organisations of disabled people to develop and produce their own courses in Disability 'Awareness', 'Education', and 'Equality', can be better informed by taking into account and trying to learn from the black experience of using training as a means of confronting racism (not least because Disability Training is comparatively new and has little to go on). Consequently, it may appear on the face of it that this paper has more to do with the black experience of struggle for justice than it has to do with the training requirements of disability issues: to pass that judgment, however, would be to miss the point of this paper.

Such links, while important and informative, must, however, avoid the risk of equating disability issues and experience as being identical to the black struggle for that would not only ignore important differences but it would also run the danger of diluting the uniqueness and validity of each struggle in its own right.

A.1.
APPROACHES TO RACE-RELATED TRAINING

The variety of training programmes available has generated considerable debate about the value and effectiveness of the different approaches adopted by organisations and training agencies. Phrases such as 'equal opportunity training', 'race relations training', 'racism awareness training', 'multi-cultural awareness
training' are used - often interchangeably - to cover a range of distinct activities, including:

* information sessions on e.g. the Race Relations Act 1976, the Commission For Racial Equality (CRE) Code of Practice, etc;

* guidance on an organisation's equal opportunity policy and how it applies to e.g. selection, monitoring, appraisal systems, etc;

* guidance on the ways in which racial discrimination occurs and the practices and systems needed to eliminate it;

* sessions which provide information/awareness of different cultures and their impact/influence in e.g. the workplace, education, housing, etc;

* 'racism awareness' or attitudinal training designed to encourage individuals to think about their own prejudices and racism as well as those found more widely in society and in the organisations for which they work;

* management or personnel skill courses on interviewing, selection and appraisal that include equal opportunity and racial discrimination issues.

Training programmes vary between a single one or two hour session and courses lasting several days, with refresher or progress sessions to evaluate their impact and develop themes. Approaches range from those where the focus is on good practice in management and personnel functions, but which include some examination of how discrimination occurs and can be prevented, to those which concentrate on attempting to change attitudes and challenge individuals' prejudices.

A.2. DEFINING OBJECTIVES

There is considerable variation between organisations in the degree to which their race-related training programmes are planned and coordinated with the other changes in policies and practices that go towards a comprehensive overall strategy for implementing equal opportunity policies. In addition, there are differences in the aims, range and scope of training programmes as well as the resources allocated to them.

Diversity of itself would not be a matter for great concern. However, it is the lack of clarity about defining the aims of training and the seeming absence of any serious consideration of the basic issues that raises doubts about the effectiveness and purpose of much race-related training. This is particularly evident in the introduction of high-profile training programmes in organisations that do not have a strong training ethos and which have not given sufficient time or thought to prepare the necessary groundwork.

In general, UK employers do not give training a high profile or status, and where this is true of an individual organisation, which is introducing race-related training on any significant scale, three questions need careful attention:
Furthermore, strong support from senior management will usually be a vital factor if scarce resources are to be used to provide training that is effective in the long term.

In some organisations in the USA, the introduction of race-related training was the first occasion that any in-housing training had been provided for managers. Clear aims and the effective implementation of race-related training can help to illuminate other training needs as well as provide useful models and methods, if senior management is prepared to give it due priority and attention.

A.3.
AIMS AND APPROACHES

Differences over the aims of various equal opportunity training programmes are most sharply raised over two issues: whether training should aim at changing attitudes or behaviour or both; and the place and use of management training where the main focus is on 'learning about different cultures'.

A.3(i)
Attitudes and Behaviour

The Debate - An Outline

Increasingly, race-related training is the subject of a debate about whether the focus should be on attitudes or behaviour. This is highlighted in the arguments about racism awareness training, which can be summed up by quoting two views: 'Racism awareness courses are self-indulgent and lead nowhere', and 'Without racism awareness no other training is effective.'

The term 'racism awareness' carries a range of different meanings in the UK. It can, for example, be used to describe any training where issues of race, racism or discrimination are the principal matters for discussion. It can also be used to describe programmes where the primary focus is on individuals' attitudes to race, prejudice, etc.

This paper uses the term 'Racism Awareness Training' (RAT) to describe a technique which was influenced by behaviour therapy and first advocated by Judy Katz in the US. The technique has been modified in the UK but remains essentially an approach designed to:

* facilitate the process whereby whites 'own' the problem of racism, i.e. acknowledge and accept responsibility for it;
* facilitate acceptance by whites of their individual role in sustaining or removing racism;
* state clearly the facts about racism in society.

Both the original Katz model and its UK variants provide a stage at
the end of the course to plan further action but, nevertheless, the bulk of such programmes is devoted to people's attitudes, feelings, 'cultural racism', etc.

Those who argue that RAT is wasteful and ineffective do so on the grounds that:

* it is more important and practical to concentrate on changing behaviour;

* changes in attitudes may or will follow required changes in behaviour;

* concentrating on individuals ignores or, at best, underestimates the institutional context within which people operate;

* the programmes are often of variable quality and the results too unpredictable to be of use, particularly in large organisations.

The advocates of RAT argue that it is a precondition for all equal opportunity training and that unless individual whites examine their own attitudes and 'own' the problem of racism, there is little chance of changing existing discriminatory structures and practices.

A.3(ii)
The CRE's View of RAT

The CRE begins its response by quoting The Manpower Services Commission's Glossary of Training Terms which defines training as:

"a planned process to modify attitudes, knowledge or skill behaviour through learning experience to achieve effective performance in an activity or range of activities. Its purpose, in the work situation, is to develop the abilities of the individual and to satisfy the current and future manpower needs of the organisation".

The CRE goes on to say:

"However restrictive its second part, this definition does provide a useful focus, namely, the need to aim for effective performance and, therefore, behaviour change. Furthermore, there can be little quarrel with the view that employers have the right to expect a certain code of conduct from the staff, consistent with the law and fair employment practice.

While emphasising, therefore, the goal of behaviour change, the Commission does not wish to ignore the attitudinal aspects of training. The debate about attitudes or behaviour draws a distinction which is not in any case as clear as might at first appear. We should recognise after all, that individuals bring feelings, values and beliefs to any training programme. This does not mean, though, that the most appropriate approach must be some sort of racism awareness training.

The point that needs to be stressed is that attitudes are very difficult to change. Even where there is some shift, it is often likely to be minimal and, unless organisations
take steps to reinforce the achievements of the programme, temporary in nature. The best use of limited training resources is to ensure that the organisation build on the maxim that individuals learn by example and reinforcement. This emphasises once again the importance of active support from senior management.

Even where attitudes are the main focus of a training programme, and racism awareness training the method, the basic question must be how these contribute to the effective implementation of equal opportunity policies, i.e. the need to see a change in the behaviour of individuals and institutions.

The Commission's view, therefore, is that the main strategy adopted for race-related training should be determined overwhelmingly by this fundamental aim. Racism awareness courses (as defined earlier) are thus not likely to play a major role in training programmes."

A.4.
'Cultural Awareness' Training

In some circumstances, training courses for managerial and supervisory groups, which concentrate on 'culture', 'cultural differences' or 'the background of minority groups', can contribute effectively to attempts to improve management performance in the field of personnel and industrial relations matters and/or in-service delivery (e.g. the Health Service).

Problems arise, though, if training provision concentrates on these topics to the detriment of other pertinent issues, such as unlawful discrimination, its effect on job opportunities for racial minorities, and the cost to organisations of running inefficient or unlawful personnel systems. There is another danger too, if the purpose of such training is not clear: it is only too easy for the emphasis to shift to minority groups as the 'problem'. Training needs to identify as the main problem the issue of whether and how organisations and individuals carry out their employment functions in a non-discriminatory way.

B.
RAT - IN DETAIL

B.1. Introduction

In less than five years of its introduction (especially since the 1981 summer black rebellions) RAT had established for itself the reputation of being the crucial and the most practical initial step against personal and institutional racism. Its success is evident by the regard in which it is held by many progressive local authorities, social services departments, schools, colleges, polytechnics, hospitals, banks and even by some sections of the state. At a conference held in London on 21 March 1984, on 'Local Authorities and Racial Disadvantage', David Waddington, a Home Office minister responsible for deportation and immigration controls, agreed that staff and management skills should be developed using RAT, with the chief officers taking the lead. A document published by the Department of the Environment, issued as a
Report of a Joint Government and Local Authority Association Working Group, also states its commitment to 'race relations training'. This training, it insists, is required to be given to 'elected members' and to local authority officers, who must be made aware of their role as employers during selection and recruitment and while providing social services. Training should also be made available to the black staff "to enable them to progress within the authority", because "other than in fairly specialist areas, there is a substantial unmet training need which just a few authorities are developing strategies to tackle". The Report recognised the immediate need to concentrate on the "needs of senior personnel and elected members", because they are involved with external matters.

Thus, as a response to racism, many councils including Brent, Lewisham, Camden, Sheffield, Liverpool, Greater Manchester (as it was), Leicester and the GLC (as it was), have set up Race Relations Units or Ethnic Minority Units. The majority of these units have understood their brief as that of training; and have chosen RAT as the best method of training. As the Haringey Community Affairs Committee Report insists, training is essential for providing "a service to our multi-ethnic community" and "to eliminate personal and institutional discrimination". It goes on to say "RAT should be central to all race relations training in order that staff can approach the issues facing them with more awareness and confidence".

B.2. The Appeal of RAT

Essentially, RAT is concerned with practical problems. It appears to address racism not only at the state and institutional level (as do most political activists and academic sociologists), but it is also rightly concerned with people's personal experience of racism. Particularly after the 1981 summer black rebellions, the appeal of practical solutions to institutional and personal racism cannot be over-estimated. Such solutions attract many interests:

1. They attract black people because to some of them RAT seems to force the recognition of their oppression on the establishment and on the professional middle class; but more importantly, it appears to constitute a concrete programme against that oppression;

2. RAT solutions attract parts of the liberal establishment because they provide an answer to their moral opposition to racism;

3. Various individuals are also drawn to RAT solutions because they promise to clear up their confusions and uncertainties about racism. For many RAT appears to reveal to them extremely important facts about themselves and about their society;

4. Even the racist state itself is persuaded that such training and a better trained police force is bound to increase law and order.

It is hoped that training would sensitisise and stimulate the professional imagination to the extent of motivating action against racism at work, at home and socially. For many people, then, if RAT does not provide a simple solution to the struggle against racism, it certainly amounts to modest steps in that direction. At the very least, RAT has brought many blacks into prominence as trainers, to question and to influence community work decisions, social work
practice, teaching curricula and methods, recruitment and selection procedures, employment policies and so on. RAT has given blacks a positive image, ensured some black jobs as trainers, and has created an atmosphere of confidence for black workers, and the possibility of promotion for some black workers.

These are powerful facts to recommend RAT and its importance cannot be dismissed, especially if what trainers and many who have been on the course claim is true: that it does make a difference. But however much RAT widely appeals to the professional middle class, to blacks, to the state, etc., according to its critics (of whom there appears to be an increasing number), it has never really been placed, or placed itself, in a critical context.

B.3.
CRITICISMS OF RAT

B.3(i)
The birth of RAT

RAT began life in Human Awareness Training (HAT) on a military base in Florida at the end of the 1960s, when the impact of black rebellion in American cities began to be felt in the military bases in the US and Japan: this drove the Defence Department to a Human Goals Proclamation upholding individual dignity, worth and equal opportunity in its ranks. The training of human relations instructors at the Defence Race Relations Institute was meant to raise knowledge and awareness of minority cultures and history, together with an understanding of personal racism.

HAT had formed part of human relations training for some time, but the race relations element came into prominence only after the Kerner Commission (1968) declared that racism in America was a white problem and that it was inherent in the very structures of society. The Commission's Report made what appeared to be a radical statement: "What white Americans have never fully understood - but what the Negro can never forget - is that white society is deeply implicated in the ghetto. White institutions created it, white institutions maintain it and white institutions condones it".

