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Examination of Witnesses

Dr Jill Rutter, Dr Muhammad Abdul Bari, David Goodhart.

Q17 The Chairman: Thank you all very much for coming along this morning; we are very grateful for your expertise and your evidence to our inquiry. A list of the interests of members relevant to the inquiry has been sent to you and it is available. The session is open to the public; it is being broadcast live on our website and is being recorded for BBC Parliament. A verbatim transcript will be taken of the evidence, which will be put on the Committee’s website. A few days after the session, you will be sent a copy of the transcript to check it for accuracy, and it would be very helpful if you could advise us of any corrections as quickly as possible. If, after the evidence session, you wish to clarify or amplify any points made during your evidence, or have additional points you wish to make, you are welcome to submit supplementary evidence to us. That is the end of the police caution, so to speak. Perhaps I could now ask you to introduce yourselves and, if you wish to make a brief statement, but we are quite tight for time, by all means do so. The acoustics in this room are terrible, and I have a bad cold and cannot hear, so I would be very grateful if you could speak clearly and loudly. Mr Goodhart, would you like to start?

David Goodhart: My name is David Goodhart. I am a journalist by background, I have written various books relating to issues of immigration, ethnicity, integration, and citizenship is obviously a big part of that. I currently work part time at the Policy Exchange think tank.

Dr Bari: I am Muhammad Abdul Bari, community activist, teacher and parenting consultant. I would like to say a few things at the beginning.

We all have multiple identities—national, ethnic or racial and faith or no faith; they are complementary. The multiplicity of our identities, our human diversity, and pluralism in society is a matter of celebration. We are all equal, but different. In my religion, Islam, the concept of human diversity is very positive as human beings are not born as clones of one another; human diversity is a garden which is comprised of multi-coloured flowers of different shades and styles. Would that not be more appealing than a garden entirely made of the same colour and flower?

Citizenship is about national identity or being a legal member of a country. There are rights and duties to being a citizen. Active citizenship is a concept that encourages citizens to work for social solidarity or the common good for all. There are many ways of being active, such as voluntary neighbourhood and community work as well as broader socioeconomic and political participation.

In the UK, citizenship is taught in secondary schools—I was a teacher—as part of the GCSE curriculum so that children grow with the knowledge, skills and understanding to play an active part in society. Citizenship teaching includes topics such as democracy, government, the justice system and human rights. Schools must promote the spiritual, moral, social and cultural development of pupils within fundamental British
values. This is defined by Ofsted as “democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty, mutual respect for and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs and for those without faith”. To me, these values are universal which take account of tolerance of others, equality, equal opportunity, fairness and justice. Prejudice, bigotry, hate and discrimination are aberrations in any society. As an active citizen, a teacher and a community activist, I have been working in the voluntary sector for decades to promote these universal values and fight prejudice, bigotry and discrimination.

You may be aware of the civil society body, Citizens UK’s Commission on Islam, Participation and Public Life, which was set up September 2015 to understand the challenges Muslim citizens face in the public domain and to find better ways for their civic engagement. The final report, The Missing Muslims – Unlocking British Muslim Potential for the Benefit of All, was launched in July and contained a number of recommendations. I can leave a couple of copies, Lord Chairman, if you would like.

**The Chairman:** Thank you very much.

**Dr Rutter:** I am Jill Rutter. I am Director of Strategy at British Future, a non-partisan think tank which is focused on immigration and integration in the UK with a particular focus on understanding public attitudes. In a previous job, I set up one of the first PGCEs in citizenship education in 2001, so citizenship and civic engagement is an issue which is dear to me.

We think that there is a common understanding of British values. British Future has undertaken polling on what people think British values are, and there is broad agreement across different faiths and ethnic groups. For example, 69% of minority ethnic groups agree that British values comprise a respect for law.

We also think that it is important to talk about British values and our Britishness because it is a civic identity; it enshrines a relationship between the individual and the state. We need to teach about British values, but we should caution against using the word too much and using it as a counternarrative to religious extremism. We were told, when we met a group of young people in Newham, east London “The more they talk about British values, the more we feel we don’t belong”. We have to be sensitive and cautious about how we use it and we need to use it in positive contexts, not as a counternarrative to religious extremism.

