

PEACE STUDIES PAPERS

THIRD SERIES

Peacemaking Journalism at a Time of Community Conflict: The
Bradford *Telegraph & Argus* and the Bradford Riots

Kirsten Sparre

February 1998

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE STUDIES

Contents

Introduction	1
Section 2:	
A Brief Account of the Bradford Riots	4
The Judicial Process and Complaints About the Police	8
Political Developments in the Wake of the Riots	8
Section 3:	
The Riots in National and Regional Media	10
Section 4:	
The Peacemaking Efforts of the Bradford <i>Telegraph & Argus</i>	12
Supporting Calls for Peace and Peaceful Relations	14
Assessing the Damage	16
Maintaining Good Relations I:	
Community Relations Between the White and Asian-heritage Population	17
The White Community	21
Maintaining Good Relations II:	
Community Relations Between the Police and the Asian-heritage Population	22
Supporting Efforts to Resolve the Conflict	26
Prize and Praise	29
Section 5:	
Limitations to Peacemaking Through the Media	30
The Role of Media Audiences	31
Notes	36
Bibliography	42

Introduction

Can and should local journalists help to resolve the conflicts that occur in the communities they cover? As journalists hurry from one story to the next, the question appears theoretical. Rarely is there time for the sustained attention to a particular conflict which is necessary for any media organisation to be helpful in a process of problem-solving in the community. However, once in a while communities experience a conflict of such a magnitude that all sectors of the community are called upon to help repair the damage and find ways forward. The disturbances in June 1995 over issues of policing in the inner-city area of Manningham in Bradford in the North of England was one such case. The rioting of a couple of hundred mainly Muslim Pakistani-heritage British young men over two consecutive nights caused an estimated £1 million worth of damage and disabused people in Bradford of any notion that the city had been wholly successful in integrating its large population of immigrants from the Asian subcontinent.¹ The Bradford-based newspaper, the *Telegraph & Argus*, rose to the challenge of covering the riots and their aftermath in a manner which makes the efforts of the newspaper an excellent starting-point for discussing the potentials as well as the limitations of local media in undertaking peacemaking roles during times of conflict in the community.

Peacemaking journalism is an umbrella-term for a number of journalistic practices which could aid the process of preventing a conflict from sliding (further) into violence and/or move a conflict towards resolution or settlement, preferably by peaceful means. Peacemaking journalism centres on the belief that journalists become part of a conflict and its management from the moment they start covering it. Conflict is not a static entity that remains unchanged by journalistic attention. Rather, media coverage becomes part of the way that a conflict is reproduced, understood and reacted upon both by policy-makers and people in the street. The ways in which journalists can act in peacemaking roles are plentiful, but they will always be subordinated to the demands of the newsgathering process and the degree to which journalists feel it is legitimate to engage in peacemaking when their commitment to journalistic ideals of impartiality, truth, and fairness is also taken into account.

This research seeks to link the processes of journalism and peacemaking in Bradford in the wake of the disorders in June 1995 which have come to be known as the Bradford riots. It does so by means of a process-oriented content analysis of all riot coverage by the Bradford *Telegraph & Argus* including articles, editorials and letters to the editor over a period of almost two years. This involved looking at the ways in which journalists at the *Telegraph & Argus* approached the coverage of the riots and their aftermath in terms of their choice of sources, stylistic formats, themes and editorial angles as well as attempts to directly impact on political and social

developments in the context of the riots. The output and the process was then assessed in terms of its peacemaking potential and supplemented by interviews with journalists and the editor of the newspaper in order to test some of the assumptions about editorial decision making and allow reflection on the theme of peacemaking journalism. The research focuses on the Bradford *Telegraph & Argus* but will occasionally make comparative references to the riot coverage of the Leeds-based *Yorkshire Post*. The *Yorkshire Post* occupies a far more marginal position in Bradford than the *Telegraph & Argus* but its riot coverage is interesting nevertheless, as it is the only other daily newspaper with a commitment to cover events in Bradford to some degree and therefore the newspaper, in theory, could have felt equal responsibility with the *Telegraph & Argus* towards helping Bradford deal with the problems caused by the riots.

Before proceeding further, it is worth reflecting for a moment on what could be considered peacemaking in the specific context of the Bradford riots and in what ways public communication in the media could be helpful in that process.

Viewed narrowly, the main parties to the conflict were the rioters themselves, some disaffected members of the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community in Manningham, and the police. However, the task of peacemaking necessarily had to be broader than that. In terms of community relations in Bradford there was a potential for an escalation in tensions between the many Asian-heritage communities in Bradford and groups of British people who query the overall legitimacy of immigration into Britain. Much was made of the fact that the majority of the one hundred and two businesses and premises attacked during the disorders were owned by White people and only one was owned by a member of the Pakistani-heritage Muslim community. Similarly, only four out of sixty six damaged vehicles were owned by people of Asian heritage.² An inquiry into the riots later concluded that the choice of targets probably had less to do with racism and more to do with the fact that many White and Sikh owned businesses were left unattended on the nights of the disorders, whereas most businesses owned by people of Muslim Pakistani-heritage were well defended and the owners were well-known to many of the rioters.³ Nevertheless, at the time there was a significant danger of the riots becoming a prelude to larger scale confrontations between Whites and Asians, and at one point there were rumours of an impending coach invasion of extremist right wing groups in Manningham.⁴

Immediately after the weekend of disorders, the most important peacemaking task obviously was to avoid further violence in the streets of Bradford in the short term, whether by disaffected Asian-heritage youths or by others using the disturbances to legitimise Asian-White confrontations. Using a terminology which peace research has popularised and which makes a distinction between

'negative' and 'positive' peace, this would be *negative peace* in the sense that such an approach seeks to eliminate violent behaviour without necessarily resolving any of the underlying issues that might have caused the behaviour, or altering the attitudes that informed the behaviour.

A longer term peacemaking task - that of *positive peace* - would be to ensure that something was done about the underlying causes of the riots in order to prevent repeats in the future. This would involve addressing issues of structural violence such as poverty, unemployment and access to resources, as well as looking for ways to ensure a just way of policing in ethnic communities like the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community in Manningham. Positive peace would also mean working on the attitudes that inform violent behaviour and tensions between different ethnic groups.