The US Commission on Civil Rights (1970) echoed the Kerner Commission and went on to define racism (which Kerner had left undefined) as "any attitude, action or institutional structure which subordinates a person or group because of his or their colour", adding that an "institutional structure was any well-established, habitual or widely accepted pattern of action" (i.e. behavioural) or "organisational arrangements whether formal or informal" (i.e. administrational). The Commission also made a distinction between 'overt racism' and 'indirect institutional subordination' (which was to become direct and indirect discrimination in the British context of the 1976 Race Relations Act). Combating racism, stated the Commission, involved "changing the behaviour of whites" and "increasing the capabilities of non-white groups" (which in Britain was to become known as tackling racial disadvantage). But the principal responsibility was "with the white community rather than within the non-white communities".

Following these two reports, a whole host of literature sprang up in education, psychology and the churches, all apparently trying to rescue racism from structural responsibility and, instead,
internalising and personalising racism and developing programmes for combating racism on that basis.

The elements of RAT were, therefore, already set by the time Judy Katz came to write her D.Ed thesis: *Systematic handbook of exercises for the re-education of white people with respect to attitudes and behaviourisms* (1976).

B.3(ii)
Katz's understanding of racism

Racism, according to Katz, is indeed a white problem, and white people had better be conscious of it - for the sake of their own mental health. As far back as 1965, she points out, the Commission on Mental Health described racism as the number one mental health problem in the US: "its destructive effects severely cripple the growth and development of millions of our citizens, young and old alike". Even before that, research had drawn attention to the split (i.e. conflict) in the white American psyche between 'American ideals of equality, freedom, God-given dignity of the individual, inalienable rights' on the one hand, and 'the practices of discrimination, humiliation, insult, denial of opportunity to Negroes and others in a racist society' on the other. New research had sprung up to show that racism was a 'psychological problem...deeply inbedded in white people from a very early age both on a conscious and an unconscious level'. And even black commentators, according to Katz, confirmed this diagnosis.

Racism, for Katz, is an 'essence' that history had deposited in the white psyche and because of this, white oppressors were not merely oppressors but also victims of their own oppression. This oppression is a part of the psycho-social history of white America, part of its collective unconscious: it is in American customs, institutions, language, etc. and is both conscious and unconscious at the same time, both overt and covert. There is no escaping it, and because the system is loaded in their favour, all that whites can be, even when they fight racism, is, at best, anti-racist racists: if they do not fight it, then they are just plain, common racists.

Hence, any training programme that intends to bring individual whites to a consciousness of themselves should also take conscience of American culture and institutions. And it should be done at two levels at once: the cognitive or informative and the affective or emotional at the level of thinking and at the level of feeling. The techniques that had hitherto been used in human relations training erred on one side or the other: they were either not self-aware enough or too exploitative of oppressed people. Only white on white techniques, according to Katz, promised any success, and it was on that basis that she devised a systematic training programme of racism awareness (an intensive six-stage programme of forty-eight exercises crammed into two weekends but adaptable to 'many different settings').

B.3(iii)
The Approach of RAT

As already indicated, RAT is not interested in theoretical concerns, but is mainly preoccupied with practical ones. This is both its strength and weakness. It is its strength because it
addresses a wider range of people and better appeals to their concerns. It is its weakness because it rarely reflects on the consequences of its assumptions and actions. Nevertheless, in as much as RAT is informed by theory, it appears to be based on two theoretical frameworks: Marxist sociology and Rogerian social psychology. However, these two theoretical frameworks are not evaluated within the context of training but merely presuppose training: Marxism and Rogerian psychology are used as ‘slogans’, and so it would be inaccurate to call RAT ‘Marxist’ or ‘Rogerian’, because as theories they are of no interest to the trainers - their usage is entirely pragmatic. One reason why they reappear in numerous RAT articles is that they appeared in the influential Judy Katz and Allen Ivey article ‘White Awareness: The Frontier of Racism Awareness Training’, and in Katz’s book ‘White Awareness’.

These theories play a very specific explanatory role in the make-up of RAT. Marxism helps to identify and describe institutional and individual racism. Rogerian psychology outlines the way racism affects individuals and also provides a practical method for dealing with racism, through the individual. Since neither the choice of these theories nor the relationship between them is ever theorised in RAT, they remain slogans. They are selected at random for their convenience, without any care about whether they are properly understood or whether their implications are in tune with the aims of training. They are treated as simple convenient tools for identifying and for taking action against racism: theory stops being a form of reflection and becomes a technique. But, if Katz and Ivey have failed in this, many of their British followers are not even aware that RAT presupposes these two theories: for them RAT is simply a technique against racism. Furthermore, many of these followers would openly dispute the necessity for any theoretical reflection, arguing that training must be kept at the level of feeling.

(a) Marxism sociological approach:

describing racism

Judy Katz sets the scene by insisting that racism is:

"the racial prejudice of white people coupled with the economic, political, and social power to enforce discriminatory practices on every level of life - culture, institutional and individual."

From this she concludes that in the US, the "race problem" is "essentially a white problem in that whites (who) developed it, perpetuated it, and have power to resolve it...", by establishing "policies and practices that serve to their advantage and benefit..." But these policies and practices are neither described nor analysed. In fact, the whole ‘analysis’ takes up no more than a few pages of the whole book, which is mostly a training manual.

Whilst it cannot be denied that racism is essentially a white problem, some black commentators reject the implication that multi-culturalism is a solution to ‘race relations’ politics. For them, like for many radical blacks, race relations assumes racial equality and racial harmony. It implies that awareness and appreciation of other cultures will remove racial tensions. But the
fact is these tensions continue for there can be no racial harmony without racial justice. Therefore, they argue, it will not do to encourage white community workers to believe that all they need to do against racism is to learn about black cultures and life styles, for then the victims become equated with 'the problem'. The colonial context of black and white people and the contemporary institutional and individual racism turns white people into racists and the process of undoing this complex relationship cannot be achieved by liberal measures of race relations politics in the form of multi-cultural awareness and understanding. For this reason many British trainers distance themselves from liberal 'race awareness training' or 'multi-culturalism awareness training'.

(b) The social psychological approach:

the psychological effects of racism

The second theoretical slogan adopted by RAT originates from American social psychology and is only cosmetically connected to Marxism (i.e. there is no theoretical continuity from one to the other). Rogerian distinction is made between the actual (racist) and the ideal (non-racist or anti-racist) self-concept. According to Katz and Ivey, racism distorts people's conceptions of reality so much that it creates an internal conflict (i.e. between the actual (what a person does) and the ideal (what a person believes)) both for the racist and the 'victim' of racism. The outcome of this internal conflict (behaviour/action v beliefs/ideals) is mental illness for both blacks and white. When whites fail to acknowledge these internal conflicts by either intellectually or institutionally rationalising them, these conflicts only reappear in the shape of increased racist attitudes and behaviour. That in turn leads to greater damage in white people's mental health, in their marital and work relations (i.e. in every area of their lives).

Critics point out that there are several analytical jumps being made here and that if any connections exist between racism and mental health, they are not demonstrated and no arguments are offered to establish their legitimacy.

According to its critics, RAT is not only theoretical inadequate but it is also reductionist in the extreme. RAT implies that people experience all oppressions in the same way, because all social oppressions arise, or at least are exacerbated, by racism. This reduction becomes an absurdity when it implies that racism mentally affects blacks and whites in the same way. What the evidence in fact suggests, is that racism not only affects blacks and whites differently, but it also affects different groups of blacks according to their cultural, class and educational backgrounds. Indeed, the evidence shows that when stress is applied, different individuals, partly in accordance with social development and partly due to personal biography, cope with it accordingly. Similarly, the way that blacks resist racism or individually counter it, differs according to these factors. Very few of these different groups of blacks become mentally disturbed simply because they experience racism or because of the strategies they adopt against it. In fact, quite the contrary, for not only do different groups experience and cope with racism in different ways, but increasingly, instead of going mad, their experience becomes a basis for black collective action against racism. It could also be argued that black mental illness is itself something of a white racist construct (as, for
example, are the so-called scientific tests and theories (e.g. IQ and biological/medical tests and theories) which fuel the myth that blacks are 'born' disadvantaged) and that far from explaining black responses to stress it merely confirms images of black inferiority and inadequacies.

(c) The Strategy of RAT:

Therapy

By resolving the conflict that exists between 'actual and ideal self-concept', between 'structural reality and personal perception' (which racism causes), RAT hopes to cure racism. But since, for Katz, racism distorts social reality for all, including the trainers, action against racism has to also recognise that the educator must be educated too. The job is a difficult one: "The disease of racism manifests itself in a tremendous degree of pain, guilt, and fear for white people. The discrepancy creates guilt...immobilisation and feeling sorry for oneself". It leads to identity confusion and makes whites adhere to their national identity and deny their whiteness; that prevents them "from becoming a fully developed and whole person". Thus, "we must begin to remove the intellectual shackles and psychological chains that keep us in bondage. White people have been hurt too long". (Some critics compare this to men suggesting to feminists that men have suffered too long from sexism! Perhaps disabled people can make a similar comparison!).

A few analytical jumps are evident here too. For instance, it is not documented how extensive is the white guilt, or how it manifests itself. No evidence is given to show who feels the pain, and it is not explained how whites can continue to have political, economic, cultural and social power when they are so immobilised by racism; how is it that whites are not accordingly more vulnerable, and why are they not compelled to relinquish their privileges? Against such questions it is all the more puzzling, according to her critics, that Katz should so lament the white suffering of racism. It is as though focus for sympathy shifts from the oppressed (blacks) to the oppressors (whites) and even smacks of a subtle implication that the victims (blacks) have become the oppressors.

The main point, however, is that whites should be confronted with their discrepancies (i.e. the conflict between their ideals and actions), to help them define racism as a white problem: "to raise the consciousness of white people, help them to identify racism in their experience...to take action against institutional and individual racism".

Furthermore, many of the black trainers in Britain emphasise the importance of doing similar training with black people, so that blacks can independently put pressure on the white professionals. There are some trainers who insist that training should be conducted only by blacks (others would approve and encourage white trainers). But all agree that racism in the first place, should be confronted via RAT.

What is problematic with most of this analysis, according to RAT critics, is that it is too superficial and static. It assumes that by 'defining' the problem, one can also 'define' a solution. They point out that what is profoundly mistaken about the unqualified
slogan, 'racism is a white problem' is that it fails to recognise
that racism is a relationship. In a relationship one cannot
fruitfully focus on the nature of the individual in the hope of
solving structural inequalities. There is no direct causal
route from the nature of the individual and structural dynamics.
The analyses and the political action by necessity has to address
the structural components themselves, and reflect on the individual
only in that context. RAT, however, hopes to solve these social
inequalities by persuading professionals to recognise their personal
racism. The professionals are then expected to translate their
raised consciousness into action against institutional racism; and
all this takes place, according to Katz and Ivey, after twenty-six
hours of intensive RAT. This does not imply that these trainers are
necessarily cynical or they lack integrity or seriousness. Quite
the contrary, for the most part the people involved in conducting
such training are highly committed and many are black. The point,
however, is that the lack of theoretical reflection on their part,
has landed them in many unintended difficulties. These difficulties
become more acute when one probes further into the politics of RAT.