The Government have a big role in promoting British values and shared values. We need clarity in the aims of our naturalisation policy: what do we want to achieve in terms of naturalisation, and is it to induct more people into Britain? I do not think we have a clear idea about the aims and objectives of our naturalisation policy.

We can work to make the achievement of British citizenship more positive. We wrote a report about how British citizenship could engender
greater belonging. The Mayor of London and the Mayor of Birmingham are looking into how citizenship—

**The Chairman:** Dr Rutter, we will give you a chance to answer some questions in a minute.

**Dr Rutter:** I was going to make some points about life transitions at 18 and citizenship education, which I am sure you can ask me about later. Thank you.

**The Chairman:** Thank you very much. We will go to the questions. I think the two statements have largely answered my question, which was to provide the Committee with a brief statement of the contemporary core essence of British values. Mr Goodhart, you did not have a chance to say anything there, so you might like to say something.

**David Goodhart:** I think the Government’s statement about British values is fine as far as it goes. As Jill said, one of the problems is that we tend to talk about it too much in the context of radicalisation and should find other opportunities to talk about it. My perhaps slightly pedantic point is that I am fine with the “British” part of it, but it is the “values” part which is a bit of a problem because the Government’s statement is not about values but about institutions essentially, with the possible exception of the concept of mutual respect, so it talks about democracy, the rule of law and individual liberty, which are all institutions which have developed historically over time. It perhaps sounds a little too abstract to talk about British institutions, but the whole point about a liberal society is that we can live freely by different values and even, to some extent, opposing values. There is a problem, I think, with the very word “values” in this context.

Incidentally, I would perhaps expand the Government’s short description of British values and include things like equal citizenship, open society and so on. Of course, much of what is said in the Government’s statement of values and even what I have described, things like equal citizenship, are essentially political things, but there are also the common norms, a way of life and the common behaviour of most British people, and this is manifested in the rules of the road of British life, if you like, and the highway code of people having to observe certain rules on things such as queuing, and one might even include a sense of humour and things like that. Obviously, governments cannot, and should not, legislate for these everyday life things, but when we talk about people from outside the country coming to live here and being absorbed into the common norms of everyday life we should talk about those things too because they matter in everyday life; it is not just about abstract political ideas.

**The Chairman:** Thank you. Lord Harries?

**Q18 Lord Harries of Pentregarth:** I think you have all said something on this question 2, but to what extent is it useful to refer to these values, in particular, as “British”? Is the debate about British values as opposed to
social values, which are important and cherished in Britain, more than a question of semantics? You have made the very good point that we talk about British values too much in the context of radicalisation and we take that for granted, but you are all basically sympathetic to the concept of British values. If you were looking for an alternative way of talking about it or nuancing, would you use a word such as “social” or “shared”? Is it more than a question of semantics?

**Dr Bari:** I do not have an issue with the definition of “British values”. To me, it is a bit limiting and I agree with my two colleagues that it is more or less in the context of radicalisation. Given what is happening around the world, the violence and destruction, the basic thing is that we live and let others live. That is the core thing. British values encapsulate—and it cannot be mentioned in the definition of British values—fair play, resilience, humour and tolerance. All these are part of British values, but I would prefer the words “social values” or “shared values” because, if someone is not a British citizen and lives in this country, there is a slight dichotomy as to whether that person has British values because, legally, he or she is not a British citizen. The nuances are there, but I would prefer “shared and social values”.

**Dr Rutter:** I do not have much to add on common values, shared values, but we need to talk about British values perhaps when a young person becomes a voter in citizenship ceremonies and so on, so I think we have to be sensitive and aware of contexts.

