

WHY THE SEWELL COMMISSION ON RACE AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY (2021) GOT IT SO WRONG.

Explaining three types of racism: personal-cultural systemic-institutional interesectional-structural

Max Farrar

This essay aims both to show some of the mistakes the Sewell Commission has made and to expose its deeper failure: its basic misunderstanding of the origins of racism. It argues that:

- The Conservative government that set up the Commission and endorsed its report is trying to shift the discussion of ‘race’ and racism away from systemic and structural causes of racial disadvantage. It wants us to focus instead on personal and cultural explanations of the failure of so many black and brown people to thrive in the UK. It wants us to say: “Blame the individuals, not the the system”.
- The report is trying to build a “Britain is best” narrative. They want us to forget slavery and Empire, to applaud the success achieved by some of those whose origins were in the British Colonies, and to agree with those who say multiculturalism in Britain works so much better than anywhere else.
- Dr Tony Sewell and his Commissioners are engaging in bad faith. They know racism is prevalent — and their report proves it beyond doubt — but they are simultaneously denying its force and trying to bypass its causes, in order to absolve themselves, and their government of their direct responsibility for the malaise of racism.

The essay goes beyond this discussion of aims and intended effects of the report.

- It seeks to discuss all three elements of a proper explanation of racism: personal-cultural; systemic-institutional; interesectional-structural.
- It notes that the report never examined the evidence for or against ‘institutional racism’, it simply denied its salience.
- It unpicks some of the specific facts and arguments in the Commission’s report to demonstrate its flawed reasoning and its inadequate recommendations.
- Equipped with a proper understand of the problem, we are much more likely to find a solution.

Thanks to my friendship with a black boy at school, I became a fervent supporter of the black Americans who launched their struggle for civil rights in the 1960s. Listening to Bessie Smith, The Supremes and Charlie Parker, reading James Baldwin and Ralph Ellison, I transferred by allegiance from Martin Luther King to Malcolm X to the Black Panthers. As black struggle emerged in Britain, I became a committed ally. For the past 50+ years I've read about 'race', racism and resistance, in literature, history, politics and sociology, and participated in the endless struggles in the UK for justice and equality. Throughout this period, progress has been inhibited by white people's inability to understand the sources of 'racial' division. The report of The Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities, chaired by Dr Tony Sewell, published on 31st March 2021, shows the poverty of analysis is not confined to white people.

I've written this essay in an effort to explain, with the minimum of jargon, how messed up is the argument in that report. It is aimed at the general reader, hoping to support the new phase of the struggle against racism.

Theory

In the marvellous #BlackLivesMatter demonstrations across the world since the killing of Trayvon Martin on 26th February 2012, reignited by the murder of George Floyd on 25th May 2020, both the placards and the media commentary in English showed that there are quite a few specialist terms in circulation. The most prominent seemed to be 'end systemic racism'. The concept of 'institutional racism' came back on show with the Sewell report in 2021. 'Systemic' and 'institutional' racism are pretty much the same thing.

Sometimes you see or hear reference to 'structural racism', often in connection with the term 'intersectional'. We read or hear accounts which tell us of the personal, mental distress that racism causes, so we can also refer to 'inter-personal racism'. This is sometimes phrased in terms of 'micro-aggressions'. So we need to address all three ways of thinking about racism: (1) personal (with cultural references); (2) systemic or institutional, and (3) structural — the intersecting structures of 'race', class and gender. This paper attempts as clearly as I can to explain what is meant by each of these, and it argues that we have to overcome each one, simultaneously.

When the 2021 Commission was press-released it met a storm of criticism. It was seen to be downplaying the force of racism, denying the existence of 'institutional racism' and applauding Britain for being the best country in terms of its positive relations between 'races'. When its chair, Dr Tony Sewell, met the press on 1st April 2021 this was the line he presented. As such, we witnessed a prime example of what Jean-Paul Sartre called 'bad faith'. The example Sartre used to demonstrate this concept isn't one that we'd use today. But Sewell showed us the process that Sartre described as bad faith: knowing exactly what is going on, but denying it, in order to avoid taking responsibility for the consequences.

On 2nd April, in response to ferocious criticism, the UK government issued a denial of the report's denial that racism was a real problem in the UK. It said it acknowledged that 'racism is real'. Sewell, however, didn't say this on air. So the accusation of bad faith against him remains. The government, however, had recognised that it had to spin again. But its 2nd April press release reaffirmed its view that institutional racism is a thing of the

past. It phrased itself more carefully this time: the Commission 'did not find conclusive evidence' for institutional racism. Since at no point did it look into the question of institutional racism, it's no surprise it didn't find the evidence.