(d) The Politics of RAT:
Some general criticisms

1. The Tone of RAT

The tone of RAT is often accusatory and appears to put people on the
spot in order that they may confront themselves. In this sense, it
is highly moralistic and tends to adopt a personal note. Clearly
not all trainers intend accusation, but given the objectives and the
method that RAT has chosen to achieve its aims, even more restrained
trainers end up incriminating. For the objective of this kind of
training can only be to guilt-trip white workers into action
against racism. This tendency is well exemplified by the concept of
the anti-racist racist. This concept implies that when whites
mobilise against racism by giving money and time, or when they join
initiatives to improve black prospects in housing provision,
employment, civil rights, schooling and recreations, or when whites
fight racist political, economic, and cultural oppressions, the most
they can be is anti-racist racists. RAT's political theory, then,
is the tendency to taunt white people. The implication is that
whites must be made to feel and accept their guilt, whatever else
they actually do. This approach is mistaken because individual
guilt rarely leads to positive action; and then, it is unclear that
even if it did, that would constitute the right kind of action.

Thus, if whites cannot possibly by-pass or overcome their guilt and
their responsibility for racism, they can alleviate their situation
by admitting to it and show that they repent. RAT depends, even
demands that people doing these sessions must confess their racism:
not to do so is held as clear evidence of their refusal to admit
that racism is a white problem, and signals their failure to
recognise their conflict between liberal democratic ideals of
equality and justice and the racism they perpetuate on blacks.

Not only does RAT guilt-trip whites, but it also affects blacks who
get involved with it. The whole atmosphere of confession encourages
blacks to play their part in this unseemly performance. Some RAT
for blacks actually teaches blacks the techniques for extracting
such confessions from well-meaning, guilt-ridden whites. It also
has a tendency to render discussion as extremely ‘precious’ and personal, where both trainers and trained talk in hushed sincere voices about their search for the inner meaning of their feelings: the inner feelings of their racism. Thus, to its critics, in its tone at least, RAT is highly dubious.

2. Negative Consequences of RAT

RAT has negative consequences because it is based on a non-reflective framework, but more serious than that, because it provides white officials with the acceptable language of anti-racism, with which to disarm black criticisms. There is nothing more disarming to a black person than a powerful official humbly declaring his or her institutional and personal racism up-front, especially when she or he promises to do something about it. Thus, instead of achieving the required transformation of racist thought and behaviour, RAT may very well unintentionally encourage tokenism.

In the last analysis, the only real measure of anti-racist success is a concrete transformation of black people’s conditions in Britain. However, it is worth noting that in the years in which RAT achieved popularity, there was a noticeable increase in state racism (e.g. Nationality Bill, Police Bill) and the denial of basic democratic rights for blacks. There has similarly been a proportional increase of black unemployment and of deteriorating educational and housing facilities. The impression is that state institutions are still not significantly responding to the criticism of racism, but display the ability to ‘manage’ these criticisms, and better ‘cope’ with blacks making them (an ability enhanced (some would say, learnt) by the development of RAT).

The state has well anticipated the possibility of further black rebellions. It has strengthened, equipped and trained a bigger police force; it has increasingly encouraged multi-culturalism (thereby dividing the black community into separate ‘problematic’ ethnic groups) in schools and public services; and finally, claim RAT critics, it has (ironically) diverted legitimate black and white opposition to state and institutional racism by sending or approving the sending of a few public officials on RAT. In these ways, the police, multi-culturalism and RAT are used by the central and the local state to manage blacks.

Thus, instead of spending the scarce resources set aside for anti-racism on young blacks, on community centres, on creating employment, some local authorities waste a good deal of the little enough resources on (at worst) camouflaging the issues, or (at best) on providing a few jobs for blacks.

3. Misdirected Energies

Thus, in spite of the intention to fight institutional racism, it is doubtful that the best way to do that is by individually persuading the various officials. These public officers have not only their professional interest to protect, but also class standards to maintain, and it would seem naive to imagine that 20 hours or so of RAT would transform their individualistic conception of the world sufficiently for them to take major initiatives against racism, when several years of sustained argument by committed political activists has brought about no significant action from them. If RAT’s claim
is true, that racism is several hundreds of years old and is firmly embedded in people's perception, in their economic and political behaviour and in their culture and that it makes them mentally sick, then, it would surely need more concerted effort than RAT to get rid of racism. Further still, if, as RAT suggests, racism is inherent in the white psyche, then no amount of RAT is going to change that other than to make whites aware of it.

Underlying RAT claims is the assumption that social conflict can be resolved by understanding: an understanding which comes from uniting ideals with behaviour, and by so doing provide the mechanism for social change. No doubt such understanding is desirable, but it is unlikely to bring about change, for understanding aside, there is individual and institutional self-interest: if blacks are satisfied with RAT, that is what the establishment will give them. Appealing to middle-class guilt is wasted effort since it can never lead to action. On the contrary, guilt can be used as an excuse, a reason for doing nothing: the whole basis of middle-class worthiness, critics argue, is that they have guilt feelings to agonise about and that this guilt is used as compensation for involvement in an oppressive system which serves their own interest. Perhaps to some extent such feelings also explain the appeal of RAT.

4. The Ethics of RAT

If it is true, that RAT strategy is to shame and lecture people into action, and that the state and institutions use RAT to manage black demands, then, both raise worrying ethical issues. What is also morally worrying to many is the commercialisation of anti-racism, and the enormous price that various training groups charge for this training.

B.3(iv)
Some Concluding Remarks

According to its critics, and for their reasons already given above, it is doubtful that RAT can even achieve its modest objective to start anti-racist action and instead stands a good chance of diverting that action or even harming it. There seems no clear strategic route from this kind of consciousness-raising sessions to political action. Critics are keen to point out that this is not meant to imply that all anti-racist education and anti-racist consciousness training is ineffectual and harmful. Quite the contrary: both are extremely important, but need to be done in the context of concrete action. Otherwise the undoubted sincerity and energies of some of these trainers is wasted, is misused, becomes harmful and sometimes is even more unethical. It is misused because it appeals to guilt; it is wasted because it is ineffective; it is harmful because it can be appropriated by the state; and, it is unethical because it can also lead to the commercialisation of anti-racism. Given the absence of theoretical evaluation of RAT, it can all happen in this way, and, according to its critics, it has been happening in this way with relative ease.

Critics are keen that their criticism of RAT is not misunderstood. Firstly, they point out that they are in no way arguing against RAT from the same point of view as racists do. They criticise RAT for not doing enough, for doing it badly, and for missed opportunities. After the 1981 rebellions, given how worried the state and its local counterparts were feeling, anti-racists who were in the position to
do so, should have prized out a lot more from the establishment than a few RAT sessions. They should have also channelled their energies, not in giving the establishment the chance to 'manage' them (i.e. tokenism), but in advancing the evident black unity. Secondly, critics say that it is not their intention to characterise all local state initiatives against racism as RAT sessions, or imply that all anti-racists in these institutions are pursuing the cynical ends of the establishment. There are clear examples where real mainstream anti-racist policies are backed up by political will and resources, to help end black oppression. The point is, these types of policies and action should be pursued rather than RAT.

B.4.
An Alternative Strategy to RAT?

RAT critics suggest a few pointers:

1. The most sustained and the most effective initiatives against racism are already taking place in the black community in the setting up of advice centres, work associations (e.g. Asian and Afro-Caribbean workers' associations), and social clubs. There are also a number of formal and informal black political organisations (e.g. the Asian Youth Movement and the Rastafarian collectives). These black groups need to be taken seriously and where possible, anti-racists should support their initiatives and get involved with their struggles, but refrain from trying to 'lead' them.

2. Anti-racists can organise separately in existing political organisations in order to initiate policy changes and action against racism in those organisations. Where these groups already exist, they should be supported in order to make effective initiatives in the mainstream of the political process (inside and outside) of the Labour Party, in women's groups, student politics and so on. The objective of such initiatives is to publicise and counter state racism. For until such oppressive legislation as the Immigration Laws, the Nationality Act, the Police Bill are removed, it is quite unlikely that there can be very effective opposition to institutionalised racism. But at the same time as these broader political measures are being pursued, groups can seek to involve the mainstream of politics to also take on the daily abuses of blacks by the police force and the law courts (and therefore, the prison system). These groups can both support black initiatives to set up police monitoring groups, and help expose the class and racist bias of judges and other professionals.

3. Anti-racist groups can be formed at work in order to directly confront institutionalised racism. Such groups can monitor recruitment, promotions and working conditions, and initiate policy objectives to change racist practices. In schools and colleges teachers can examine the content of their curriculum and interfere with those colleagues who teach racist material. Union members can both initiate policies and ensure that they are followed within the unions, while at the same time mobilising the unions to confront the employer's racism. All these activities will create a lot of conflict and make anti-racists very unpopular, but they are preferable to RAT: not only would they raise some people's consciousness, but they would also ensure that racists are isolated and are made ineffective.

4. Groups and individuals can take on the mainstream media and set
out 'to win the arguments', while ensuring that the usual diet of racist humour and assumptions is consistently and relentlessly criticised. That can be done by writing letters to editors and producers of newspapers and television programmes, by writing to the National Union of Journalists and to its Race Relations Working Group, by writing to the Press Council, etc. But it is also necessary to create alternatives to the racist stereotypes by writing different material for the media, and by setting up and strengthening existing alternative radical publications that represent the black community.

How these things are done depends on the circumstances. On occasions black and white solidarity is useful, on other occasions separate black action is called for. The racist establishment (and some of its officers) will not like it, but if enough pressure is put on, some changes will occur in spite of their opposition. The intention is not to alienate and isolate people, but to seek support, not from those who are going to divert anti-racist initiatives, but from those who are likely to maintain sustained action. Realistically, it has to be assumed that many will remain racist in a racist society. But blacks cannot wait until whites change their mind, before they can command legitimate rights. To its critics, no RAT is necessary because the issue of racism is not obscure. What is needed is the political will to act and to take initiatives in every day affairs. In the same way as racism is not obscure, effective action against racism is not new either. Most of these initiatives are already taking place, and RAT is a diversion from these initiatives.

C.
IN COMMON WITH DISABILITY

On the surface, at least, disabled people experience much of the oppression caused by discrimination that black people experience. An obvious example is the poor deal that both groups suffer when it comes to employment, housing, and a negative media image. At a less obvious level, blacks experience a kind of segregation in education not unlike that which disabled people experience, not because there are 'special' educational institutions for blacks as such (though there have been 'special' educational programmes for blacks), but because mainstream education (based on a white construct) often expects less from blacks and so blacks are likely to perform accordingly. In the USA, of course, segregation on the basis of colour took place (as it still does in South Africa) up until the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Even less obvious is that blacks, like the disabled, have been victims of the so-called 'medical model' treatment by professional 'experts'. It is not only the disabled who have had to suffer the humiliation of being made 'objects' for medical, scientific and sociological research. Even before Darwin's theory of natural selection and the survival of the fittest, blacks were the subject of research that attempted to prove black inferiority as biological and, therefore, inherent: such 'proof' did much to justify slavery and colonialism, and with that, the belief that white superiority was 'natural'. It can at least be argued that the 'medical model', no matter how oppressively experienced by disabled people, has resulted in some progress, and, at any rate, was hardly hostile in intent: for blacks there can be no such argument for all that the 'experts' have done is enhance the myth of black inferiority without
any compensation of at least some benefit to blacks.

Whilst oppressed people, on the whole, respond to their oppression with remarkable resilience, exploitation does, nonetheless, leave its ugly mark, and no mark can be uglier than when it takes the form of low self-image and esteem, and with that the inevitable result of passive behaviour. Though black commentators have said much about the experience of blacks internalising their oppression to the extent of believing and feeling themselves to be inferior, there is, nonetheless, much evidence to show that many blacks have regained their strong sense of pride, dignity and self-respect, and, as a result, will no longer tolerate the conditions under which they are expected to live in a racist society which constantly feels the need to remind blacks that they are 'guests', 'settlers', etc. and that they should, therefore, be grateful for British hospitality (disabled people can compare this 'be grateful' attitude with their own experience of able-bodied 'hospitality'). The 'black is beautiful' mentality which blacks have regained has much from which disabled people can draw upon in their own struggle for equality not least because it shows that negative self-image and passive behaviour (see the paper on Assertiveness Training) can be mobilised and transformed into positive attitudes and action rather than run the danger of festering and remaining internalised.