**David Goodhart:** I would disagree with Dr Bari. I think the “British” word is very important; it is much firmer in some ways than the “values” word. Moderate nationalism and a national identity is increasingly important in a much more diverse society. We did not have to talk about these things so much 100 years ago or even 50 years ago because there were implicit understandings; we were a very ethnically homogenous country. We are now not, and national identity becomes more important in these circumstances, not less, so I think we should very much stick to the word “British” and not dilute it because everybody living here, or most people, are British and, indeed, people who do not become citizens should be encouraged to do so. I think there was a proposal some years ago to make it more or less compulsory to become a British citizen once you have lived in the country for a certain period of time. That may be a little draconian, but I do not think we should not use the word “British” because a few hundreds of thousands of people are denizens, which I think is the technical term of people who are permanently resident in a country but not citizens; I think that would be a very small tail wagging the dog.

**Baroness Barker:** Thank you very much. I am very taken with Mr Goodhart’s statement about different and opposing values coexisting as opposed to having common values. Can a commitment to mutual respect and tolerance be combined with a belief in shared values within society? Are there boundaries or limits when it comes to respecting diversity? Is that what the word “British” is trying to convey?
**David Goodhart:** Richard Dawkins, for example, at some level, has contempt for Dr Bari and, indeed, for all religious believers; he thinks they are idiots, children at some level, and he is entitled to have that belief, which is antagonistic to organised religion. What he is not entitled to do, obviously, is to throw a brick at a mosque or abuse Dr Bari in the street as that would be a hate crime, but he is entitled because, like I say, we live in a liberal society which has diverse and even conflicting values, and that is part of what makes us a good society in some ways.

**Dr Bari:** To me, values and beliefs are two different things. Beliefs can be very limiting and values are to be shared, so beliefs are not values and values are not beliefs. People can have any sort of belief, a belief in religion, a belief in no religion, but they can have shared values, so I consider values as superimposing on beliefs. Beliefs can be changed as well and, of course, values can change, but religious and other beliefs have changed over decades, so I would rather give more importance to values than beliefs. When it comes to beliefs, we may disagree on many issues as religious people disagree; within a single religion, there are disagreements.

**Q20 Baroness Morris of Yardley:** I take that point and I do not disagree, but there is a point where that analysis becomes more difficult. Values are great until they challenge you and you do something that is not value-driven, and we have all had that experience. It is very easy to sign up to the values, but it is sometimes more difficult to sign up to the practicalities of living those values. If we talk about tolerance, I accept that we say to everybody, “You needn’t have a religious faith, but you must be tolerant of other people’s faiths”, but, if you go into the position of women or gay rights, that becomes more difficult. If we might take that as an example, where do we get to at that point? As a nation, we have legislation, values and a common stated view from leaders of our nation that we are tolerant of homosexuality, of gender reassignment and all those social changes of the last 20 or 30 years, so what right does that give people to oppose those and behave in a way that challenges those British ways of behaviour? There has to come a point where there is a conflict and how do you deal with the conflict?

**Dr Rutter:** The boundaries are clear and outlined in law. There are things which are illegal, and hate crime is against the law, but there are lots of tensions, as you said, around gay rights and the position of women. At British Future, we have been doing quite a lot of work in Bradford looking at how integration and cohesion could be improved in that very diverse city. We think that there need to be more safe spaces where people can discuss face to face their differences of opinion and accommodate each other. That is happening, to a certain extent, in schools. It is harder when adults leave school, but it has to be a face-to-face discussion. One of the areas where these tensions are manifest, wrongly, is in online discussions and social media where people’s opinions are not moderated by face-to-face contact, so we have to think about how we come to terms with our social media.
**Dr Bari:** There may be tensions, and there are tensions, between values and beliefs, and that is the nature of human society; if the family has tension, the community has tension, society will have tension. If traditional views conflict with the national shared views that must be challenged, but my contention is that that challenge should be done in a civilised way. People’s religious views or beliefs can be definitely challenged, and should be challenged, but two wrongs cannot make things right. If you become intolerant to a certain opinion and then talk about tolerance, it does not work in a society. Tolerance has to accommodate some beliefs and practices, until and unless they break the law, and there should be robust discussions on the table. If free society has the benefit of having robust discussions, it has the benefit of giving people the chance to air their views until and unless they break the law.