The report of the Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities is packed with examples of individual, institutional and structural racism. Yet Sewell explicitly denied institutional racism. His report said individual racism is declining and he never addressed structural racism (though the report does indicate that there is a class component to 'disparity').

By denying the racism he knows to be there, he serves the interests of those in power by exonerating them from the burden of their complicity. Then he makes recommendations to alleviate the very racism he has simultaneously demonstrated and denied. Sewell and his team are living examples of the topsy-turvy world of 'post-truth'. Like his Prime Minister, Boris Jonson, it seems he has lost the ability to think logically and speak honestly.

Modern racism has a 500 year history and if any proof is needed that it is still alive and kicking (very hard) it's the multitude of theories about 'race', and our failure to properly explain them, let alone deal with the issue of racism. Each theory, taken separately, points in a different direction for changing policy and practice. Tony Sewell and his Commissioners are trying their best to pick out the theory that it's 'personal-cultural' issues (rather than 'institutional') that are the key to unlocking the problem. My argument is that the structures of race, gender and class cannot be considered separately, because they intersect. This idea has eluded the Commission altogether. To make headway in the struggle against racism, we must address then personal, the institutional-systemic and the structural forms of racism all at the same time. First, we need to sketch out the problem.

What is racism and how bad is it in the UK?

Everyone, especially racists, knows what inter-personal racism is. My definition is this: you systematically negate and exclude other people because you object to their appearance. You think their hair, their nose, their lips, their eye colour or their skin mean that they will say, believe or do things that you despise. Their clothes and what they wear on their heads might add to your certainty that these are bad people, who deserve your contempt, and you think that you should avoid them at all costs. You believe you have the right to hurt them physically and mentally, and to stop them gaining access to housing, education, jobs, leisure facilities and public space; if you have the power you will actually put some or all of these exclusions into practice. When you put them into practice, you do so by building institutions, with all their rules and processes, that express your prejudices. Underlying these opinions and these institutions are structures which have become so 'natural' that most people don't notice them.

With the emergence of socialism, the structure of class became more visible, nurtured by Karl Marx and his followers. With the emergence of feminism, gender structures were revealed, thanks to thinkers such as Juliet Mitchell. Pioneering black intellectuals such as WEB Du Bois pointed to 'race' as an underlying structure, and CLR James pushed this theory forward. The civil rights movement and Black Power in the 1960s took up these

ideas, and Stuart Hall explained them further — but somehow ‘structural racism’ hasn’t entered the mainstream, yet.

The problem of racism is undeniable. A 1960 survey of British attitudes to people of African, Caribbean and Asian heritage in the UK found that ‘One third is tolerant of all coloured people, one-third is mildly prejudiced, and one-third is extremely prejudiced’. It’s worrying how little has changed.

In recent UK surveys, huge numbers of white people confess their hostility, from mild to deep, to people who don’t look like them. A 2016 survey by the anti-racist organisation *HOPE not Hate* showed that almost a quarter of the British population held either ‘active enmity’ or were ‘latently hostile’ to ethnic minorities and the new immigrants. Those who were actively hostile (about 8%) believed it was legitimate to act violently against minority groups. Around 45% were ‘concerned’ or ‘ambivalent’ about multiculturalism. Only a third were ‘very positive toward our multicultural society’.

In 2019, *HOPE’s* report showed that the ‘very positive’ group had expanded to almost 29%, but the two hostile groups had also expanded, to 32%. That’s just over 21 million British people who are actively or latently racist. The 2019 report identified a new grouping, characterised by intense hostility to Muslims. They constituted 18% of the population.

These shocking statistics show us that there is something deeply wrong with the UK today. Racists may have significant roles in their neighbourhoods, in schools, in businesses and in other institutions. So it is no surprise that those excluded ‘others’ continually show up in statistics that measure how well British people are doing socially, psychologically, politically and economically. When compared with white-skinned, thin-lipped, blue-eyed people with a Christian background who adopt a clothing and hair style familiar in the UK since the 1950s, routinely, the victims of racism are doing much worse than these white Christians. These figures suggest that racism is not just an interpersonal issue: it is perpetuated by the institutions white people have built over many centuries and which they still control. Those historical processes are themselves driven by deeply embedded structural divisions of race, class and gender.