From the point of view of the media, peacemaking functions that would help Bradford achieve negative peace would include promoting a culture of peace and include reporting on calls for calm and condemnations of, and apologies for, the violence that had occurred. Further, the media could be a source of conflict analysis and attempt to cut through the maze of confusion and rumours by helping to identify the immediate causes of the violence and stimulate debate about what should be done about those. Whilst doing so, it would be an important task of the media not to antagonise direct parties to the conflict further, or report in a manner that might inflame the situation.

Adopting a longer term view, the media could call for and aid the search for peaceful solutions to the underlying social problems in Manningham. The media could also play an important role as bridge-builders between different groups of Bradfordians and supply information that could form the basis of decision-making and conflict resolution, as well as improve the general understanding of the situation of the Asian heritage communities in Bradford.

Section 2 provides an account of the Bradford riots and judicial and political developments in their aftermath. **Section 3** is a very brief assessment of riot coverage in the national press and on regional television. **Section 4** is an in-depth analysis of the peacemaking efforts of the Bradford *Telegraph & Argus*, whilst **Section 5** is a discussion of the limitations of local newspapers in undertaking peacemaking roles at times of community conflict.

Section 2:

A Brief Account of the Bradford Riots

The aim of this section is to provide a brief overview of events in Manningham in the three-day period from 9th-11th June 1995 as a context for understanding media coverage of the events. The account is based on contemporary media coverage and on the extensive Bradford Commission Report which was published in November 1996 and was the result of a community inquiry set up by the Bradford Congress which represents all the major organisations in the city.⁵

The problems began at around 9.30 p.m. on 9th June 1995, when police went to Garfield Avenue in Manningham to investigate a noisy game of football. This led to a confrontation between police and the local residents, mainly of Muslim Pakistani-heritage, and that confrontation was ultimately the incident which sparked off the rest of the events. As has been pointed out later in the inquiry conducted by the Bradford Commission, there is absolutely no evidence that the disorders of Friday night were pre-planned: events simply escalated from that one incident.⁶

Accounts of what happened in Garfield Avenue differ widely, depending on whether the source is the police or people who witnessed and/or took part in the events. The police claim that a group of Asian-heritage youths shouted and kicked at their police car when it arrived in Garfield Avenue. When the police officers came out of the car, the group of youths became aggressive and started threatening them. The police arrested two youths whom they thought abusive, but the youths managed to free themselves and one of them ran into a nearby house. When police went after him into the house, they were confronted by a brother who, according to a later police statement in court, "repeatedly punched one of the officers on the back of his head."⁷ The brother was also arrested. Meanwhile, a crowd had gathered outside and the police officers called for reinforcements because the crowd "was calling us racist pigs and I was in complete fear of my safety", one of the officers later said in court.⁸ The police also described one of the youths as a "wild animal".⁹ A fourth young man from the crowd in Garfield Avenue was then arrested for allegedly assaulting one of the police officers. Ultimately, the four youths were taken away while other officers dispersed the crowd in the street.

The incident has been described entirely differently by young Muslim Pakistani-heritage men telling their story to the British Muslim magazine *Trends*. Starting in Garfield Avenue, the police car ran over the foot of one youth playing football and trapped it under the car. The police officers got out of the car and began laughing and decided to arrest the youth. Another youth passing by went up to the policemen and told them that they were acting outrageously and should release the first youth. By this time a small crowd had gathered and more police were called in.

A local man, a teacher, came out of his house nearby and asked what was going on. However, he was told to go away and was threatened with arrest. The teacher went back into his house, but a police officer charged after him with a raised truncheon and aggressively confronted him and his sister who was carrying her eight month old daughter at the time. Scuffles broke out, and the police officer struck the teacher's sister with the truncheon, ripped her dress and slapped the baby before arresting the teacher. Eventually, four people were arrested and taken away.¹⁰

When the four people arrested were on trial at Bradford Magistrates Court four months later, the magistrate Mr. Hodgson was not impressed with what either side had to say about the incident. However, he cleared the four youths of charges of assaulting a police officer, using threatening behaviour and resisting arrest because an independent eyewitness had raised serious doubts about the "reliability of police evidence". In fact, Mr. Hodgson felt that the police case had collapsed like a "pack of cards."¹¹ The magistrate also rejected completely the story of one of the youths that a police vehicle had gone over his foot.¹² Similarly, members of the Bradford Commission rejected both the story about the youth whose foot became trapped under a police car and the story about the assault on the mother and her baby. The stories are nevertheless important because they turned into persistent and growing rumours in the local community and fuelled events further. One Asian professional man told the Commission that:

What went through the community from household to household was that Muslim women were being attacked by the police.¹³

Events in Garfield Avenue have also been described by a number of onlookers.¹⁴ Many people were summoned from their houses when they heard angry protests outside in English and Punjabi from the sister of the two brothers arrested. A group of twelve to fifteen curious residents - men, youths, women and children predominantly, but not exclusively, Pakistani - were told by an agitated police officer to go back into their houses or risk being arrested. Following continued protests from the residents and questions about why the youths were arrested, one of the police officers produced his baton and waved it aggressively at the crowd in an attempt to get them to go back into their houses. Meanwhile still more residents came out onto the street and were deterred from talking to one of the arrested youths sitting in the back of a police car by two police officers with drawn batons. At this point police reinforcements arrived, and the fourth youth was arrested after making verbal protests only about the arrests of the other three. Police officers, assisted by a police dog, made a last attempt to get people to go inside before setting off in convoy, driving over the pavement, with "tyres squealing in their haste to get away."¹⁵

The Bradford Commission's conclusion about the behaviour of the police officers in Garfield Avenue was that:

There was no differentiation made between curious local residents who later became protesters, responsible people trying to calm the situation down, and trouble-makers. All members of the public were treated with equal hostility and contempt by the police. No attempt was made to explain what the police were doing, even when the arrests had been accomplished and all the activity of the other officers had ceased. Even the manner of exit, across the traffic barrier pavement, was unnecessarily provocative. The police swept in, and then swept out, having acted throughout as though the local residents were of no account, and incapable of understanding an explanation.¹⁶