As mentioned in the opening section of this paper, there is much that disabled people share in common with black people when it comes to the experience of oppression and exploitation, and therefore, it stands to reason that a Movement that is more advanced in its struggle for justice and equality (because it has a longer history) has much to teach a younger Movement which is fighting the same struggle. This 'commonality', however, cannot be over-stretched for the experience of oppression, while similar, is not identical, and therefore, solutions to that oppression will likewise not be the same. For example, blacks do not face the oppression of physically inaccessible buildings and transport (though historically they did (e.g. in the USA), and still do (e.g. in South Africa) but not for the same reasons), even though many blacks will claim that they face the oppression of emotionally inaccessible places, such as in employment and socially. Also, blacks are not heavily reliant on the technology of 'aids' to enable them to work effectively, as some disabled people, but again, blacks will claim that they find it hard to work effectively in a predominantly white work place because the 'rules of the game' are white (e.g. very few blacks achieve promotion at work) and because of indirect institutional racism. Equally, some black commentators, in comparing racism with the inequalities that disabled people experience, state that there is one fundamental difference: namely, that public sympathy is on the side of disabled people whereas blacks face public hostility. Whilst there may be truth in this view, disabled people can equally argue that such public sympathy is tokenism and does more harm than good, and that, in any case, they do face hostility. All this only goes to emphasise the point that while different oppressed groups can learn from each others' experience of struggle, it serves no purpose to dismiss differences or to make comparisons that run the danger of playing off one oppressed group against another and thereby diluting the validity of each in its own right.
LESSONS FOR ANTI-DISABILITY TRAINING?

This paper does not assume that Anti-Disability Training (ADT) has anything to learn from Anti-Racism Training (ART) but it does suggest that there are lessons which ADT would be wise to consider.

The remainder of this paper will be taken up with raising issues and questions which need to be considered if ADT is to be effective. Where appropriate the experience of ART will be brought in.

C.2. APPROACH: WHY ADT?

1. As we have seen one of the major criticisms of RAT is that, whilst claiming a theoretical framework (i.e. Marxism sociology and Rogerian psychology), it fails to relate theory to practical training: theory is a slogan, and RAT does not appear to reflect on the consequences of its assumptions and actions.

Our first consideration, therefore, is whether ADT should be purely practical or whether it should include some underlying theory or philosophy which reflects its thinking and purpose. In other words, should ADT:

* have a critical context from which it can reflect on the consequences of its assumptions and actions?

* be reactive (i.e. respond to issues as and when they appear) or proactive (i.e. set the agenda; have clearly defined short and long term policies, etc.), or both? And if both, equally so or with more energies focused on one rather than the other?

* be entirely practical and pragmatic or include a political, sociological, psychological, understanding of its aims and the methods by which it hopes to achieve its objectives?

An example of the above is our understanding of the medical and social models of disability. Does our view that disability is caused by an able-bodied society mean that we regard disability as an able-bodied problem and that, therefore, 'they' should 'own' disability (compare RAT's premise that white people should own racism because racism is a white problem)? If so, why are we shouldering the responsibility for 'their' problem, and does this not imply that in reality disability is 'our' problem? Defining problems is not the same as defining solutions and responsibilities, and given that discrimination and oppression normally consists of two parties some attempt must be made to define the relationship between able-bodied and disabled people (e.g. do disabled people want to go as far as RAT and suggest that the best that able-bodied people can be is anti-disablist disablists?). This is of particular importance if, for example, we do not want our demands for integration and control of our own lives to be diverted into demands for separatism. And where separatism may not be a diversion for some disabled people, but rather a desirable goal, how does ADT address this view?

In other words, given the scarcity of the resources available to us, we need to be clear in our approach why we regard training as an effective tool in our demand for equal opportunities and our fight
against discrimination. If resources were not a consideration there
would be no doubt that training would be one tool amongst many that
could usefully be deployed to achieve our objectives, but since
resources are a consideration, are we satisfied that our focus on
training will be more effective than, say, concentrating all our
energies on mobilising and sustaining action by disabled people for
political changes? Of course, there is no reason why training
should exclude political demands and action (other than perhaps for
reasons of practical achievements and realistic expectations). (For
another issue that we may wish to consider under 'Approach' in
relation to politics see Section (E) 'Postscript').

2. In considering our approach to ADT and why we need it, the
second issue we have to address ourselves to is: should ADT focus on
changing attitudes or changing behaviour, on providing
information or mobilising action, on concentrating its energies on
individual or institutional discrimination (bearing in mind the
distinction between direct/overt and indirect/covert
discrimination)? Given the resources and the choice the ideal is to
work on all areas since attitudes and behaviour are inter-related,
but we must be clear about our main priority in order to be
effective.

3. Our approach must take note of the tone which ADT adopts,
bearing in mind the criticism of RAT's tone. Assuming that
guilt-tripping and personalising methods are neither desirable nor
ethical, what tone do we want ADT to have? In addition, given that
a professional and competent approach is desirable because it
demands respect and is, therefore, more likely to be effective
(particularly when the trainees themselves are professionals), what
will be the dividing line between professionalism, on the one hand,
and adopting the tone of experts, on the other (this is of
particular importance when ADT is geared towards disabled trainees
who are already oppressed by experts)? The tone which ADT adopts
will also be influential in determining whether or not it runs the
risk of becoming commercialised and, therefore, potentially
exploitative.

Bearing in mind that RAT achieved recognition through popularity,
our approach to ADT would benefit by considering in advance whether
or not we wish ADT to be popular and, therefore, in demand:
presumably if it is effective in achieving its objectives, then it
would be foolish not to encourage its popularity. Such popularity
would make it all the more necessary to watch the tone, not only of
ADT itself, but also the way in which it is publicised and portrayed
both by ourselves and by the receivers of ADT (both actual and
potential receivers).

4. The thinking behind our approach to ADT would benefit from
some form of a systematic method of evaluation: this method of
evaluation could be adapted to include our experience of how ADT is
measuring up in terms of its effectiveness in achieving its
objectives.

5. Since ultimately the success of ADT must be measured by whether
it has achieved concrete improvements in the equal opportunities of
disabled people and, therefore, an increasing reduction in the
oppression and discrimination that they experience, an approach to
ADT must include suggestions as to how equal opportunities and
anti-discriminatory practices (Appendix I) can be achieved. It is
of vital importance, therefore, that ADT conveys a clear understanding of (including the arguments for and against), and an opinion on, current practices that are employed to facilitate equal opportunities. For example, what stance will ADT adopt towards the practice of affirmative action (or positive discrimination), quota systems, and contract compliance (Appendix II & III)? Effective monitoring and evaluation of progress in equal opportunities cannot be achieved unless an approach to ADT includes advocating certain policies which aim at reducing anti-discriminatory behaviour. Since affirmative action, quota systems and contract compliance are three methods which are practised with varying degrees of success by various local authorities and other employers, ADT needs to be both informed about these practices and have a working knowledge about their implementation and effectiveness: above all ADT will need to decide whether or not to advocate such policies.

C.3.
OBJECTIVES: WHAT does ADT hope to achieve?

Although the objectives of ADT may appear to be obvious they need to be clearly defined and set out. If our energies and resources are not to be wasted or misdirected the ultimate objective of any ADT has to be the elimination of anti-discriminatory behaviour: the success of ADT will, therefore, be measured by the degree to which improvements in the lives of disabled people are achieved.

To that end choices and decisions have to be made. Given that resources are limited, priorities have to be established if ADT is to be effective. What, therefore, will our priorities be in aiming at realistic objectives? For example:

* to focus on disabled people;
  to focus on able-bodied people;
  to focus on both equally;
  to focus on both but give priority to one;

* to focus on changing attitudes through information;
  to focus on changing behaviour through action;
  to focus on both equally;
  to focus on both but give priority to one;

* to focus on decision makers: i.e. senior level management;
  to focus on those who administer the provision of services:
    i.e. junior level personnel;
  to focus on both equally;
  to focus on both but give priority to one;

* to focus on e.g. employment, housing, education, welfare benefits, social services, transport, access, the media, the law;

* to include management or personnel skill courses on interviewing, selection and appraisal that include equal opportunity and anti-disability issues.

It would also be useful to justify our priorities. For example, we may wish to focus on behaviour and practices on the basis that changing attitudes, while desirable, does not necessarily result in behavioural changes. Similarly, we may opt to concentrate on
decision makers and power bases on the premise that that is where change takes place and where, alternatively, change can be blocked. Again, to make employment a priority may give disabled people not only confidence and a voice in the mainstream of productivity (and thereby challenge the attitude that disabled people are a burden on society and a drain on economic resources), but also the financial means to force integration and control of their lives onto the agenda of mainstream life, and thereby compel changes in, for example, housing, transport, access, etc. (consider the fact that women, though they are an oppressed group, have a more powerful voice because they have spending power, unlike blacks or disabled people). Care has to be taken not to automatically opt for 'obvious' disability issues since improvements in these may not necessarily result in wider social changes. A realistic strategy for focusing on power base priorities is vital if ADT objectives are to be achieved in a way that does not waste or misdirect what precious resources are available to us: such a strategy would help avoid the danger of diversions which invariably encourage tokenism.

C.4. METHOD: HOW will ADT work?

A method for making ADT effective will be determined by our approach and objectives which, in turn, will dictate the contents of ADT. Whatever method we eventually decide upon will have to have taken into consideration ways in which we hope to see the objectives of ADT implemented, and this will invariably involve a system for monitoring and evaluating results. Thus a policy geared towards achieving equal opportunities will need to consider and form decisions on:

* quota systems;
* affirmative action;
* contract compliance;
* advice and information on the law as it relates to equal opportunities in general, and to disabled people in particular;
* advice and information on e.g. access, aids and adaptations, grants, welfare benefits, etc.;

In addition to such considerations, our policy needs to include what line we take in the event of individuals and institutions (who have received ADT) failing to implement their equal opportunities towards disabled people. Our powers are obviously limited but this does not mean that we are powerless (indeed, we have as much power as we are willing and prepared to use): we may wish to reserve the right to withdraw our support and recognition, to refrain from association, to make full use of local MPs, to draw upon the press and media and make full use of whatever publicity is available to us, etc. If we are to be taken seriously then we likewise need to be serious about our response to tokenism: effectively asserting ourselves (see Assertiveness Training paper) and becoming increasingly 'visible' is fundamental if our demands for justice are to be heard and acted upon.
C.5.
DANGERS TO AVOID

It is clear that here we can learn most from the mistakes and experience of ART in general and RAT in particular:

1. Tokenism: we must be on our guard against so-called sympathy and understanding for, whether they are genuine or not, they can easily be used to manage us and cope with our demands (particularly if ADT has served only to give professionals the language with which to disarm us). It is all too easy to be disarmed by people who understand us, sympathise with us, agree with us, and who have even changed their attitudes towards disability, but all this amounts to little more than tokenism if not followed up with results in behavioural changes.

2. Tone: we must be careful not to encourage feelings of guilt as this can be a cover for, at worst, not doing anything, and at best, result yet again in tokenism. Here the tone of our relationship with able-bodied people is of particular importance, for guilt can easily immobilise the able-bodied into a state of inadequacy if they are left with the impression that they are a 'necessary evil' and that the best they can be is anti-disablist disablists.