Yet Dr Tony Sewell, speaking to the press on 1st April 2021 placed his emphasis on how much had improved in Britain in the past few decades, and he denied that ‘institutional racism’ was a serious problem. Instead, he argued, black people are held back by their own attitudes and cultural practices; the main barrier to their success, he said, was their class position, not their ‘race’. His views were widely applauded in conservative media.

His report actually included masses of data that proves that racism is real. It showed, for instance, that between 2018-20 the rate of reported hate crime was 142 incidents per day. That’s just what people told the police about. Much, much more goes unreported. It states: ‘These incidents cause serious and lasting trauma in people’s lives’. It wants ‘substantial penalties’ against online racist abuse. But, pushing its optimistic line, it noted that the numbers were higher in the past.

The report included data on unemployment rates which prove there black people and white are in a very different position: whereas white British young people (16-24) had an unemployment rate of about 11% in 2017-2020, 16% of those with a Black Caribbean heritage were unemployed, 19% of young people of Pakistani heritage, 21% of Chinese

heritage, 24% of Bangladeshi heritage, and 26% of Black African heritage were unemployed.

Yet the Race and Ethnic Disparities report concluded that Britain is a much more 'open' society than it was, and said that we live in a new 'era of "participation"'. Sewell's report stated that where there are 'impediments and disparities', 'very few of them are to do with racism'. Sewell said that the Commission found no evidence of institutional racism. Since the 1999 MacPherson Report it has been widely acknowledged that British institutions are riddled with racism. If there has been progress since then, it's because the problem has been admitted. Sewell, on the other hand, makes no review of the mechanics of institutional racism — he simply denied its existence.

Explaining racism

1 Racism is personal

About half the population knows exactly what they are doing when it comes to excluding 'the others'. They will use derogatory, demeaning terms to describe the people who they don't like the look of. The hard-core racists will use deliberately provocative terms like Paki, Nigger, Yid, or Bog-Irish and, if they get the chance, they will quickly list all the things they think all members of these groups do that they object to. This is racism at its most obvious: it's in your face, it's inter-personal. People on the receiving end of this overt racism sometimes say: 'At least they are being honest.' Or: 'I just laugh at their stupidity and walk away.' Underneath, they are deeply wounded, as all their worst fears are being confirmed. This type of racism is up close and personal.

Equally disturbing is the huge number of people who would deny racism in a survey but who engage in **micro-aggressions**. They say or do something that may seem minor, and they don't see as racist — such where they decide to sit on a bus; offering alcohol to a person wearing a hijab; asking someone where they are 'really' from; ignoring them when they make a point in a meeting. This is experienced as a type of aggression. It may be 'micro', compared to being called a Yid or a Paki (nowadays a code for Muslim), being unfairly refused a job, or being beaten up, but it is still an aggressive act.

These questions and behaviours hurt because they treat a person not for what they believe in or do, but for what they are assumed to be. Everyone has the right to be seen and understood for what they feel themselves actually to be. To find out who that other person actually is, you have to be empathic and ask questions, without making assumptions. When people don't deliberately intend to offend, this is the operation of '**unconscious bias**' (often based on false assumptions); but, too often, bias is conscious.

The psychological effects of these hard and soft forms of racism are immense. They reduce people's confidence in themselves, induce depression (and worse), and thus make it much harder for them to achieve their goals in life. For society as a whole, this psychological demoralisation of large groups of people means that the whole population suffers because it reduces the incentive for talented people to make their full contribution.

While this type of racism is sometimes explained by psychological problems experienced by the racist, and sometimes sociologically, as a result of the culture in which that person

was brought up. Thus it's sometimes said that racist whites come from a cultural background which hasn't placed much emphasis on educational achievement, so they are ignorant or ill-informed. But there are lots of educated racists who are equally personally hostile. The explanation here is that they have adopted an ideology which argues that there are essential differences between population groups, and that some groups should be excluded because of their inherent characteristics. All of them may have psychological issues too.

The Sewell report omitted any explanation of racism, but in clustering many of its recommendations under the heading of 'agency' it showed that it placed much emphasis on the individual — seeking wherever it can to find individual solutions to the problem. In saying that there is no evidence for institutional racism it reinforced this individualising approach. By rejecting other explanations of racism, the Commission was unable to provide a comprehensive approach to solving the problem.