Following the arrests of the four youths, two separate groups of people gathered and went to the police station on Lilycroft Road to complain: one was a group of youths protesting about the arrest of the friends, the other was a group of residents who wanted to complain to the officer in charge about the hostility and contempt shown to people in Garfield Avenue by the police. By 10.30 p.m. sixty local men were gathered outside Lawcroft House police station,¹⁷ and in the next quarter of an hour the police made eight further arrests on public order charges of people who were well regarded in the local community and had no previous reputation as trouble makers.¹⁸ Meanwhile, down Oak Lane, another group of young people had already smashed a shop window and dragged pallets from a nearby shop into the road and set fire to them.¹⁹ Police were sent in and were met with bricks and bottles, and by 11.00 p.m. the Acting Superintendent decided to send in police in full riot gear and call for reinforcements from other parts of West Yorkshire. Despite attempts at intervention from local councillors and other community leaders, the clashes between police and rioters continued until nearly 4.00 a.m., and, according to police records, the disorders resulted in the looting of a chemist shop and extensive damage to a local supermarket and a DIY store. Eleven cars were damaged - five of these were from a garage in Oak Lane and were deliberately set on fire.²⁰

On Saturday 10th June, young men in the Oak Lane area were still very angry and threatened to take matters into their own hands because they felt that councillors had no sway with the police at all.²¹ Meanwhile community leaders and police held four hours of talks at Lawcroft House police station - talks which only included representatives of the residents in Garfield Avenue by coincidence.²² The community demanded that the two officers who had first become involved in the original incident in Garfield Avenue should be suspended. Further, the community wanted the charges dropped against all the people who had been arrested on Friday in Garfield Avenue and outside the police station. The police rejected these demands and instead suggested that the Assistant Chief Constable would review all evidence, that complaints made against the police

would be investigated with minimum delay, that the police would meet with representatives of Manningham youths, and that the deployment of the two officers involved in the original incident would be reviewed.²³

Meanwhile tension was rising in the streets. Media attention to Friday night's disturbances attracted what the Bradford Commission Report calls "trouble makers and excitement seekers from other areas of Bradford and beyond"²⁴ who, together with local youths, formed a growing crowd outside Lawcroft House. At around 6.30 p.m. a group of about a hundred youths outside the police station knocked down a wall and started hurling bricks at the police. The police were already out in full force: a reinforced ring of two hundred police officers in riot uniforms had been posted around Oak Lane and adjoining streets. Local people have later said that they felt they were held in containment, and that the riot squad was not dressed to attend a peace event. People have also complained that the riot police only allowed white people to pass police lines, and that the riot police marched up and down and periodically charged to make arrests. Both tactics were seen as reinforcing an image of the police as racist and led to heated arguments.²⁵ By 8.00 p.m. a group of three hundred mainly young people had gathered in Oak Lane and violence erupted as police tried to block off the street at both ends. Over the next six hours the youths moved through town smashing windows of businesses and pubs, as well as attacking a garage and destroying several cars.²⁶ It was later estimated by the police that the two nights of riots caused approximately £1 million worth of damage.²⁷

The Bradford Commission Report said about the disorders on Saturday night that they had taken place because:

The police were unable to convince the local representatives that their concerns were understood and would be taken seriously, and because the police failed to relate to the aggrieved residents themselves. The general indignation which therefore continued provided the occasion for youths motivated by distrust of the police, or attracted by the potential excitement, to follow a small number bent on confrontation with the police.²⁸

On Sunday 11th June community leaders and police held further talks to calm the situation. In the evening hundreds of people gathered again outside Lawcroft House police station demonstrating for the suspension of the two officers involved in the original arrest on Friday evening and the dropping of all charges against the people arrested on Friday night. This night the police adopted a different tactic: wearing ordinary uniforms they were posted in pairs on street corners throughout the Manningham area. Despite tensions, the evening passed quietly with only a few incidents of stone throwing. The end came with a spontaneous multi-ethnic peace demonstration by local

women who quietly marched through the crowd and the police lines in an appeal for an end to the violence.²⁹

The Judicial Process and Complaints About the Police

Since the weekend of disturbances in June 1995, a number of steps have been taken in the judicial process. Shortly after the riots, on June 20th 1995, the Crown Prosecution Service decided that it would “not be in the public interest” to pursue charges against the people who were arrested outside the Lawcroft House police station on the night of Friday June 9th.³⁰ In October, the four youths arrested in the original incident in Garfield Avenue were cleared by the Magistrates court of charges of assaulting a police officer, using threatening behaviour and resisting arrest.³¹ Meanwhile, the police continued their investigations to find out who were responsible for arson, robbery and violent disorder during the riots. Ultimately, a total of forty one people were arrested. Sixteen people have been punished by the criminal courts on charges of arson, assault, breach of the peace, conspiracy to cause explosion, disorderly conduct, possessing an offensive weapon, and offences against the Public Order Act 1986. The courts dismissed a number of cases, whilst others were discontinued by the police or the Crown Prosecutor. There was one custodial sentence of twelve months imprisonment, and another three individuals were put in detention at a Young Offenders Institution.³²

In meetings between police and community leaders during the events in June 1995 it was decided that the police would undertake an internal inquiry into police behaviour during the riots under the auspices of the Police Complaints Authority. In April 1996, the Police Complaints Authority reported to the Bradford Commission that it found allegations of police misconduct during the riots were “entirely without foundation”. Consequently, no police officers were to be disciplined except one officer, whom it was recommended should receive advice and retraining from his divisional commander for having wrongly exercised his powers of arrest.³³ Three months earlier the Crown Prosecution Service had announced its decision not to prosecute any police officers over their role in the Bradford riots.³⁴

Political Developments in the Wake of the Riots

Following the weekend of disturbance, the then Labour MP for the Manningham area, Max Madden, attempted to convince the Government of the need to set up an independent public inquiry headed by a judge, partly to look into the causes of the riots in Bradford and partly as a way of dealing with the general problems in Britain’s inner city areas. However, Home Secretary

Michael Howard refused to hold such an independent inquiry, and instead Bradford Council called on Bradford Congress to set up a community inquiry. The Bradford Congress represents all the major organisations in the city, and in early September 1995 it announced that a three-person panel had been set up to look into the riots.³⁵ The Congress said that its commission had been set up to be “forward looking, rather than dwelling on past events.”³⁶ There were three members of the Bradford Commission: Professor Sheila Allen of Bradford University, Mr. John Barrat, a former civil servant with extensive experience of conducting inquiries for local authorities, and Mr. Mohammed Taj, an Employee Director of Yorkshire Rider with strong links to the trade union movement.