3. Divisions: care needs to be taken that our demands for equality for all disabled people are not diverted to focusing our attention and energies on different physical impairments (compare this with multi-culturalism): this not only makes us less effective as a Movement, but it takes us back to the medical model where the person with the physical impairment once again becomes the problem, rather than society. Whilst occasionally it may serve a purpose to focus on various physical impairments (e.g. for service delivery), it is all too easy for ADT to become an arena to satisfy able-bodied curiosity about 'what's wrong' and the particular 'problem' that a physically impaired person may have. Such divisions into various 'problems' are often used as tactics for avoiding changing the system and for splitting people apart. In this way unity is destroyed not only by diverting attention on to irrelevant issues (red herrings), but also by giving some small sections what they demand so as to pacify them, and so that it can be claimed that improvements are taking place. Disabled people are particularly vulnerable to this ploy: not only is survival the name of the game, but attitudes such as 'be grateful', and experiences of internalising feelings of inferiority, and traditional passive behaviour, are aspects that are all too familiar and in many ways are ideal fodder for divisions.

4. Diversions: it is all too easy for demands for equality to be diluted by getting carried away by detail. For example, in working towards trying to get the law changed our focus can easily be shifted from the fight against inequalities to legislative detail. Since focusing on detail normally takes considerable time this diversion can be used as a delaying tactic by those who have the power to change the law. It would also serve us well to be wise to the fact that changes in the law, while desirable, do not guarantee improved conditions (e.g. blacks and women still suffer discrimination despite the Race Relations Act and the Sex Discrimination Act, even though they have the Commission for Racial Equality and the Equal Opportunities Commission respectively to represent them). Another diversion is the temptation to get carried
away with trying to change people's attitudes at the cost of concrete changes in behaviour and practices.

5. Commercialism: the dangers of competing with and exploiting other disabled people by becoming 'experts' in ADT are all too obvious. We must also guard against this, however, becoming an excuse for being unprofessional and incompetent when it comes to the quality of ADT we offer. We must avoid, therefore, the danger of portraying ADT as a programme of no thought, clarity, or policy.

6. Response to experience: like any section of the population we can be our worst enemies if our response to the experience of oppression itself oppresses us even further. Our response to being forced into a traditionally passive role by society can itself result in harmful behaviour. Not only is there the danger that those who have moved out of this passive role can (consciously or unconsciously) start 'patronising', 'dominating', 'exploiting', etc., other disabled people (who are still passive), but there can also be the danger of trying to over-compensate for this past passivity through behaviour that is motivated by the urge to impress, show competence (i.e. 'ability' rather than 'disability'), and prove ourselves, not only to ourselves and to other disabled people but also to able-bodied people. Such responses not only oppress other disabled people, but they are physically and emotionally exhausting and are likely to grind such people into the ground: they also provide yet another confirmation of negative attitudes held by some able-bodied people (e.g. "you can't blame them for trying to impress - they're disabled")!, and imply that our demand for equality is superficial because the need to prove ourselves does not reflect a belief that we are equal. All this, however, is no reason or excuse for incompetence or being second-rate.

D. CONCLUSION

Whilst it is strongly recommended that any ADT be based on a policy that reflects thought and clarity (as expressed in its approach, objectives and method), this paper also recognises the difficulties in producing and developing such a policy given that there is little ADT material to draw upon and insufficient practical experience. Accordingly, we may opt for a purely practical solution (probably time saving, too) of simply getting on and 'doing' ADT, and then, from gradual experience, formulate a policy that reflects that experience. This approach, however, does run the risk of portraying ADT as unprofessional and it could end up acquiring a negative reputation before it has even properly started: such a start may only serve to confirm certain attitudes (e.g. the 'stuff' of media images) that a disabling society holds towards people with physical impairments. That said, however, we do not have to engage in that all too familiar urge to impress the professionals and thereby gain their approval, though recognition is desirable and necessary if we are to be effective.

E. POSTSCRIPT

An issue that has played a significant part in race relations in general and in racism in particular, is the question of how much is oppression a class issue. Some black commentators have expressed concern that anti-racism efforts (whether they be in training or
political action) are a diversion away from the real issue which is the class struggle because racial discrimination, in their view, only exists as a result of working class oppression. According to these commentators, if justice and equality is achieved by the working class then racism would automatically disappear because most blacks are working class people: as such they are members of Trade Unions and it is these Unions, therefore, who will represent and achieve their rights. Consequently then, rather than have separate anti-racism activities, all efforts should be directed towards fighting for the political objectives which Trade Unions advocate.

Against this view, other black commentators point out that it is the class struggle itself which perpetuates racial discrimination and disadvantage: the white working class, they argue, have a vested interest in maintaining a black working class that is worse off than itself, for were that not the case, the white working class would face the same level of oppression which their black counterparts face. According to these critics who oppose equating racism with working class oppression, it is amongst the white working class itself that the crudest form of racism can be found. In addition, they argue that, whilst the Trade Unions have a stance against racism, they have done little to improve the conditions of blacks, and where there has been progress it has always been extremely slow due to the low priority that racial oppression is given. Indeed, Trade Unions, it is argued, can never effectively represent blacks because it is too risky for them to do so: given that the overwhelming majority of union membership is white, that racism is part of the white working class make-up, and that whatever standing and status the white working class has it has at the expense of the black working class, Trade Unions have too much to lose in seriously taking up the fight against black oppression because that would risk white working class antagonism. It is for such reasons that some black commentators who oppose all forms of working class oppression, will even go to the extent of advocating a black middle class as the only real way of redressing black working class oppression: this, they argue, would provide black role models with spending power and would go some way in reversing the image of black inferiority.

On the surface such a debate has little relevance to disability issues since a physical impairment can and does affect a person regardless of his or her social standing, and in that sense, it has little to do with class status and, therefore, class oppression. The debate does, however, at a deeper level, raise the question of whether or not there is a relationship between disability and class and between physical impairment and class (the distinction between disability (i.e. the social model) and physical impairment (i.e. the medical model) is here being made). For example, it could be argued that a working class person is more likely to be affected by a physical impairment than a middle or upper class person due to a lower standard of living; and equally a middle or upper class disabled person, who has access to greater financial resources, is not likely to experience the same degree of oppression as a working class disabled person whose resources are limited. If this is not stretching the point, it does raise the question of whether, to some extent, disability (in its widest sense) is a class issue, and if it is, what role the Trade Unions plays, if any. The arguments for and against equating racism with class oppression may be applicable in raising this question. (At any rate, to form an opinion on this issue may be useful for Sections (C.2.) 'Approach' and (C.5.) 'Dangers to Avoid' under 'Divisions' and 'Diversions').
APPENDIX I: EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (IN EMPLOYMENT)

1. INTRODUCTION

Fifteen years or so ago, the concept of Equal Opportunity (EO) hardly existed in the minds of managers, trade unionists and the general public. It is now an increasingly used phrase and consequently runs the risk of becoming a hollow catch-phrase used by woolly-minded liberals and rejected by hard-pressed managers. But the facts now indicate that EO in employment is something that should be managed rather than ignored. As Baroness Seear has argued, "It is better to manage change than to be managed by it".

One of the problems of dealing with EO is that the phrase is often used without a clear indication of its precise meaning. It is possible to use the phrase in quite different ways with different practical implications. One thing is clear: almost everyone thinks EO is a good thing. It is frequently regarded as a high ideal which must be upheld like honesty, justice and personal integrity. Unfortunately, the precise definitions differ and it is quite common for people to uphold the same principle but differ entirely in terms of what is considered necessary action to achieve the goal.

There are three broad definitions of EO:

* Equal Treatment Passive
* Equal Access
* Equal Share Active

(a) EO as non-discriminatory (equal treatment)

This is probably the most common approach. It is essentially passive and assumes that so long as no one deliberately discriminates unfairly against another person there is EO in society. The guiding principle is that everyone should be treated alike, and if they are, then there is no discrimination and consequently there is equality of opportunity. Ideally, steps should be taken to ensure that there is no deliberate unfair discrimination against specific individuals or groups. The key question that remains is: how much change will result in the pattern of discrimination and inequality that exist in society merely by prohibiting and (ideally) eliminating unfavourable treatment?

(b) EO as equal access

This definition is more sophisticated in that it starts by assuming that is important to eliminate unfavourable treatment (as above). It goes further by arguing that the removal of unfavourable treatment at the point where people are considered for the benefits of society (jobs, training, etc.) is not sufficient where there are obstacles which prevent some groups reaching the point where they can be considered for the benefits. In other words, there may be no discrimination when benefits are conferred, but there may not be equal access to consideration for those benefits.

For example, many married women cannot undergo management training if it entails a three month residential course. Consequently, those women who are capable of becoming good managers are prevented from undergoing the necessary training because of their domestic and
family responsibilities who do not restrict men in the same way. By this model there is no equality of opportunity if women are prevented from being considered for, say, a management job because of an obstacle (e.g. the residential course) which is not actually necessary. The obstacle could be removed (by having a non-residential course or a different approach to management development) thus increasing the access of women to consideration for jobs which in the past have been rarely done by women. (Such examples can be applied to disabled people.)

(c) EO at equal share

This is the most sophisticated approach as it assumes the previous two definitions (i.e. absence of unfavourable treatment, and the removal of unjustifiable obstacles). It also entails more direct action and intervention to ensure true equality of opportunity. EO exists, by this definition, when the benefits of society are held in equal proportion by the groups which make up that society. Expressed the other way round, there is EO when there is no inequality in society which is related to, say, sex, race or disability. There would be EO when equal proportions of able-bodied and disabled men and women, black and white, occupy the top jobs in the civil service, or in jobs or occupations which have traditionally been dominated by white able-bodied men.

The equal share approach is essentially a goal to be achieved and has far-reaching implications for the kind of society we wish to have and the kinds of changes that are necessary to bring it about. The implications run deep into child-rearing practices, sex-roles, educating the structure of work, attitudes and ideologies. In the US it is largely this approach that has been adopted by the Government, the courts, and the pressure groups. Some employers have willingly followed this general pattern, whilst others have compiled grudgingly only as a result of severe law enforcements.

2. ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST AN ACTIVE STANCE

(a) For:

(i) Social responsibilities

Some employers have recognised that they have a social responsibility to reflect (and sometimes assist) changes that are already occurring in society. Some organisations feel they have a corporate responsibility towards the community in which they do business. Efforts to ensure equality of opportunity are just one part of that responsibility.

(ii) Purchasing power of minority groups

For selfish reasons an employer has a vested interest in increasing the spending power of groups hitherto not economically active and confined to low paid, low status jobs. This applies particularly to women, but also to disadvantaged sectors of the ethnic minority population (and the disabled?). Conversely, employers may have an interest in avoiding boycotting by groups with significant purchasing power, if they develop a reputation for discrimination.
(iii) Company image

It may be deemed bad for the company image if a reputation for discrimination develops. This could have consequences for trading abroad with countries which have traditionally been the sources of immigration. For example, a few years ago Saudi Arabia threatened to break off a contract with the Soviet Union because of the way the latter treated its Muslim subjects.

(iv) Sense of injustice

Persistent discrimination and denial of EO can cause a sense of injustice among the groups affected. This can cause break-downs in communication and poor working relationships. It can promote a wider sense of grievance and frustration. This can lead to civil disturbance such as we have seen in Northern Ireland, Brixton, Bristol, Liverpool and Manchester.

(v) Use of human resources

If someone is discriminated against they have been denied a job, training, promotion, etc. on grounds which have nothing to do with their suitability for the job. Unavoidably, this must make personnel practices (e.g. selection, performance, appraisal) less efficient than they could be. Avoidance of discrimination results in a wider choice of personnel, backgrounds, experiences. Discrimination on the grounds of, say, race, sex or disability, is inconsistent with a personnel policy to select and develop employees to their full potential, in their own interests and that of the employer.