2 Racism is systemic-institutional

Systemic racism' is a term which in some circles seems to be replacing 'institutional racism'. Both refer to a discriminatory process that takes place inside all the public institutions or social systems that make up society — such as educational services, businesses, health and welfare organisations, sports clubs, arts centres, political parties, legal services, places of worship and so on. These are the systems in which we organise our economic, social and cultural lives. If there is racism inside these institutions, people are unfairly alienated and distressed, and society loses their talents and skills. In the classic definition of institutional racism, set out in the 1999 MacPherson Report, there is reference to processes that deliberately (consciously) or 'unwittingly' (unconsciously) discriminate against people of African and Asian heritage. It's these processes, rather than specific racist individuals, that result in black and brown people finding themselves excluded — e.g. not getting full attention in the classroom, not getting hired, not getting the recognition their talent and their work deserves.

There is a huge amount of evidence that there is institutional racism in the UK. It has permeated all the systems that underpin people's lives for hundreds of years (solidifying with the enslavement of Africans in the 16th Century, and the steady imposition of British colonies from 1700 onwards). The exclusion (and sometimes mass murder) of Jewish people in Christian societies was institutionalised in the church from the 4th Century and the organised suppression (led by the English) of the Irish was initiated in the 17th Century.

Since 'race' is a recently invented term with no virtually biological relevance, the concept of 'racism' has been employed to encompass systematic exclusions of all groups of people, whatever they look like, once the oppressor has made up its mind to exploit those groups, justifying its actions by claiming that the 'other' culture is utterly different and inherently inferior. (Thus when people who are not in any sense in a 'racial' group, such as Jews or Muslims, are systematically discriminated against, the term 'racism' is often used.)

Today, systemic racism impacts most strongly on people whose skin colour is not described as white. Colour has become the simple way of putting a boundary around

human populations. (The definition of ‘white’ can change: East Asian people were once described by Europeans as white — they became ‘yellow’ when they started to rebel against European domination.) These ‘not-white’ people are the groups whose educational qualifications and incomes suffer, whose health is worse and whose chances of being locked up are higher. MacPherson said this can be an unintended consequence of an institutional process.

More often, it’s because systems are deliberately in place that make it very difficult for non-white people to succeed, and no-one in power (usually a white person) has the insight, commitment or the energy to change those institutions. This is exactly what the mass anti-racist mobilisations that have erupted consistently since the 1960s have demanded, and they have strengthened the elbow of those few people in powerful positions who have tried to institute change. The point emphasised here is that the systems in place within these institutions consistently result in unfair outcomes, even when lots of people, including those in senior positions, say they are against racism, and they wave their policy statements to prove it — but too little has actually changed.

Tony Sewell’s 2021 report attempted to deliberately muddy these waters by pointing out that some groups who are not white are doing very well in terms of school qualifications. It’s true that white working class boys are doing worse at school than many of their peers whose history was in Africa or Asia. The Sewell report draws two conclusions. One is that class, or socio-economic position, is an important consideration in explaining lack of success at school. There’s no dispute here. Class is a structure that shapes all the educational institutions in the UK. The other is what it calls ‘the immigrant paradigm’: whatever their economic status, immigrants put huge emphasis on their children’s schooling and thus they do well. Pupils of Caribbean heritage, Sewell’s report argued, fail because their parents were born here, so they are not immigrants any more — and they don’t put enough effort into supporting their children at school. (This is their alleged cultural deficit.) It’s not an ‘institutional’ problem, Sewell argued, its ‘personal-cultural’.

Somehow it didn’t occur to Sewell and his people that the Windrush generation of Caribbean migrants put enormous emphasis on their children’s education in the 1950s, 60s and 70s. When, despite their personal efforts, their children failed at school, they set up their own Saturday Supplementary Schools. These made a huge difference to those that attended — but they couldn’t overcome the institutional racism in the schools the children attended for five days a week. (In Leeds, black parents organised a strike of pupils to force change in a Chapeltown school — and this did have positive effects.) Sewell’s report has the effect of dividing black Caribbeans against others of African origin who arrived later, and against Asians.

At no point did his report properly address the structures of class, race, or gender.

3 Racism is structural, and ‘race’ intersects with class and gender

Structural racism is similar to systemic racism in that it refers to the pervasiveness of racism across the whole of society — both in individuals and in institutions. But it differs in pointing to a deeper cause of racism, suggesting that even if individuals changed their ideas, and institutions offered genuinely equal opportunity to everyone, we would still have a problem. The point here is that are structures operating in

society which aren't as visible or audible as those we have noted in discussing personal-cultural or systemic-institutional racism.