The Bradford Commission Report was published in November 1996 and its main conclusion was that the riots were caused neither by police racism nor because parents of Muslim Pakistani-heritage had lost control of a generation, nor because of the social pressures of poor education, overcrowded homes, poverty and unemployment. The Commission judged these pressures to be merely “predispositions” to violence. The Commission concluded instead that the main problems were that:

Bradford’s social divisions are inadequately perceived, and inadequately bridged, and Bradford’s problems are actually shared across wrongly perceived divides, with the result that Bradford’s economy, public services, and local politics have not come to terms with the nature, the circumstances, or the potential of Bradford’s present and future population.³⁷

However, one of the Bradford Commission members, Mr. Mohammed Taj, refused to endorse the final version of the official commission report and instead published his own report “A ‘Can Do’ City”, about a week later. In his report, Mr. Taj attacked the Bradford Commission Report for lacking both “intellectual coherence and courage” in its refusal to come up with practical recommendations for future action in Bradford:

To put this as simply as possible - the thrust of the report was that Bradford’s institutions and organisations had failed the city. Yet the draft report’s conclusion was to hand the responsibility back to those same institutions that had failed, without any guidance, targets or timetable for action. It is clearly inadequate to have as virtually the sole practical proposal that the Congress should set up a range of ‘sub-groups’ to ‘devise new strategies’.³⁸

Mr. Taj then proceeded with a number of practical suggestions of his own on how to solve Bradford’s problems.

Following the Bradford Commission Report and Mr. Taj’s report, Bradford City Council produced its official reply and plan of action in March 1997, twenty one months after the events in

Manningham. The Council concluded that catastrophic levels of “economic exclusion” were at the roots of Manningham’s problems and unveiled plans to tackle the main issues of shortage of jobs, low skills and poor education simultaneously. The Council identified four key areas for action: community stress, economic regeneration, alienation of young people, and housing, and announced the creation of a council body to oversee inner city regeneration and the establishment of a Youth Justice Forum to focus on young people’s relationship with the law.³⁹

Section 3:

The Riots in National and Regional Media

Although this case study intends to explore mainly the peacemaking efforts of the Bradford-based *Telegraph & Argus*, it is useful to consider briefly how the riots were covered by the national media as well as the regional BBC and ITV television stations. Much too often the term media is used as a blanket term and the behaviour of one media organisation is assumed to be more or less synonymous with that of another. However, a closer look at national and regional coverage of the events in Bradford enhances the understanding of how unique the *Telegraph & Argus* was in its approach to the task of covering the riots and their aftermath. Even a brief look at national newspaper coverage and regional TV coverage of the Bradford riots will establish that media behaviour - and thereby the potential for aiding processes of peacemaking - was very different, depending on the distance between the media organisation and the community embroiled in the problems.

The Bradford riots attracted a huge amount of media coverage. The story travelled internationally as well as being covered relatively intensively by Britain’s national broadsheet and tabloid press,⁴⁰ with the majority of the coverage on June 12th, the Monday after the disturbances. The coverage petered out about a month later and the Bradford riots have only resurfaced in the national press since then at times of riot-related events, such as the publication of the Bradford Commission Report, or at times of general stories about Bradford.⁴¹

The short-lived attention by the national press to problems in Bradford produced two main explanations of why the riots happened, both of which centred on the relations between the police and the Muslim Pakistani-heritage youth. One which was promoted heavily by the police itself was that young Pakistani Muslims had lost touch with their cultural roots and religious traditions but without the advantage of being assimilated into British society. The tension, the police said, was waiting for something to spark it off, and the police were only the “anvil on which the youths were beating out their frustration and anger.”⁴²

The second explanation took its cue from a particular aspect of race relations in Bradford which was already in the media at the time of the riots. During the early part of 1995, ITV had shown a drama series called *Band of Gold* about prostitution. The series was set in Bradford's Lumb Lane district in the heart of Manningham, which was also the real life scene of prostitution in Bradford. The local community around Lumb Lane had for some time tried to move the prostitutes out of the area by sending out groups of men to stand next to the prostitutes to deter any customers. The campaign was successful in the sense that most of the prostitutes now work in a different area of Bradford. However, the campaign attracted a fair amount of media attention - in part because of the *Band of Gold* series, in part because of a small element of vigilantism where a group of different Asian-heritage youths used the campaign to legitimise physical harassment of prostitutes and their customers. Because the majority of the local community around Lumb Lane is of Muslim Pakistani-heritage the media depicted the campaign as a Muslim question of morality, despite the fact that white non-Muslim people were also part of the campaign.⁴³ When the riots happened, many national newspapers described in analytical articles how relations between police and the Asian community had been strained because the community felt that the police were not doing enough about the problem of prostitution, and it was that strain which had led to the riots.⁴⁴

The Bradford Commission Report later queried the degree to which a generation gap amongst Asian-heritage youth and elders played a role in the riots, and the Commission did not point to the anti-prostitution campaign as a major cause of events either.⁴⁵ However, journalists from the national papers could be excused to some extent for not getting the story right: they did not have the benefit of local contacts on the ground, the police did not go on public record with their version of events before the cases of the four youths arrested in Garfield Avenue came to court four months later, and many local people refused to cooperate with national media because they were angry about some media's instant commentaries on the situation and the lives of people of Muslim Pakistani-heritage.⁴⁶

For a few days events in Bradford were also covered closely by regional as well as national television news programmes. However, once the tension died down somewhat, television coverage died down too, and after a week the riots only merited the occasional story without pictures (or one-off reports in special programmes like *Edit V* and Channel 4's *Black Bag* shown weeks or months later).