(vi) Expanding labour market

More and more women (and especially married women) are coming on to the labour market (hopefully in time this trend will apply to blacks and disabled people). It would be unrealistic to ignore this fact, and the fact that many women wish to combine a career with a family, just as their husbands do. This greatly expands the pool of talent and skills from which an employer can select and develop staff.

(vii) Compliance with the law

Anti-discrimination laws in the UK make it unlawful to discriminate on sex and race grounds (to a lesser effect this applies to registered disabled people though the legal 3% quota is not enforced by the overwhelming majority of employers). The European Court of Justice in the EEC also plays a role. Defending cases can be costly and can be bad for the employer's image. It may be more efficient to reduce the risk of cases being brought.

(viii) Trouble-shooting

A positive policy of EO coupled with a programme of action can be a good way of circumventing problems or preventing their occurrence. A feeling that management is biased against blacks, women and the disabled, may cause grievances which exacerbate other problems. Concentrations of ethnic groups in certain departments or on certain shifts can lead to other problems. A fairly normal conflict between two people could flare up into a racially based strike if the atmosphere is not conducive to it being seen naturally (this may
also apply if there is a concentration of disabled people rather than them being a part of the mainstream).

(b) Against:

(i) No problems here

Many employers are not prepared to have EO statements or policies because top management is confident that there is no discrimination anyway. A study conducted by the Institute of Personnel Management found this general view, but concluded that there were many problems being swept under the carpet. There is, in fact, considerable evidence of extensive discrimination against minority groups and much evidence of their inequality in society.

(ii) Fear of hostility

This is often quoted as a reason for not doing anything as the reaction to the case is alleged to be worse than the ailment itself. It is worth noting that in the US, with its much greater law enforcement and very stringent remedies, there has never been any industrial action arising from the actions of an employer in pursuit of an EO policy.

(iii) Policies do not change attitudes and cannot work

Whether or not this is true in a given company, this is not really an argument against an active concern with EO. It is essentially a question of strategy. Each employer needs to decide the kind of policy and approach that will be most practicable and effective for its circumstances.

(iv) It is discriminatory in itself

Many employers argue that to pay special attention to the needs of minority groups is itself discriminatory. In particular, they argue that to keep records of minority groups is unethical and an invasion on privacy (e.g. they apply this argument to keeping records of ethnic origins but not with regard to records of employees' sex). The CRE has made it clear that it is not unlawful to keep ethnic records: on the contrary, the CRE actively encourages the collection of such records as a necessary means of ensuring that a policy on EO is being effective. This raises the question of what should be included on the records of disabled employees.

3. ORGANISATIONAL RESPONSE TO EO

There are basically four kinds of response:

* The Token Gesture
* The Procedural Response
* The Training Response
* The Organisation Development Response

(a) The Token Gesture

The traditional approach to EO typically involves issuing a statement of company policy. This is sometimes followed by instructions to key staff to ensure that there is no discrimination in their departments. In one of its surveys the EOC found that
among top employers in Britain 25% had actually formulated policies on EO, but among these virtually none, with some notable exceptions, had taken any action. The token gesture is invariably made in the belief that it is good for public relations in the secure knowledge that discrimination is not widely practised. Consequently, no further action is regarded as necessary. Would it make sense to have a health and safety at work policy along similar lines?

The advantages of the token gesture is that it is quick and cheap. It means that the employer has decided to do nothing until such time as it is forced to. This force could arise from a formal investigation by one of the Commissions, or from other legal proceedings, a strike or other industrial relations issue. Then the employer may be forced to act and allocate resources at a time and in a way which is neither convenient nor planned.

(b) The Procedural Response

This is nearly always associated with a clear statement of policy which is sometimes communicated to all employees, and is occasionally made public. Its distinctive characteristic is the tightening up of procedures. There may be more formal control of the recruitment and selection process, with the introduction of employee specifications, job descriptions, and (rarely) formal job analysis. Attempts may be made to ensure that selection and promotion criteria are valid and prescribed procedures are adhered to in practice. Detailed instructions are issued to key personnel who are asked to ensure that there is no discrimination, and that offending employees are dealt with.

Typically, the tightening up of procedures tends to focus on recruitment, selection, training, promotion and dismissal. In other words, it tends to focus on movements in, out, up and across the organisation. Usually, there is no manager who has been given responsibility for EO, and there is no monitoring of the effectiveness of procedures in eliminating discrimination and promoting equality of opportunity. It is generally assumed, though not necessarily consciously, that if the procedures are right then there will be no unfair discrimination.

(c) The Training Response

This approach is sometimes combined with the procedural approach, but is frequently used in isolation. Typically, training in the context of an EO policy will focus on selected topics such as the meaning of the anti-discrimination laws or the culture and background of ethnic minority workers. Sometimes the training will go under the general heading of Managing or Supervising a Multi-Racial Workforce, and is rarely designed in the light of a formal training needs analysis. Other forms of training include 'awareness' seminars for senior managers which are designed to facilitate a process of change, or may be aimed at increasing the skills of employees who have special responsibilities such as induction or recruitment.

(d) The Organisational Development Response

The traditional approach, which is largely a combination in varying degrees of the three approaches outlined above, assumes that by changing procedures and/or introducing special training, an
organisation (and the individuals within it) will change the way in which things are done. The traditional approach works through the formal channels of communication and tends to ignore the powerful role played by informal channels of communication. It assumes that supplying information and changing procedures is sufficient to bring about changes in the organisation. It fails to realise that (i) there should be a 'felt need' for change before change can happen; (ii) that individual and corporate values unless acquired, may undermine what is being done; (iii) that real power and influence does not always reside with the individuals who are supposed to have it; (iv) that policies can be made to work or not work by key individuals; and (v) that formal policies can easily be rendered ineffective without any open opposition.

The Organisation Development approach does not begin with a detailed statement and an elaborate policy. Instead it regards these as an end product of a process whereby a felt need to change is created through data gathering, analysis, and interpretation. In this way the policy directly reflects the need for change that has been diagnosed and it also matches the characteristics and circumstances of the organisation. Decisions can then be made about record-keeping, accountability, intensiveness of effort, special training, etc., in the light of the special needs and problems that have been revealed from the analysis.

This approach is essentially evolutionary, it is slower and more focussed but is more likely to achieve a successful change in thinking and practice from an organisation whose 'culture', implicit or explicit, is male-orientated, able-bodied and white, to one which recognises the need to move towards doing things that includes the 'culture' of minority groups normally not represented or properly acknowledged. This ultimately boils down to behaviour but an important component is the set of values and attitudes which both determine and help explain why people do things in a particular way.

4. EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES LEGISLATION

The list below (by no means comprehensive) represents the main legislation regarding EO in employment:

(a) Race Relations Act 197
(b) Sex Discrimination Act 1975
(c) Equal Pay Act 1975 and
   Equal Pay (Amendment) Regulations 1983
(d) Disabled Persons (Employment) Acts 1944 and 1958
(e) Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974
(f) Employment Protection Act 1975 and
   Employment Protection (Consolidation) Act 1978

Other legislation dealing specifically with the employment of disabled people are:

(a) Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons (Amendment) Act 1976
   (focused on access to employment buildings)

(b) Employment and Training Act 1973
   (included careers guidance service)

(c) Health and Safety at Work Act 1974
   (employers required to take relevant disability into account)
(d) Companies Act 1980
(companies with over 250 employees must make a statement in their annual report of their employment policy towards disabled people)

(e) Employment Act 1988
(established Employment Training: section 25 may include arrangements to encourage increases in the opportunities for employment and training of disabled people)

The 1944 Disabled Persons (Employment) Act established a register of disabled people who were eligible for employment. Section I deals with disabled people in 'open' employment, while Section II deals sheltered workshops.

The Employment Register is kept by the Manpower Services Commission, and registration is entirely voluntary. There are no benefits or services which require the individual to be registered, other than grants or employment aids. Many people choose not to register, believing that it is likely to lower, rather than raise, their chances of finding work. This is especially true of young people. In 1981 there were approximately 460,000 people registered as disabled throughout the UK, but it is estimated that only 40%-50% of those eligible to register do so.

The Act established a quota system which imposed an obligation on all employers of not less than 20 employees to employ a 3% quota of registered disabled people. In order to implement the quota the employer must:

* allocate for that purpose vacancies which may occur;
* not give or offer employment to persons other than registered disabled people if, by so doing, the number of registered disabled would fall below the quota;
* not to discontinue the employment of a registered disabled person if, by so doing, the employer would be employing less than the quota.
APPENDIX II: AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

1. THE UNITED STATES EXPERIENCE

(a) The Context

The debate about Affirmative Action (AA), and 'positive', 'benign', and 'reverse' discrimination in the US has been long, confused and bitter. It has generated a lot of heat and good deal of literature. Private actions undertaken (e.g. De Funis, Bakke, Weber cases) demonstrate the constitutional, political and moral controversy which can arise from these degrees of preference. All these terms are used to describe the programmes framed by Government agencies and individual employers which try to do 'something more' for minorities, remove entrenched patterns of discrimination and ensure that equality of opportunity goes beyond the simple prohibition of overtly biased acts. The notions of indirect discrimination (the disadvantages suffered by minorities more as a result of institutional practices and patterns than of deliberate acts by prejudiced individuals) and of AA are closely linked in the US. It became increasingly clear during the '60s and early '70s that the disadvantages faced by black Americans, particularly in employment, would not be removed by ending individual acts of discrimination. The landmark case (Griggs v Duke Power Co.) in 1971 laid the foundation for the subsequent attack on indirect discrimination because it dealt with the effects of employment practices rather than their intent or purpose. Job qualifications and tests used were held to be racially discriminatory and, therefore, contrary to the Civil Rights Act (1964) if they produced adverse racial effects unless the employer could validate them as accurate indicators of actual job performance.

The widespread confusion about the meaning, the morality and the legality of AA can be traced to its development as an equal opportunity policy. The Civil Rights Act was concerned with individual rights, individually violated: AA is to do with group rights, with the perception that black Americans as a group were disadvantaged in relation to whites, and that only some attempt to equalise results could remove unequal opportunities. AA came to be seen as an attempt to overthrow the American ideal of individual progress based on merit, and replace it by 'proportional equality of results'; and it led to confusion and distress amongst those of the liberal establishment who opposed discrimination on the very grounds of the rights of the individual.

(b) The Development of AA

Several studies have traced the ways in which AA programmes emerged in the late '60s. The phrase was first recorded in an Executive Order (March 6 1961) issued by President Kennedy which called for 'affirmative steps' and 'positive measures' to achieve equal opportunity in Federal employment, and required Federal contractor or subcontractors to undertake 'affirmative action' to promote equal opportunity in their workforces. In 1965 the Department of Labour foreshadowed the future debate by calling for a '....new and special effort....' to produce roughly equal group results and to avoid social conflict. The formal position was amended and extended by subsequent Executive Orders (1965, 1969, 1978) until eventually AA came to mean the promotion of equal opportunity in employment which
may be undertaken by any employer but must be by Federal contractors of subcontractors; and it was designed to overcome 'underutilisation', which was defined by the Department of Labour as '....having fewer minorities or women in a particular job group than would reasonably be expected by their availability....' As one US official put it, AA is '....anything that you have to do to get results....AA is really designed to get employers to apply the same kind of imagination and ingenuity that they apply to any other phase of their operations'.

(c) The Arguments For and Against AA

The moral dilemma which AA has presented to the American liberal establishment is acute: how can consideration of group membership be appropriate in pursuing the rights of the individual? To a great extent the moral position adopted towards AA is closely related to, if not determined by, the view taken by the situation of black Americans in the '70s, and the debate has been articulated mostly by Glazer (1975) and Dworkin (1977), the former opposing AA and the latter defending it.