**David Goodhart:** There clearly is a conflict, as you say, between freedom of belief and freedom of speech and equality for gays and women in the sense that people are allowed to believe that homosexuality is wrong. It is not yet a crime to believe that homosexuality is wrong, and that obviously does lead to conflicts. As Dr Bari says, it is regulated by the legal space that you are allowed to express opinions that run counter to the general principle of equality and tolerance.

**Q21 Lord Blunkett:** I wonder if we could address for a minute or two the deeply alienated, probably as exemplified in the last two years with the vote in the United States for Donald Trump as President and the vote in the UK for Brexit, as most people would see that and as the evidence from the election survey would reinforce. How do we address that group of people who do not fit into any alphabetic list of inequalities and feel that the debate around this area is completely outwith their own day-to-day concerns? I wonder if all three of you would like to say a word or two about the juxtaposition of rapid change and its impact on people’s perceptions of themselves, where they stand in society, how they see the world changing, and the economic changes and perhaps the slow burner from the collapse of heavy industry through to the global meltdown. If you take too much notice of the BBC, you would believe that the global meltdown started with Northern Rock 10 years ago this week, but, of course, it started a lot longer before then. Is that economic, social and cultural mix something that we can easily take account of in the debate that we are having in this Select Committee and the recommendations that we might come forward with?

**David Goodhart:** It is a good question and an important subset of the general issue. The question in Lord Blunkett’s list implies that the so-called left behind depart from the mainstream liberal norms of British society. I would question that to some extent. As you mention, I have written this book, *The Road to Somewhere*, and I talk about decent populism. Some people regard that as a contradiction in terms, but obviously I do not. What I mean by that is a large section of our population, whom I call “the people from somewhere” tend to be more rooted and perhaps somewhat more socially conservative in their
attitudes, placing a higher value on security and familiarity than the highly educated and the affluent, who tend to stress more openness and autonomy and serve social change more comfortably. The “people from somewhere” have, generally speaking, gone along with the great liberalisation over the last 30 or 40 years, which Lady Morris was talking about, in attitudes on homosexuality, gender, race and so on. If you look back as recently as the late 1980s, I think about 65% of the British population thought that homosexuality was wrong. Now, 70% plus support gay marriage. We have seen a great switch particularly on that issue, but on others as well.

I think that most people, even the people whom Lord Blunkett was referring to, feel not so much hostile to the socially progressive values that one associates with London and the great metropolitan centres, but feel that their way of life has been undervalued. They still have very strong national and local attachments, they have very strong group attachments in the way that perhaps the more mobile “people from anywhere” do not and they have seen the social changes that have happened. The great economic openness of the last 20 or 30 has led to deindustrialisation, radical changes in their way of life, with mass immigration and rapid changes to neighbourhoods. They feel that their lives have not been valued by the people who are most dominant in society with the declining status of so much non-graduate employment, among other things.

If you come from Barnsley, say, 50 years ago you lived at the centre of one of the great European coalfields. Now you feel you do not have a place in the national story in the way that you used to and that the national story has shifted so much to the great metropolitan centres. That fragments society and divides us into our version of red states and blue states, which is damaging for the national cohesion. Although, as I say, “decent populism” is a regional description of how many people believe, they have gone along with many of the changes. They look at the national conversation coming out of London about transgender issues and about this, that and the other, and it is not necessarily that they are intolerant of transgender people, but they think that there is too much stress on these things and they would like there to be more stress on decent jobs for people who do not go to university, for example.

**Lord Harries of Pentregarth:** How do you feel this can be addressed? I think we acknowledge the truth of what you are saying as it is borne out by all the facts, but how can it be best addressed?