In general, the two regional television news programmes, BBC's *Look North* and ITV's *Calendar*, explained the riots as a confrontation between the police and a particular group of Muslim Pakistani-heritage youths. They did not look particularly hard for explanations of what might have triggered

the disorders, nor did they look for explanations to do with structural problems such as housing, unemployment and poverty, even if there was some exploration of the suggestion by the police that there was a cultural and generational gap in the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community in Manningham. There are a number of possible reasons why television journalists approached the subject in this manner. As has been pointed out in research on the particular news values of television, images of violence is a major driving force in television coverage. The pictures from Bradford showed police in riot gear charging with batons and dogs against groups of young people, and youths hurling petrol bombs at police, and that makes it easy to understand how the youth-police confrontation became the major frame for understanding on television. Further, unlike the written press, television journalists were covering the story during the weekend and, when the story broke, journalists were finding their main sources on the street or by attending the impromptu press conferences organised by police after the sessions of negotiations with community leaders. The anger and sense of crisis came to determine the beginning of the story and later it was probably hard for television journalists - the majority of whom did not have regular sources in the area anyway - to move beyond that frame of reference. Secondly, competition is stiff for inclusion on a television news programme, and when the tension died down in Bradford, it is likely that editors on regional television news programmes judged that other stories had wider appeal than a story about continued feelings - as opposed to acts - of unrest in Bradford. It should be borne in mind that both *Look North* and *Calendar* are broadcasting to huge areas outside Bradford. The consequence, however, was that on regional television, coverage never moved beyond the simple formula of police against youths.

Section 4:

The Peacemaking Efforts of the Bradford *Telegraph & Argus*

The riot coverage of the Bradford *Telegraph & Argus* went through four main phases from the weekend of disturbances in June 1995 to the publication of the Bradford Commission Report in November 1996. The first phase concerned the reporting of the weekend's events and lasted from Saturday 10th June 1995 to Monday 12th June. The second phase was the immediate aftermath of the riots and events related to it, which stretched from mid-June until the setting up of the Bradford Commission in September 1995. During the third phase, which lasted until the publication of the Bradford Commission Report in November 1996, the riots were part of the running story in Bradford and were mainly covered through riot-related events such as the Police Complaint Authority's decision in April 1996 that no action would be taken against police officers

involved in the original incident in Garfield Avenue.⁴⁷ There were no attempts to give special attention to developments and life in Manningham in the light of the recent riots with the exception of a series of features in June 1996, under the theme of 'one year on from the riots'. During the fourth phase, the *Telegraph & Argus* reported widely on the Bradford Commission report, including the production of a supplement with a summary of the main findings of the report as a way of making it accessible to as many people in the Bradford area as possible.

The decision to apply a particular peace angle to riot coverage did not come about before the newspaper's editor and journalists met in the morning of Monday 12th June to prepare that day's edition. The *Telegraph & Argus* had covered the events on Friday night in the Saturday newspaper. Under the heading *Flame mobs fight police*, crime reporter Alun Palmer had relayed the night's events in an account which was mainly based on police information but also included criticism of police behaviour from eye witnesses to the original incident in Garfield Avenue.⁴⁸ The article was remarkable in the sense that at no point did it mention the words Asian or Muslim: instead it referred to people, youths and crowds. Editor Perry Austin-Clarke, as well as journalists Alun Palmer and Alam Khan maintain that when writing up the story on Saturday morning they did not think anything suggested that the disorders had been racially motivated. To them it was an ordinary outbreak of violence, and only later events convinced them that there were ethnic and cultural dimensions to understanding the disorders in Manningham. In that first report the fact that the majority of the youths were of Asian heritage was not mentioned in the article because reporters said that they had also observed English people taking part in the riots.⁴⁹

However, by Monday morning it was clear that the Asian heritage of the rioters had played a major role in the disorders, and editor Perry Austin-Clarke decided on pursuing an editorial line looking for ways forward in order to prevent repeats rather than dwelling on the drama which had just happened. Austin-Clarke was less motivated by wanting to mediate between police and the youths in Manningham as he was by wanting to avoid reporting in a manner that could set White people and people of Asian-heritage against one another:

The overriding image from the riots was of Asians throwing petrol bombs, Asians attacking the police. It didn't spark off the other way around. There were no pictures of police attacking Asians. There was a real danger that if we just presented those images all that we could possibly do was to perpetuate the violence and inflame passions. So we took a decision to say: Look, how should we carry this coverage forward? We should report what happened, but try not to inflame passions, and if you like we took a bold decision to try and keep a lid on events by not exaggerating the extent of the violence and not encouraging the obvious response from White youths who could easily have moved in gangs to have a go back at the Asians.⁵⁰

The editorial line of the *Telegraph & Argus* was significantly different from that of the Leeds-based *Yorkshire Post*, which also covers events in Bradford. In the week immediately after the riots, headlines in the *Telegraph & Argus* were dominated by calls for peace such as *We must heal these wounds*, (12th June 1995); *Cries we must all listen to*, (12th June 1995); *Act now to deal with grievances*, (14th June 1995); *Women's role in healing the scars*, (15th June 1995); *Religious leaders' call for understanding*, (17th June 1995); and *Vital need for hearing*, (19th June 1995). Meanwhile only one of thirty five headlines in the *Yorkshire Post* mentioned the word peace (*Pleas for peace bring calm to riot city*, 19th June 1995); the rest were either straightforward accounts of events (e.g. *Cars bear brunt of mob's violence*, 12th June 1995; *Hindus say they had no part in flare-up*, 13th June 1995; and *Independent inquiry into riots ruled out*, 16th June 1995) or, if concerned with conflict dynamics at all, more likely to focus on the aspect of violence (e.g. *Fears grow of more violence*, 14th June 1995; *City holds its breath as riot tension rises*, 17th June 1995; and *Police fail to allay riot fears of Asians*, 13th June 1995).