These structures are so much part of people's 'common sense', so 'taken-for-granted' that they are largely invisible. When they are highlighted (often by teachers in schools, colleges and universities, occasionally circulating in the more radical media) they are quickly dismissed by politicians and pundits as 'the ravings of the loony left'. Sewell's Commission gives ballast to that attack.

For as long as anyone can remember, it has been widely accepted that some are rich and some are poor, that men are quite different from women, and that therefore the hierarchies we see in society are perfectly natural. They neither can be changed, nor should they be, because these divisions have been in place throughout human history and are embedded in human nature. To make sense of the 'natural' divisions between rich and poor we refer to the class structure; to explain the division between men and women we refer to the structure of gender. Operating across both of these is the structure of 'race'.

'Race' is in inverted commas here because it has no foundation in science. All those who attempted to prove that there are different races, reaching their climax in Hitler's Germany, have been proved wrong. Genetically, all humans are the same in every significant respect. Variations in skin, hair and eye colour or shape of nose or lips or waviness of hair arise from tiny genetic differences that have no impact on intelligence, creativity, dexterity, or any of the characteristics we properly value in humans.

Racism is a term that no longer even refers to the difference that racists used to obsess over (skin colour). In England, white-skinned Irish people experience racism; across the UK white-skinned Muslims and Jews experience racism; white-skinned Eastern Europeans experience racism. Scientifically, 'race' is bogus, but racists think it's real, and in everyday life racism is painfully real in its effects. It is devastating when it combines with class and gender.

Class and gender are the original twin pillars of hierarchy. Their origins lie around 10,000 years ago when the dark-skinned peoples of the South — in the 'fertile crescent' stretching from the Nile to the Indus rivers — settled into villages and then (from about six thousand years ago) built cities. This is the start of what we call civilisation, with writing and mathematics originating among these dark-skinned peoples.

When, around 4,000 years ago, the barbarian (light skinned) people from the Steppe (often called the Aryans) attacked the civilised Africans and Asians in their cities in the fertile crescent, hierarchies of colour began to assert their ugly reasoning as well. Religious beliefs and rituals embedded these hierarchies. These population groups are all one species, so they inter-mix, and their offspring are of various skin-colours — at the very beginning of settled society, class and gender hierarchy is imposed by the most powerful, and skin colour begins to overlap with wealth and gender as a sign of power.

Sewell's report will not address these issues because he is allied with a Conservative government which is utterly comfortable with hierarchy; it has absolutely no intention of upsetting the class at the top of the pile. Significantly, that class now includes women and people whose families came from the South and the East of the globe. Today's UK government contains members of the diasporas of African and Asia. Modern Conservatives are committed to equality of opportunity and social mobility. It's welcome

facts like this that might propel the view that Britain is making progress and the problem of racism is receding. Sewell's report's conclusions include the active promotion of 'fairness', 'agency' and 'inclusion'.

But these worthy (if limited) ambitions are thwarted when there are structures of class/race/gender that make it extremely difficult for most people to get fair treatment, mobilise their agency and achieve inclusion. Conservatives are committed to hierarchy — there is no suggestion that everyone can, or should, reach the top. 'Agency', for them, depends upon educational success. The Commission blamed personal attitudes and family culture for the failure of some black and brown people to rise up the ladder — and then they referred to class position and gender to explain low achievement of white working class boys. These structural barriers are made much greater when the boys are black and in the same social class.

This an impoverished analysis unworthy of a government Commission. It glanced at class and failed to follow through. It winked at gender — noting girls of all colours do better than boys — and failed to take up the implications. It was utterly silent on the inter-connections between gender, class and 'race' — despite the full resources of the government's civil service and acres of academic research to call upon. Its blindness must be have been wilful. It was operating in bad faith.

Thus the Commission could not recommend the eradication of structural barriers of any sort. When it praised those 'immigrants' who do well at school, it did not point out that they almost always have parents with high levels of cultural capital (and often high economic capital too). Yes, family culture makes a difference, but economic position is crucial. Lack of money means lack of access to digital technology and overcrowded accommodation, both of which impact on educational attainment. If the Commission wanted to see real progress, its recommendations would replace 'promoting fairness' with 'promoting equality'. This would involve tackling the intersecting structures of class, 'race' and gender.