**David Goodhart:** Well, it is being addressed partly because we are having to address it because of the Brexit vote. A lot of these people had not voted, which is one of the reasons why the pollsters got the Brexit vote so wrong. They had not voted in the preceding four or five elections because they thought all the parties were the same, “they are all more interested in transgender people than me”, to slightly exaggerate, and, perhaps partly thanks to the Brexit vote, we are now talking differently. We might not have been having this conversation but for Brexit. They
have used their political power as citizens, their vote, to change the argument. It may have been a lashing out, but it requires greater emotional intelligence on the part of the people whom I call the “anywheres”, who will continue to dominate our society, the highly educated, mobile, generally speaking more affluent people.

The Chairman: But Lord Harries’s question is how do we get emotional engagement? Here we are in our little Committee with a chance to drop a small pebble into the pond. What pebble are we going to drop? What does the pebble look like?

David Goodhart: It is adjusting our national conversation to accommodate the sentiments of this large group of people who feel that they have been excluded. I think we are beginning to do that. Some of this is not subject to legislation, it is literally the nature of the continuing public conversation we have. One little policy thing that I am quite keen on is compulsory voting; one of the reasons these people have been ignored for so long is that many of them had stopped voting, until Brexit anyway, and that allowed the politicians to discount their views so much. Compulsory voting works perfectly well in Belgium and Australia, I think. Obviously it is one small thing which is not going to change things enormously but it is worth considering.

The Chairman: Dr Rutter, I know you want to come in.

Dr Rutter: We have been doing this activity called the national conversation on immigration—essentially, citizens’ panels, glorified focus groups. I have done some of these panels in outer city areas and people are saying that they do not trust politicians, they do not trust their MPs, and feel that the council just does stuff to them. When you go and do a panel in Bradford, the so-called left behind talk about HS3 and why is HS2 going up from London when they want a fast railway link across the Pennines. It is those economic issues.

In terms of what we could do to enable the so-called left-behind to feel that they had a greater stake in this country, I think MPs should get out and talk to every single sixth-former in their constituencies in small groups, which I am sure is possible. Councils need to think about how they engage with local people. Some are very, very good at that, and councils are an institution of the state as well. Some are not so good, and you get this phenomenon of people not trusting councillors and feeling that the council comes and does stuff to them. Our new academies have to be strongly rooted in the communities in which they are teaching, and I do not think that some of the new academy chains have built their community roots to a sufficient extent, but trust in our local politicians is part of this left behind phenomenon.

Lord Blunkett: I do not disagree with what Dr Rutter is saying, but does not her answer exemplify the problem we have? Many MPs go around the sixth forms in their constituencies, but they do not get the chance, or are not in a position, to talk to the young apprentices who are not in the sixth form and have not gone through the sixth form. So we get a skewed
view, do we not, of the way the world is?

Baroness Morris of Yardley: I have certainly not got the evidence, but I am surprised at that research because I thought that, on the whole, people trusted their MP but they do not trust MPs, so I think it is more complex than that. I think people trust their MP, who gets around, and they trust their councillor, who gets around, but they do not trust the council, and they separate it. I think the switch has been that the local representative is seen as being on their side, but it is the institutions to which they have elected them which are not on their side. I am not sure that it can be solved by getting the local politicians to go and talk to more people, but it is the bridge between them and the institutions that they belong to.

Dr Bari: Going back to the problem that Lord Blunkett and Lord Harries mentioned and looking for the solution, while we have come together, in a social and community sense many communities are fragmenting, and that is the reality I can see, even in the minority communities. Equal opportunity, which I mentioned, is one aspect. Fragmentation can be economic, political or even ideological, and here lie the challenges on the politicians and the civil society leaders in coming together and addressing the issues so that no community or group is left somewhere else. I was part of the Olympic board and we used to bring all the communities together and there were hard-to-reach communities. There is a target for the local boards to go to the communities which feel alienated, so that is important. Fragmentation is a reality and addressing it has to be done politically, economically as well as through social enterprise by the civic society leaders.

The Chairman: This is an important point. Does any other member want to ask a question, otherwise we will go on to Baroness Redfern?

Q22  Baroness Redfern: What role should the Government or society more generally have when it comes to promoting or embedding certain shared values, particularly promoting beyond the education system?