Against AA Glazer presented an optimistic view, arguing that discrimination against black Americans in the '60s and '70s had largely collapsed: black incomes had rapidly gained on white, and greater security and higher status was available to black citizens not just in employment but also in housing and education. Where disadvantage still existed, he argued, was not necessarily due to institutional racism but to other factors such as lower qualifications: assuming racism was problematic because it could not always be validated and individual failure had to be taken into account. Secondly, he draws attention to the observation that AA programmes tend to benefit the skilled and better qualified rather than the very poor. Glazer's third point is the most crucial: he insists that, by establishing categories of people to be singled out for preferential treatment, governments formally divide populations into groups with different rights. This he sees as tantamount to George Orwell's *Animal Farm* situation in which 'all animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others'. Further, the divisions, as well as being morally suspect, create new resentments and cultivate new angers, thus prompting the possibility of a white backlash.

In support of AA Dworkin contests that programmes aimed at the achievement of important social goals, such as equality of employment opportunities, should not be defeated by the interests of individuals. He concedes that rejected majority group members (e.g. the Bakke case) who may possess greater qualifications than accepted minority groups are rendered disadvantaged, but this is 'a cost that must be paid for a greater gain', that is, the gain of the community. Dworkin argues his case by making a distinction between equal treatment (i.e. equality as a policy where, for example, a policy is intended to equalise opportunity) and treatment as an equal (i.e. equality as a basic right which may in the short term be suspended in the interests of a policy intended to equalise opportunity): such a distinction, he argues, is justified by the overall long term gain to the society rather than to the individual and, to that goal, preferential treatment can help decrease differences in power and wealth and so make for a more equal society.
Other supporters of AA cling to a more pragmatic than moral view. They point out that a negative ban on discrimination has not delivered the goods: minorities and women have been denied opportunity for so long that they now need, not just opportunities, but compensation, even if only temporarily; discriminatory attitudes persist and AA is one way of cancelling out their effects; a distinction between goals (positive) and thinly disguised quotas (negative) can be maintained. This pragmatism holds that doing nothing more than prohibiting overt discrimination is to accept in perpetuity the disadvantaged position of minorities and women in all its manifestations.

On the whole, however, the debate is moral rather than practical in tone and there appears to be no real hard evidence to support the arguments one way or the other. There is clearly a case for viewing the social benefits as outweighing individual costs and for emphasising that AA is but a device for balancing out inequalities in other areas. Yet there is still the grave danger that, in creating categories for positive treatment, governments may be perpetuating them and, therefore, establishing conditions for a new brand of discrimination and disadvantage. And there is an even stronger case against AA: that it is merely a cosmetic device to cover up the gross inequalities so essential to the continuance of capitalism and that the condition of minorities and women can be improved only marginally (if at all) by such AA programmes, for their condition as a fraction of the working class is too advantageous to powerful group interests. It follows that discrimination is some form is functional for the total system and that divisions amongst the working class, whether existing before AA or exacerbated by it, are necessary elements of a system of control rather than emancipation.

(d) Public Opinion

Three important distinctions have emerged in the American debate over AA. The first is the moral one: between what is good for the individual and what is good for society; between equal treatment and treatment as an equal. This has been a pill too large for public opinion to swallow. But there is evidence that two others - between goals and quotas, and between 'compensation' and 'preference' - have gone down rather better. An investigation of American attitudes to race as measured by opinion polls since 1935 showed that Americans were not in favour of discrimination or disadvantage, but were overwhelmingly opposed to 'preferential treatment'. The confrontation between group and individual justice has posed a dilemma for American opinion. It appears to have been resolved by seeing a distinction between compensatory programmes with goals - making allowances and providing extra help for overcoming past deprivations - and preferential treatment with quotas. Relatively few object to compensation in the form of special training programmes, head start efforts, financial aid programmes, community development funds and the like. But most Americans draw the line at predetermining the results of any competition.

2. GREAT BRITAIN: THE CONCEPT OF FAVOURITISM

In Britain, talk of AA and numerical goals, or of special provision for special needs in relation to ethnic minority groups, raises exactly the same cries of positive discrimination as have been heard in the States. The debate in the House of Commons in March 1979 on
the Local Government Grants (Ethnic Group) Bill demonstrates this. Despite the fact that, as one member pointed out, provisions similar to those in the Bill giving special help to ethnic minorities had been accepted by governments and local authorities of all political complexions for 13 years, the 'preferential treatment' proposed by the Bill was denounced as illegitimate favouritism. The obvious charges against preference were all listed again and it was called inherently unjust. Without any consideration of the complex moral issues involved in group disadvantage which had informed the American debate, it was simply assumed that 'colour-blind' policies based on individual merit would be more just. Special treatment was said to denigrate the capacities of blacks, without any explanation of why removing unfair obstacles from the path of minorities should imply some incapacity on their part. As J C Livingstone (Fair Game? Inequality and Affirmative Action, 1979) put it: 'we worry conscientiously about undermining the dignity of minorities....But what of the dignity and sense of self-worth of those who owe their positions in the professions to the preferential advantages whites have enjoyed in the past? Or, more generally, what of those who have inherited success by inheriting wealth....Why does their 'success' not carry the stigma of an arbitrarily conferred benefit?' In a sense, he claims, condescension in the short term is unavoidable: '.....the only way to avoid the risk is to do nothing, to wait for the oppressed to claim their inheritance by force'.

Another charge levelled in the Commons debate against special provision - that it would alienate the white population and produce a white backlash - seems to point in the same direction: ignore racial disadvantage and it will go away. An essay in 1979 by D Kirp on race and education in Britain, Doing Good by Doing Little, tries to suggest that it might. At all events the virtues of British inexplicitness in race relations policy are contrasted with the sledgehammer quality of American AA. Doing good by stealth, and doing the right thing by doing very little indeed, is an attractive programme in such a controversial field as AA. But there are three obvious objections to it: inexplicit policies are fundamentally undemocratic; they are likely to conceal confused objectives leading to weak and ineffectual implementation; and most importantly, if they are the basis of British race relations policy in the past decades, they are demonstrably ineffective in removing the disproportionate incidence of most kinds of disadvantage from amongst ethnic minority groups.

Another less obvious point follows from this: although Kirp argues that inexplicitness is the main characteristic of British 'race relations policy', this is based upon a narrow conception of that policy. At least two parts of race relations policy are explicitly designed on racial lines, namely, immigration control and discussions about British nationality, and ant-discrimination legislation. Both of these are quite explicit about their objectives and means of achieving them. To reduce immigration into Britain, and particularly black immigration, and reduce discrimination based on racial origin, policy was overt, explicit, and extensively debated. Arguments about 'stigma', 'special treatment', and 'favouritism' were used also against the changes being introduced, but this time they were out-argued and out-voted on the pragmatic ground of the need for change. This last argument should also be applied in the debate about AA. The main objection to Kirp's 'inexplicit' policies is the scale, persistence and social consequences of inequalities between racial groups. This is the key
argument for explicit action in wider areas of social policy than immigration control and anti-discrimination, in the same way that it was the politically crucial argument for changes in immigration and anti-discrimination policies.

The need for the kind of AA programmes found in the States can be defended just as strongly and logically for Britain. Patterns of disadvantage and discrimination exist and are being passed on to the second generation of ethnic minority citizens: the present legislation and litigation are cumbersome, expensive, and of unproved effectiveness. Simply ending discrimination will allow these patterns to continue: doing nothing more may be to accept increasing segregation, disadvantage and an unacceptable degree of polarisation.

3. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

(a) Area-based AA

The development of the idea of area-based AA in Britain has been traced in the '60s, in parallel with the US War on Poverty. The Urban and Educational Priority Programmes, the Community Development Projects, the General Improvement Areas, the Housing Action Areas and the 'Six Cities' studies all bear witness to the political acceptability of deciding some areas needed more help than others (currently it is the inner cities). The largest scheme of this kind - the Urban Programme - was specifically inspired by the especially disadvantaged situation of ethnic minorities in generally deprived areas and in 1975 was described by the government as an integral part of its attack on racial disadvantage. In education, the Department of Education and Science believes that the term 'positive discrimination' and much that has followed from it has long been an accepted feature. Where it is used in relation to deprived and disadvantaged pupils it is now an almost neutral term, though it may become less so at a time of reducing resources. There is little argument in educational circles that equality of opportunity means more and different for some if equal access to educational chances is to be a reality for all: the debate is about what that 'something extra and different' should be.

(b) Group-based AA

The idea of providing for special needs, and therefore, in some sense discriminating in favour of some groups (without the implication of it being at the expense of the rest) is not new in Britain. Numerous examples of special provision for special health or educational needs are accepted as commonplace in the Welfare State; and differential rates of benefits are recognised for some groups, for example, war pensioners or the industrially disabled under the Industrial Injuries Act 1948. Admittedly, these two 'special cases' are contested by the disabled generally; and special compensation for the 'victims' of particular kinds of disablement, for example, thalidomide, have also been resisted by the disablement lobby. The key is the extent to which the kind of disadvantage under discussion implies particular remedies. In other words, disadvantage due to disability through thalidomide may not imply a different policy from that appropriate to disability disadvantage caused by poliomyelitis, but disability disadvantage as a whole may call for quite different treatment from disadvantage generally. Those who support group-based AA argue that the special nature and
degree of racial disadvantage will not be removed by policies aimed at the disadvantaged generally. And the principle seems to be accepted by the educational service, although to a limited degree, to the extent in which it is involved in a range of activities particularly aimed at meeting the specific needs of ethnic minority pupils (e.g. the teaching of English as a second language).

(c) The Stigma of Special Provision

The arguments relating to the stigmatising effect of special provision in relation to special needs do not apply just to racial disadvantage. Similar charges are levelled at special provisions in other context: for example, the employment quota system for the disabled. But this example provides interesting evidence on the attitudes which the disadvantaged themselves may have to 'stigma'. The fact that a small proportion of disabled people register as such for employment is used to demonstrate the unacceptable nature of the quota provision, unacceptable to the disabled, and to general public opinion. But it can be argued that the ineffectiveness of the quota is producing this result, rather than simply years of stigma. In this country, where the quota is not enforced, the ineffectiveness of the scheme acts as a deterrent. A 1980 Manspower Services Commission study, for example, has found that some of the disabled unemployed '....had obviously learnt by experience that they were more likely to get a job by covering up their disabilities than by being open about them'. By contrast, the scheme which is operated in West Germany gives rise to no such reluctance to register: a 6% quota obligation is given teeth through a levy system, and registered disabled people qualify for certain additional benefits. In just over three years of its introduction 1.9 million West Germans applied for registration. It is clear that in Germany at least, disabled people are supporting a scheme which actually caters for a specific need.

The whole question of stigma in relation to special provision is of particular importance to minorities and women if these groups are to avoid experiencing an added oppression: if it involves preferential treatment regardless of merit and ability (i.e. in employment) it can do more damage than good for it will confirm the image of inferiority and with it incompetence and poor standards. AA requires a clear understanding and response from oppressed groups if for this reason alone.
APPENDIX III: CONTRACT COMPLIANCE

1. WHAT IS CONTRACT COMPLIANCE?

Contract compliance (CC) is the policy of using the public sector's purchasing power as an instrument of public intervention in the market economy to bring about changes in bad employment practices. There is nothing new about it: forms of CC have been practised by British governments of all political colours since the first Fair Wages Resolution was passed by the Conservative government in 1891. It is still being used by the present government in one part of the UK, Northern Ireland, and there are many examples of its use by local authorities. There are even rare examples of private companies using it.