Nowhere is the intersection of structural factors more evident than in health. People of the African and Asian diaspora in the UK have much worse health than the white British. Sewell's Commission report included the shocking fact that the death rate from Covid-19 among 'Black African' men in the first wave of the pandemic was 3.4 times higher than the rate for 'White British' men. They argue that high density living in some parts of the country, low income and general poor health (due to their class position) explain most of that difference — but they did not dare say that racism isn't a factor.

When it comes to noting the much greater incidence of mental illness among Black Africans compared to any other group, Sewell's report had to admit that 'mental ill health has little to do with genetic predisposition but rather is to do with adverse social circumstances, including racism and hardship'. These 'adverse circumstances' are the effects of the structures of race and class.

But when it noted the fact that people of African and Asian heritage are less likely than whites to be receiving treatment, the Commission retreated to its default position of blaming individuals and their cultures, saying such people are reluctant to admit their mental ill-health. This could well be a factor — but leaders in the NHS itself are willing to admit that there are institutional failures within the service that compound that problem.

The structure of gender is also in operation. Girls of all ethnicities do slightly better than boys at school but after school the level they rise to in their workplaces, and their pay, is lower than men. They are discriminated against after school — and there are interpersonal, structural and institutional reasons why.

The intersection of the structural forces of racism, class and gender structures makes it likely that black women will be seen by whites as being at the lowest point in the hierarchy, placing black men a notch above them. (It's worth recalling that Irish people in England are also at the lower end of the spread of income and wealth, and their health problems are immense.) Understood in this way, combatting racism requires significant focus on overturning the belief that hierarchy is natural. That's why the term '**intersectional**' appears on some #BLM placards — protesters recognise that 'race', class and gender intersect to cause the mess we are in; to get out of the quagmire we must challenge all ideas that 'race', class and gender difference are natural. We have to re-model the behaviour and institutions that result from these antiquated structures.

What should we do?

There are lots of practical things we can do right now to defeat racism in our personal interactions and in the institutions we work in or use. I'm particularly interested in how we can transform our public spaces because of the work I do in helping to make the David Oluwale Memory Garden in Leeds. So I have begun to think how the ideas in this article apply to the problem of transforming all the public spaces in the city into places where everybody feels at home, regardless of their geographical origins. The accompany chart (*An Action Plan for Transforming 'Place'*) — sketches out my suggestions.

Overcoming personal and systemic-institutional racism is hard enough, given their very long history. But personal contact, knowledge, understanding and careful action can have a big impact on individual racism. Big strides towards equal opportunity for all have been made in the past 40 years, slowly reducing institutional racism. On both of these, much more work is needed.

Challenging structural racism is even harder, since it entails reversing ideas and institutions that have an even longer history. Those who have mounted that challenge — starting perhaps with The Levellers in the 17th century, building with the Suffragettes in the 19th century, added to by the anti-colonial movements and civil rights struggles in the post-1945 era — have assaulted the deepest structures of difference. They have been condemned as revolutionaries by those who fight hardest to maintain the privileges conferred by their skin colour, class and gender.

You don't have to be a revolutionary to combat racism. I would suggest, however, that the work we do to lessen personal and systemic racism should always include the reminder that structural racism is the elephant in the room. To notice that elephant is to become aware of the possibility that humans do not have to think they must scale a pyramid: they could, if they wanted to, live together on a level field. Structural racism can — and should — be challenged alongside personal and systemic racism.

Notes

Hope Not Hate publish their Fear and Hope reports online. The 2016 report I refer to seems to have been taken off their website but I can supply it to anyone who asks. The 2019 report is available here <https://www.hopenothate.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/fear-and-hope-report-2019-07-final-1.pdf>

Various reports with statistics on the operation and effects of racism are linked in this 'Black Lives Matter' blog I wrote in 2020 for The Tetley <https://www.thetetley.org/whats-on/max-farrar-blog>

The 2021 report of the Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities, chaired by Dr Tony Sewell, is available at [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/974507/20210331 - CRED Report - FINAL - _Web_Accessible.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/974507/20210331_-_CRED_Report_-_FINAL_-_Web_Accessible.pdf)

The government's 'clarification' of the report, issued on 2.4.21, is here <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/the-commission-on-race-and-ethnic-disparities-statement>

Max Farrar, Leeds, UK
5th April 2021

maximfarrar@gmail.com
maxfarrar.org.uk