Dr Bari: I think that both the Government and society have a large responsibility. The Government can only legislate against discrimination or hatred in society, but they cannot promote values or be the nanny state. When it comes to hatred or discrimination or violation of equal opportunities, it is the Government’s job to legislate, but civil society has to be on its feet as to where laws are highlighted, where values are needed for the whole society. Civil society, including the voluntary sector and the religious communities, has a great responsibility to bring them together.

The role of the media has been discussed, and the Muslim community has been facing the brunt of the media, especially in the recent headlines. When I talk about civil society, the media are also part of it and nobody wants to talk about it. I know that there is freedom of expression and the media are free in this country, but do the media follow the self-regulation that we talk about? That is probably the big issue. If a certain community
is demonised for actions by a small part of the community that is not fair to that community and civic engagement is hampered. That is the whole purpose of forming the Citizens UK Commission so that Muslims do not face what they are facing in the public domain and they can have full civic participation as normal citizens, like others.

**Dr Rutter:** The state reaches people in many different ways, not just through the education system.

**Baroness Redfern:** That was just one example.

**Dr Rutter:** Yes. It reaches people through lots of different ways, through the arts, through publicly funded art through libraries and art through leisure centres. We could think about how these different organisations of the state could gently promote shared values, perhaps by encouraging volunteering and bringing people of different communities together. It would be lots of different small things.

**Baroness Redfern:** Which the Government are doing at the moment.

**Dr Rutter:** And everybody contributing in different ways and reaching different groups of people. It is people who are more isolated who are less likely to participate in arts, leisure, sports and volunteering, whom we need to reach.

**Baroness Redfern:** So how are we going to try and attract those people?

**Dr Rutter:** Perhaps, as Lord Blunkett says, through further education and apprenticeships, through football and through the institutions that they use and visit. It is a very big task.

**David Goodhart:** In a way, Brexit ought to be an opportunity to reboot the country to repair our national social contracts and to bring into the public realm people who have felt excluded for different reasons. Of course, it is not really working out like that and the debate is not exactly being conducted in the spirit of reconciliation, but quite the opposite. What Brexit has done is reveal the divisions that were there more clearly to us, but at least they have been revealed and we know what we are talking about now perhaps more clearly than we did before the vote. It has revealed what a very big job we have.

Dr Bari was talking about the media, and the whole evolution of social media, which is an extraordinarily recent thing in the last five or ten years. It has undoubtedly coarsened public debate in many ways, but it has also broken the elite filters on public debate. In some respects, I think it is a very healthy thing and has given the "somewhere“ and others a voice, and they may be misusing that, but these are very early days and, as time passes, the so-called trolls will become more responsible citizens. That may require some degree of nudging or regulation; I am not really a media expert, but we should not be too depressed about this coarsening. I hope it is obviously a temporary thing, or we need to make sure it is. There are minor things, and Jill may have already mentioned
them, just symbolic things in relation to citizenship, like reviving the citizenship ceremonies, which started off with a bang whenever it was. I think Lord Blunkett was involved in the initiative starting whenever it was, 15 years ago, and there was a lot of cynicism about it but it turned out to be really popular. It still does not involve enough long-established citizens in these ceremonies and if more noise were made about them, if you had them more like a group, like the Moonie weddings, as it were, with hundreds of people at a ceremony and it is a big local event, that would be good. On national volunteering, what is it called that The Challenge organise?

**Baroness Redfern:** The NCS.

**David Goodhart:** It is a volunteering scheme, but perhaps we should make volunteering compulsory. There has been a long debate about this and it would be very expensive, but what about a three-month version of national service in which everybody has to do something with a particular emphasis on mixing the social classes and the different ethnicities in the group of volunteering work that they are compelled to do?

**The Chairman:** I think that takes us to your question, Baroness Stedman-Scott.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** To what extent might the concept of the “civic journey” through life add structure and meaning to the broader issues of citizenship and civic participation? Do the Government or civil society need to do more to outline a positive framework of citizenship that instils a series of shared values?