Reluctant to comment on the behaviour of other media organisations in the region by naming them, the editor and journalists nevertheless agreed that the *Telegraph & Argus* had had a unique approach to covering the riots, which in no small measure was due to the fact that as a newspaper and as individuals they felt part of the community in Bradford. Austin-Clarke said:

Other papers in the region took the purely macho approach of large pictures of Asian men throwing bricks at police which in a sense they could afford to do because they do not have the responsibility to the community we have. We have to live with this community and it has a very important ethnic minority element.⁵¹

The editor's sentiments were echoed by journalist Alam Khan:

We did not say: "Oh, Bradford is a terrible place" like a lot of other media which supposedly covers Bradford. We felt part of the community, we wanted to work with them on the whole situation. How many others would have taken that stance?⁵²

Supporting Calls for Peace and Peaceful Relations

Calls for peace and the need to heal the wounds caused by the disorders dominated coverage in the immediate aftermath of the riots. On Monday 12th June, the *Telegraph & Argus* led its riot coverage with the frontpage headline: "*Urgent pleas for peace as community leaders gather to find the way ahead after a weekend of turmoil: We must heal these wounds*", and reflecting the editorial decision not to focus on dramatic pictures of violence, the main front page photograph showed a group of women carrying a banner with the word 'Peace'.⁵³

During those first few days the focus in Bradford was on avoiding further disturbances during the following weekend. The *Telegraph & Argus* opened its columns to several people calling for a weekend of peace, calm and dialogue instead of violence. The group included the Bishop of Bradford, the police, council chiefs, a group of women from Manningham, and religious leaders of five different faiths.⁵⁴

In the event, the following weeks passed peacefully, but there were fears of renewed trouble around the up-coming Bradford Festival whose main event, the Asian-inspired Mela, was going to be held in Lister Park in the middle of Manningham. Quite early on various community leaders were looking to the Mela as an opportunity to heal the wounds opened by the riots because the Mela traditionally attracts people from all social, cultural and ethnic backgrounds. The main problem was that for the first time it had been decided to introduce a £1 entry fee to the Mela. This was a very unpopular decision with the Asian-heritage community in Bradford. On the Asian continent a mela is renowned as a free event for rich and poor alike, and it was felt that to charge for the Mela in Bradford would be wrong, both culturally but also practically, as there were many large and poor Asian-heritage families in Bradford who would be unable to afford the entry fee.⁵⁵ The *Telegraph & Argus* reported - but did not overtly support - calls for the entry fee to be scrapped. However, when it was decided to drop the Mela fee, thanks to a donation from the Bradford Congress, the decision was reported on the front page and the whole story was framed in terms of re-uniting the community and healing the wounds after the riots.⁵⁶ The *Telegraph & Argus* continued to celebrate the Mela's contribution to peaceful relations in Bradford. In an editorial on 3rd July, the paper congratulated Bradford on the peaceful passing of the Mela:

The event was a tribute to the organisers and to those community leaders who have made considerable efforts to heal the wounds since the disturbances of a few weeks ago.⁵⁷

It is impossible to measure in a meaningful way the effects of a newspaper calling for peace and celebrating peaceful relations, but that is not the same as saying that such efforts are meaningless. In a volatile situation such as that in Manningham, a public and outspoken commitment to the norm of peaceful community relations would probably be supportive of work done by other members of the community who tried to communicate to young men that rioting is an unacceptable way of behaving. At the same time, a public discourse disclaiming the validity of violence could also go some way towards discouraging other groups in Bradford who might have seen the riots as an excuse to attack the Asian-heritage community.

Assessing the Damage

The *Telegraph & Argus* also tried to impact on community spirits in another area. The ability to find a way forward in part depends on how serious people believe the damage to be and the likelihood that the problems can be overcome. The *Telegraph & Argus* took a very positive approach to assessing the attractiveness of Bradford as a place to do business in, in the wake of the disorders and the nationwide publicity they attracted. In an article on June 13th, journalist Olwen Vasey asked a number of developers with plans to invest in Bradford to assess the damage caused by the riots. They all agreed that Bradford would only suffer short-term damage as a result of the riots, and none of them were planning on cancelling their investments in Bradford because of the riots.⁵⁸ Meanwhile, “defiant shopkeepers” in the Manningham area declared that it was business as usual,⁵⁹ and the manager of a looted charity-shop in the city centre was even planning a brighter future on the back of the publicity caused by the riot-damage to his shop, as he believed the public would dig deep into their pockets as a mark of defiance.⁶⁰

Doing the rounds of people affected by major upheaval is normal practice for journalists, but the spirit in which the exercise was carried out by the *Telegraph & Argus* is better appreciated by comparing it with the efforts of the *Yorkshire Post*. On June 13th, journalist Richard Rae wrote an article headlined ‘*Terrible blow*’ to city businesses for years ahead after clean-up. In it, the manager of the Bradford Asian Business Association said that “This weekend spells economic disaster across the board” and the chairman of the council’s compulsory competitive tendering committee warned that it “could be years before the city realises the full economic impact”.⁶¹ A month later the same journalist wrote an article headlined *Riot-area traders ‘on brink of folding’*, which detailed how a number of Asian restaurants were seeing losses in trade and some of them might be on the brink of folding.⁶² At the end the article did, however, quote a Bradford city councillor for saying that the problems of the restaurants might be short-term and that the amount of new business coming into the city was an indication of long-term confidence in Bradford.⁶³

The question is less which newspaper was closer to the truth, and more one of slant. By focusing exclusively on the “riot-hit” traders and their difficulties, the *Yorkshire Post* painted a picture of businesses being defeated by the riots and credited the rioters with more power than they actually had. Meanwhile, by probing into the largely positive attitudes to long-term investment in Bradford, the *Telegraph & Argus* deliberately tried to maintain an atmosphere of overcoming the riots. Journalist Olwen Vasey who covered the beat of local politics and development said:

[What happened] could have been enormously damaging for Bradford in view of that sort of publicity. It could have stopped investments and so on. But in fact it wasn’t as black as it was painted. Developers still came in, and the big scheme for Manningham

mills was still planned to go ahead. So again, we were careful, we were positive, and we didn't just paint a black picture which would have been dramatic but it wouldn't have been right to do it.⁶⁴

Maintaining Good Relations I:

Community Relations Between the White and Asian-heritage Population

Another area which had been put under severe strain as a result of the riots was that of race relations in Bradford. The *Telegraph & Argus* was quick off the mark to warn the non-Asian population of Bradford against panicking. An editorial pointed out that while links between the Asian community and groups like the police, the Church and others had been put under tremendous strain by the riots, they were still there and should not be written off; also still present was "the strong will among the majority of Asians and white Bradfordians to continue to operate successfully as a multi-racial community".⁶⁵

The *Telegraph & Argus'* own editorial policy on operating in a multi-racial community should be mentioned here, as it had some bearing on the way the newspaper approached the task of covering the aftermath of the disorders in Manningham. The newspaper deliberately does not employ a special Asian affairs or ethnic minorities reporter, explained editor Perry Austin-Clarke:

Our editorial policy here is that we cover the whole community, full stop. It is my belief that every member of the reporting staff should be able to deal with any member of the public irrespective of the colour of their skin, or their background or religion. I think that if we actively pursue that policy then naturally you should find that our coverage more or less corresponds with the make-up of the city, almost like a pro-rata arrangement where if 16% of the population belongs to an ethnic minority, 16% of our coverage overall will be [about issues related to that minority].⁶⁶

Austin-Clarke maintained that this editorial policy enjoys support from the Asian-heritage community itself:

I occasionally go to meetings in the city's interfaith council and I have talked about what we could do to make the *Telegraph & Argus* appeal to a wider audience. Generally, the meetings reject any suggestions of supplements on Asian issues or writing parts of the paper in different languages because it tends to make them a special case and reinforces segregation.⁶⁷

Both the editor and journalists at the *Telegraph & Argus* acknowledged that as a consequence of this policy, the newspaper was not an essential part of ethnic minority life in Bradford at the time of the riots and it continues to have a fairly small readership within the Asian-heritage community. On the other hand, the editorial policy also means that when quoted as sources, members of the

Asian-heritage communities appear as individual members of the community rather than being seen as representatives of the ethnic group they belong to. The implications of such a policy can be quite significant. For instance, the campaign in Bradford to move prostitutes out of Manningham was rightly presented as an issue for a whole community comprising both White people and people of Asian heritage, whereas articles in the *Yorkshire Post* almost exclusively saw the campaign as an Asian issue even though both newspapers quoted the same sources of Muslim Pakistani-heritage.⁶⁸

The editorial policy mentioned above did have important implications for the peacemaking carried out by the *Telegraph & Argus* in the area of community relations between White people and people of Asian heritage. The *Telegraph & Argus* framed the coverage of the riots as an issue for the whole community rather than pigeonholing it as an Asian issue separate from the rest of Bradford in two ways: firstly, by publishing a number of interviews with young Muslim Pakistani-heritage men and women which helped to broaden the popular view of the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community in Bradford, and secondly by avoiding the creation of a White-Asian divide in the riot coverage.

The interviews with young men and women of Muslim Pakistani-heritage came in the immediate aftermath of the disorders in Manningham. On June 12th a group of young men in their twenties discussed the underlying reasons for the riots under the heading *Frustrations that fuelled the riots*. The following day journalist Alam Khan wrote an article headed *We want a bobby on the beat here*, detailing the views of a group of male teenagers. And on June 15th, journalist Lucy Ward explored the views of a group of young women under the heading *Women's role in healing the scars*.

The articles were an important part of the *Telegraph & Argus'* peacemaking efforts for a number of reasons. Firstly, by seeking out the youths in youth clubs and schools, the newspaper was broadening media access to groups whose voices are not normally heard in the public forum. Broadening media access was important because it was a way in which the newspaper could show that it was taking seriously the concerns of the youths in Bradford and gave them an opportunity to air their views. It is also worth noting that the interviews served to show that the *Telegraph & Argus* took a fair and impartial approach to covering the riots which probably enhanced its credibility within the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community and made it more likely young people in Manningham would listen to messages for peace carried in the newspaper.

Laudable as the interviews were, however, it should not be forgotten that better access to the media for youths in Manningham in the time prior to the riots might have helped prevent them from happening altogether. As one young man complained after the disorders:

Why should it take something like this for people to realise that Manningham has problems?⁶⁹

Another young man said:

We are angry that everybody is jumping on the bandwagon now. Before the riots nobody wanted to look at the problems we have here, but now everybody is talking about how they should tackle it.⁷⁰

A young woman felt that the anger boiled over because it could find no other outlet:

The feeling was 'We have already sat and talked about it and we are just not going to get our point across'.⁷¹

However, it should also be pointed out that even if media access is difficult to obtain for young people in Manningham, they did not help themselves either when many adopted a rather hostile attitude to the media who sought their comments in the wake of the disorders. Journalist Alam Khan found it very difficult to find young people willing to talk to him:

When I went out into one of the situations and tried to get some of the young people together, a lot of them were very critical of the press, the media, because they said that they had been brandished as these hooligans. A lot of them were genuinely nice people and felt they had been hard done by because they had been tarnished in that way. I got a lot of abuse that day but I said: "This is your chance to say what you think and what you feel." Luckily they managed to see it that way and we talked. But a guy from ITN had gone ten minutes before me to one of these youth clubs and he had been told to ... goodbye. Politely.⁷²

The second reason for the importance of these interviews to the *Telegraph & Argus'* overall peacemaking efforts, was that in addition to exploring why the riots had happened, the articles were pointedly focusing on solutions and ways forward. Among suggestions on how to improve the situation for young people in Manningham were the cultivation of Asian-heritage sporting talent and the setting-up of a development association. One young man said:

By getting more people in charge of things they will feel more responsible and take pride in doing a good job. They will want to make it a success.⁷³