The Local Government Act 1988, currently under review, seeks, amongst other things, to prohibit non-commercial contract conditions: it is, therefore, in doubt whether the use of CC will continue to be legal.

2. HOW HAS CC BEEN USED?

CC has been used in four main areas, although these areas are not necessarily self-contained. They are listed below in the order in which they have generally been developed:

(i) There is the accepted practice that all contractors are required to meet standards of quality, price, technical efficiency and financial soundness;

(ii) This approach was adapted to promote better employment practices. In the past this included adherence 'fair wages clauses' but now embraces undertakings on health and safety, training, direct employment and trade union rights;

(iii) This approach was further adapted to try to ensure equal employment opportunities for ethnic minorities, women and disabled people. It is seen as a way of giving teeth to legislation such as the 1976 Race Relations Act;

(iv) This has been followed by the introduction of 'political' clauses, such as a firm's connections with South Africa or the nuclear industry.

One new feature in CC is a the desire to monitor progress and to ensure that the contract conditions are being met. Many local authorities are not simply seeking to insert equal opportunities clauses into contracts but to institute procedures that ensure that practices actually change. This is seen as a move away from the 'passive' requirements of existing anti-discrimination legislation towards 'positive action' programmes, recommended in the statutory codes of practice. This involves the setting up of special CC units, extensive questionnaires and regular visits to companies to see if they have achieved their 'targets'. The exclusion of firms from approved lists remains a sanction of last resort.

3. EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES CC

The main thrust for equal opportunities CC has come from across the
Atlantic and has been largely developed by the GLC and later by the ILEA.

(a) The US Experience

CC to promote equal employment opportunities in the US has been developing since the second world war. The early emphasis was on race rather than sex or disability and at the beginning it was a national initiative at Federal level.

In the USA the origin of CC were based on labour shortages in war production and the necessity to overcome the exclusion of black workers from these industries. This, combined with an active civil rights movement, led President Roosevelt to sign an Executive Order in 1941 which prohibited discrimination by 'race, colour, creed and national origin by defence contractors'. These conditions were later extended to all Federal government contracts.

The Executive Orders passed during these years were essentially 'passive' instruments, statements of intent simply requiring employers not to discriminate. There was little, if any, practical advice on what steps they should take to eliminate discrimination. More fundamentally, there were no sanctions against those employers which did not conform with the order. It is widely acknowledged that the Executive Order had only a marginal effect on the employment opportunities open to black people and after the war these marginal gains were soon lost.

However, CC became an accepted part of the Truman and the Eisenhower administrations' policies. A Presidential Committee on Government Contracts was established in the 1950s. This body was empowered to 'receive complaints about violations' and 'engage in activities designed to further encourage the compliance of contractors to the Executive'.

In these years the basis for future programmes was established, with important innovations such as pre-constructual discussions, field checks and the establishment of conciliation arrangements. However, such measures had little impact because there were no powers of enforcement.

By the late '50s the view was increasingly being expressed that there was a need for a 'positive policy'. In 1960 the final report of the Committee argued that the major barrier to the hiring and promotion of ethnic minorities was 'the indifference of employers to the establishing of a positive policy of non-discrimination'.

It was the Kennedy administration in 1961 that introduced for the first time the concept of 'affirmative action'. A President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity (PCEEO) was established to oversee the implementation of the new policy. There were also a number of other innovations:

* The insertion of an equal opportunities clause into all Federal contracts;

* The requirement that contractors should file compliance reports;

* The termination of existing contracts or the exclusion from future contracts as the penalty for non-compliance;
CC offices were set up in each of the government departments.

It was also during this period that the Civil Rights Act (1964) was passed which made discrimination in employment illegal. The force of law was added to the enforcement of CC by Executive Orders. For the first time sex and religious discrimination were added. The Act also incorporated into law the idea of affirmative action and an Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) was set up.

The framework for current CC programmes was established in 1965. The Office of Federal Contract Compliance was set up within the Department of Labour to co-ordinate the CC activities of all government departments. In 1978 this became the present Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programmes (OFCCP) and centralised all CC functions in one office.

There were also new regulations that set out in detail the specific steps that contractors were required to take to establish equal employment opportunities. In 1971 the concept of 'goals and timetables' was introduced. Contractors are expected to set reasonable targets to achieve their equal opportunity goals. From the outset it was stressed that these goals and timetables were not to be inflexible, but the 'good faith' efforts to achieve them were required. It is an important feature of the US system that the companies themselves draw up the affirmative action plans including the goals and timetables. It is only when they are subject to a formal OFCCP review that they are required to submit their plans for examination and assessment.

In recent years CC programmes have been used by state governments to achieve a different set of goals. For example, New York has used it to promote equal employment opportunities regardless of sexual orientation and Washington has placed emphasis on the employment of local labour.

(b) The Impact of CC

Three major studies (1983, 1983, 1984) have been conducted to ascertain the effectiveness of CC in the US. In each of these studies, firms subject to CC were compared with those not on the Federal list. The evidence points to general conclusion that US CC programme has indeed made a significant contribution to improving the employment available to women and minorities. Both groups were found to have greater job opportunities in both quantitative and qualitative terms.

CC has been endorsed by eight successive Presidents (an accepted policy for forty years), having achieved support from all sections of society. In contrast to the UK, the American programme has received backing from the business community. There were reservations in the early years but now many business leaders are advocates of the programme. This was clearly illustrated by the reaction to President Reagan's attempt to abolish affirmative action goals and timetables. Many in the business world voiced their objections. For example, the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), which covers firms employing over 85% of all workers in manufacturing industry, wrote to the President asking him not to revise the Executive Order. They argued that 'the current Executive Order provides the framework for an effective affirmative action policy. Since it was signed into law, dramatic progress has been
achieved in incorporating talented minorities and women into the workforce. Companies affiliated to the NAM have consistently expressed the belief that the Executive Order has served as a mayor impetus in achieving a diverse workforce.

The programme has not, however, been without its critics in the US. The US Chamber of Commerce and Associated General Contractors of America have argued that the cost and complexity of the programme is a burden on industry. They also assert that women and minorities have fared worse under the programme than those in companies not on the Federal list. They also argue that the targets are really quotas which lead to the appointment of unqualified or unsuitable people.

The supporters of the Executive Order, which form the overwhelming majority in the debate, are particularly insistent that critics have confused targets with quotas. In fact the regulations specifically prohibit inflexible quotas. The goals and timetables are set by the companies themselves, and targets are used in all aspects of business planning.

It is also argued out that critics are ignoring the available evidence that the programmes is in fact effective in promoting equal employment opportunities. They also point to the benefits to companies of opening up to new talent and ideas which improve both productivity and labour relations.

(c) The GLC Experience

In Britain it was the GLC which pioneered this new approach to CC followed by the ILEA, which is still the only sizeable public body to have adopted a similar US style policy.

Before embarking on such a policy the GLC sought detailed legal advice. It found that the 1976 Race Relations Act charged local authorities with a special duty to promote equal employment opportunities whilst carrying out their functions. It was the GLC's legal counsel's opinion that this provision entitled them to ensure that contractors also promoted equal opportunities. There was no specific legal obligation for other areas of discrimination but it was felt that, on moral grounds, it must be the case that public bodies should positively seek ways to promote the laws against sex discrimination and promote the statutory requirements of the 1944 Disabled Persons (Employment) Act.

The policy was formally introduced in 1983, and aimed to give real effect to any equal opportunities requirements on contractors by giving back up advice, monitoring and enforcement. The policy was operated through a Contract Compliance Equal Opportunities Unit. The system was based on regular reviews of employment practices and advice on the ways the requirements could be met. Ultimately, the sanction remained that those companies which repeatedly failed to comply would be removed from the councils approved list of contractors.

Following the GLC's example both the Association of London Authorities (ALA) and the Association of Metropolitan Authorities (AMA) now support the use of CC as a way of promoting social goals.
(d) The Northern Ireland Experience

The pattern of discrimination in Northern Ireland is different from the rest of the UK and the USA. The primary focus of attention is on religious rather than race of sex discrimination.

In August 1972 the Van Straubenzee Committee, set up after direct rule from Westminster was imposed, argued the US style affirmative action programmes should be initiated either voluntarily or compulsorily. It also went on to reject the use of quotas, arguing that they were too blunt an instrument to work in the labour market. It was also thought that quotas would enforce and perpetuate the polarisation of Northern Ireland society.

The 1976 Fair Employment (NI) Act, which followed this report, made it illegal to discriminate on the basis of religion at work. A Fair Employment Agency (FEA) was set up to promote equality of opportunity and to eliminate discrimination in employment on the grounds of religious or political beliefs. In some ways the work of the FEA is comparable to that of the CRE and EOC, and in respect of CC. The Act requires the FEA to invite all contractors to subscribe to a voluntary Declaration of Principle and Intent, which applies only to religion and politics. Those that do are automatically given a Certificate and entered onto a register. Since 1981 the government has only accepted tenders from those on the register.

In theory the FEA has extensive powers of enforcement, but in practice its role is limited. There is no systematic monitoring of the Certificate holders' conduct, so that once obtained it is invariably unchallenged.

(e) Government Views Contradictory on CC

The government's support of CC in Northern Ireland and the 1988 Local Government Act which seeks to prohibit non-commercial contract conditions, illustrates the contradictory nature of the government's view on CC.

(d) Trade Union Views

In May 1986 the TUC published a guidance note on 'Contract Compliance and Equal Opportunities' which describes the policy as 'a way of effectively enforcing what is already accepted public policy - namely that employers should adopt equal opportunities policies and practices in line with the CRE and EOC codes'. Further, it considers 'the strategy of of CC commends widespread support within the union movement. It is consistent with the trade union objective of seeking to encourage the spread of fair employment standards'.

The TUC was concerned that some union members in the private sector might see the policy as a threat to their jobs. It therefore, sought to demonstrate that CC could enhance trade union rights and collective bargaining procedures. It called on union members at companies subjected to CC procedures to respond to any enquiries from local authorities and to urge their companies to comply. It also encourages early and continuous consultation with the trade unions of any company threatened with removal from an Approved List. The TUC also encouraged its affiliates to seek to spread CC procedures into the private sector.
4. HOW SUCCESSFUL HAS CC BEEN?

Local authorities admit that they have little evidence so far to prove that CC has achieved its goals. This is largely because most units and policies have not existed for very long and it is too soon to make an assessment. However, some London councils (e.g. Lewisham and Hackney) do claim achievements in good employment practices such as improved wages and conditions, health and safety policies, training schemes and the centralisation of council tendering arrangements.

5. THE FUTURE OF CC

The future of CC seems in doubt with the Local Government Bill's proposal to outlaw 'non-commercial' contract clauses. However, there are suggestions that the policy may still have a future.

Moves have already been made by the AMA to simplify and standardise CC procedures, and a series of regional seminars in the West Midlands has tried to achieve a consensus on policy and practice. The CRE has put forward its view of CC (which it supports) and has published its proposals on 'Principles and Practice for Contract Compliance'. Likewise, the Institute of Personnel Management, whilst having some reservation about the current operation of CC procedures, believes that the principles of CC which meet the requirements of fairness and reasonableness should be supported. The National Federation of Housing Associations has also given serious consideration to the vetting of contractors hired to do their work.

Finally, the opposition parties are in favour of some form of CC, and Labour has a clear commitment to introduce such a policy at central government level if elected. In the words of John Cunningham, 'Contract compliance should be central to any government's policy to reduce unemployment, to regenerate inner cities, to attack the scandalous housing crisis we face, to promote racial equality, to strengthen the impact of equal opportunities legislation, to improve employment prospects for people with disabilities, to improve Britain's abnormal lack of training, to achieve better conditions of employment, to produce better value for money in public spending and to improve health and safety, especially in building and construction'.
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