**Dr Bari:** If I understand the term “civic journey”; it should start from the moment a child is born, so it starts with positive, gentle parenting, which is important. Of course, one of the ideas could be that citizenship is a subject at GCSE, so why not have it as a core subject like maths and English? That is one of the suggestions that I support. Of course, the civic journey is about civic participation, starting from the local neighbourhood to the community and society and all sorts of things, so the Government, civil society, the media and the whole of society should work together for people’s civic journey from the moment they are born until they die.

**Dr Rutter:** I think more could be done at 18 when a young person becomes a voter. Maybe one could look at a ceremony to welcome that young person to the voting community. I know that in parts of London people are thinking about that where you meet your MP and your local councillors and get a pack of information about what voting means. I think we should look at the transition at 18 as being particularly important and make sure that all young people are included in that, not just those at school.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** Have you done any research into this? Has this come up or have you any evidence to say that 18 year-olds would appreciate something like this?
**Dr Rutter:** We do not have evidence at the moment, but the Mayor of London has appointed a deputy mayor for social integration. One of the things that he is looking at is whether there should be more done to welcome new voters, whether they are new British citizens from abroad or voters who have just turned 18, into the political community.

**Baroness Redfern:** Also probably information about what the young people can get involved with and do, working with other bodies.

**David Goodhart:** Yes, some sort of rite of passage. Rites of passage are always good things and they have tended to disappear from our lives. I would just add to what Jill said that if there is this induction into citizenship at the age of 18 it should involve visits to the institutions, including the local magistrates’ court or the local Crown Court. The whole legal system exists invisibly to 98% of the population until they do something wrong or have a friend who does something wrong, but the legal process stands behind so much of everyday life.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** Would you do it at 16 or 18?

**David Goodhart:** At 18, definitely. I think the idea of reducing the voting age to 16 is ridiculous.

**Baroness Stedman-Scott:** No, I did not mean voting, but this citizenship.

**David Goodhart:** Well, it makes sense to do it when you can first vote, in a way, to link it to the act of voting.

**Lord Verjee:** Are there any other big issues relating to British values that we might not have touched upon in this session? I would like to hear some thoughts about the role as a global citizen and as a British citizen. The Prime Minister famously made a distinction there: can one be a global citizen and a British citizen? The other area I would like to hear about is the breakdown in family education. We talk a lot about teaching citizenship in the education system, but, as Dr Bari was saying, it should start from the day you are born. How can we find ways to encourage good citizenship within family values as well? Are there any other big issues that you feel we have not touched upon relating to British values?

**Dr Rutter:** Shall I start by talking about parenting education and what happens within the family? As a result of government initiatives, the Department for Education has looked at how the early years can promote fundamental British values and has given guidance to our early years providers. There is a lot going on implicitly in nurseries, which is promoting British values and rubbing off on parents and how we bring up our children. Democracy is about making decisions together and listening to other people. In nurseries, staff encourage children to sit down and listen to each other, which is an implicit British value; they encourage mutual respect and tolerance and treating others as you wish to be treated yourself. A lot of the best kind of parenting education is doing that and I think that a lot of families do that implicitly anyway.
As regards being a global citizen and having global responsibilities, an aspect of being British that we are concerned about is what is happening internationally. We have polling data on that from British Future and people do understand their global responsibilities.

**Dr Bari:** I would mention three specific points that probably need to be addressed. One is the incorrect perception of seeing a people, say, in the case of Muslims, seeing Muslims as a monolithic community and often treating them with suspicion of criminality. This does not help with social cohesion or citizen engagement and has undermined the Muslim community. I am not saying the Muslim community is perfect, but there are issues in this area.

Secondly, the Social Mobility Commission, probably 10 months ago and more recently, came up with why Pakistani and Bangladeshi children are doing far better than 25 years ago but social mobility of these two communities is very weak because of the job situation and discrimination. One of the suggestions is a nameless application form and all sorts of issues. I mentioned the overenthusiasm of mainstream media on certain communities, but in the global citizen area, we are global citizens—it cannot be nationalistic because global nationalism is not feasible—in the sense that this small planet should be looked after by human beings in a way that it is not distorted and destroyed. In that sense, we have the global citizenship values which are important.

As a parenting consultant, I have always emphasised that a person’s life starts in the family and parenting is fundamentally important. In some countries I know, probably in Singapore, there is parenting education from the Government. I am not saying that Britain should do this, but this should be given higher value. Children who are born happy and educated and inspirational citizens can say a lot of things in the future and we can learn other ways.

**Lord Harries of Pentregarth:** I could not quite hear, and perhaps others could not, the point that you made about Bangladeshi and Pakistani children. I could not quite gather whether they were doing better or worse.

**Dr Bari:** They are doing better in education. Even in university, they are doing far better, but their job situation, their moving into the higher echelons of the job is very weak.

**Lord Harries of Pentregarth:** So education is better, but social mobility is worse?

**Dr Bari:** Yes.

**David Goodhart:** That is not quite correct. When people look at these statistics, they include the British-born and the immigrant Bangladeshis and Pakistanis. If you just look at the British-born, there is an almost equal proportion of Bangladeshis and Pakistanis in the higher social class as white British, so we are not doing too badly on that score.
Dr Bari: Those are the Social Mobility Commission’s findings.

David Goodhart: Well, the Social Mobility Commission is often wrong. On the broader point, I think most people in this country think that charity begins at home, but it does not end at home. We believe in the moral equality of all human beings but we do not believe that we have the same obligation to all human beings otherwise the development aid budget would be as big as the NHS budget, but it is not—it is a fraction of it; a growing fraction, admittedly.

Theresa May’s famous statement in her conference speech last year that if you are a citizen of the world, you are a citizen of nowhere, was an attempt to empathise with people whom I call the “people from somewhere”, the majority of the population who still tend to be very rooted in this country where 60% live within 20 miles of where they lived when they were 14 years of age and we are not that mobile a society. It was also signalled that we want to repair our national social contracts in employment, in welfare, and so on, and the feeling that some people, the global citizens, do not have a particularly strong attachment to Britain and to British citizenship. She was implying that they should have a stronger one, which does not mean that you cannot also be very internationally connected and support lots of international causes. I think that, in retrospect, it was a political mistake and a lot of people were absolutely enraged by it. Why did the Tories lose Kensington, for goodness’ sake? Because lots of people who regard themselves as citizens of the world took that as an insult.

One of the things that is important here, going back to my anywhere/somewhere distinction, is the particular problem in this country that people feel that to succeed and to lead an ambitious and fulfilled life you have to leave where you were born, unless you happen to be born in London or Manchester or one of the great metropolitan centres. Justine Greening gave a speech to the Social Mobility Commission just a few months ago. Justine Greening comes from Rotherham and she said, “When I grew up in Rotherham, I used to dream of owning my own home, having an interesting job, having a career that challenged me, and I felt that I could not have that in Rotherham”. Rotherham has seen better days, but it is not a one-horse town; it is a town of 120,000 people and within half an hour’s commuting distance of Sheffield. The idea that you cannot live a fulfilled, ambitious life in Rotherham is ridiculous, and a lot of people feel that to be part of the successful bit of the country you have to move, which we have to do something about.

I think we have neglected the private realm of the family too much and too much of our family and gender policy has been about encouraging parents to spend as little time in the family as possible over recent years. That lies behind a lot of our biggest social problems, like social care and the housing crisis, where much of the issue stems from the neglect of the private realm and we need to rethink a lot of it. We are the only country in Europe which does not provide fiscal support for the family. We are one of the few countries where we spend £8 billion or £9 billion on
childcare every year and you cannot access a penny of that if you want to look after your own child. Lots of other countries allow women, and sometimes men, to use childcare funding to stay at home for longer with their own kids, and I think there is a huge appetite for that which is not recognised enough in public policy.

The Chairman: Thank you all very much; it has been a most interesting session and you have given us a lot of food for thought. If you have further things which you think we ought to be aware of, please do not hesitate to get in touch with us. Thank you very much.