Others wanted a bobby on the beat to improve day-to-day relations between police and youths in Manningham, and more youth facilities to offset the feelings of boredom which many Muslim Pakistani-heritage youths saw as a major contributing factor to the riots.⁷⁴ Young Muslim Pakistani-

heritage women pointed to the need to improve race-relations by teaching school children of all communities about racism and good relations from an early age. They also thought it would be a good idea if there were more Asians in the police-force, and if police officers paid regular visits to schools to talk about police careers.⁷⁵

The interviews were important for a third reason. Together with other articles they helped make the public picture of Asian-heritage youth in Bradford far more complex than that of a riot-mob on the rampage by talking to school-girls, students, and young business men. The articles also helped question the idea that the riots could be explained solely as a question of race or religion - even though the group of rioters was made up almost exclusively of Muslim Pakistani-heritage boys and young men. Several young people pointed out that the riots were a “community issue”,⁷⁶ others that people joined in because “they were bored. They have nothing to do and nowhere to go.”⁷⁷ Some of the women felt that many of the young men were also spoiling for a fight:

“I think half of the men were there just for the buzz of it - just because the rest were involved. When the TV cameras were there they were getting in front of them and throwing bricks to show how macho they were.”⁷⁸

When interviewed, journalists at the *Telegraph & Argus* denied that there were any specific peacemaking reasons for making those interviews with young people from the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community. Rather they felt that the interviews were the proper journalistic way of covering the views of Asian-heritage youth instead of relying on what other people said about them. Journalist Alam Khan said:

A key aspect was to ask the people who were involved where the problems lie. Everybody was getting the blame, saying it was the Asian youths and that the rest of the Asian young people were just trouble-causers and had nothing better to do. But we actually went into the community and asked them how they felt about the situation. Rather than us making analysis and doing reports, we actually asked them. It was all their comments saying what they felt.⁷⁹

In addition to broadening the public picture of Asian-heritage youth in Bradford, the *Telegraph & Argus* also published articles where prominent members of the Asian-heritage community condemned and apologized for the violence of the young. Former Lord Mayor and councillor Mohammed Ajeeb made a public apology through the newspaper to businesses that were hit by vandalism during the riots.⁸⁰ Elsewhere, four Asian-heritage business-men in the Manningham area said that “what happened was so wrong” and they all recounted how the riots had affected their businesses negatively and condemned the youths for their actions.⁸¹ Nevertheless, the Bradford Commission Report was critical of the “limited publicity” given to the considerable

extent of apologetic feelings which existed in the local Muslim Pakistani-heritage community and implied that local media should have done more in this area of rebuilding community relations.⁸²

The White Community

At no point did the *Telegraph & Argus* single out white people for comment on the riots unless that person, or his or her business, had been directly affected by the events, whereas the *Yorkshire Post* did try to examine the divide between white people and people of Muslim Pakistani-heritage in an article headlined *Beyond spark that fired the tinder-box*. The article was an interview with four different white people living in Manningham and their reactions to the riots. Remarkably, the interviewees all expressed an understanding of the need to look at the underlying causes for the riots and to work together for a better future. A manager from a motor-dealership said: "This was bad, but we should take it as a warning of worse to come unless everybody gets together and works positively to give areas like Manningham more hope for the future." Another interviewee, from the city's Civic Society said: "I think many would agree that the basic problem is not racism, it's unemployment. We need a really wide-ranging independent inquiry and some pretty rapid bridge-building."⁸³

The question is, however, to what degree the article in the *Yorkshire Post* was representative of the views of the white population in Bradford at large. In the letters pages of the *Telegraph & Argus* in the days after the disorders there was plenty of evidence that many white people in Bradford nursed serious grievances against the rioters in general and Asian-heritage youth in particular. One R. Stephens from Heaton wrote on June 15th:

We have heard a great deal about the "demands" of the Asians. Now the white community, many of whom are also of immigrant backgrounds, should put their "demands." Respect for the law by all citizens should come top of the list.⁸⁴

Ann Noon wrote:

I am incensed about the behaviour of the Asian youths wanting an apology from the police. They were in the wrong. We who live up here are sick of how they get away with such rubbish they are giving out on the news. They are nothing but vandals. We have had years of it and it is time it was stopped.⁸⁵

A. J. Clarke wrote:

The police were not responsible for the orgy of violence that caused thousands of pounds worth of damage and left frightened people cowering in their homes fearful where the mob might strike next. Let us at least apportion blame where it belongs, namely with the marauding gangs of Asian youths who were intent from the start on

some kind of confrontation and the excuse to go on a wilful spree of wanton destruction.⁸⁶

At the *Telegraph & Argus*, journalists and the editor shared the view that the majority of the newspaper's readership had a negative attitude towards the Asian-heritage communities in Bradford. However, the editor made a conscious decision not to use riot coverage to add fuel to that fire, mainly because he found their attitude to be morally wrong:

I would say that the majority opinion [in Bradford] was: You know, the immigrants are at it again, I wish they would go away. If I am totally honest about it there is still that sort of underlying, innate racism ... I think there are situations like this where you have to make a judgment whether or not the majority opinion is necessarily the most constructive or progressive opinion, and take a moral stand that even the majority can be morally wrong. But it is a very difficult decision to take. A lot of it is on the hoof, and you go with the flow really. It is what you feel to be right at any given time. And I am as open to criticism as the next man for having taken that stance and I can only defend it on the grounds of what I and my colleagues here feel to be morally right.⁸⁷

Austin-Clarke nevertheless defended strongly the newspaper's decision to publish letters such as those quoted above:

If nothing else local newspapers have to be a forum for debate. That's part of their whole reason for existence really. We received a number of letters from people who were out and out racist: completely unreasonable, totally bigoted. And we filtered those. Having said that every reader is entitled to his or her opinion and provided that opinion is expressed in a way which is not likely to incite racial hatred or offensive in any way we are more than happy to publish it and allow them to get that view across. And there was a view that the Asian youths are nowhere nearly as badly mistreated as they like to think they are, and all we were trying to do was to strike a balance.⁸⁸

The editor also pointed out that the *Telegraph & Argus* had been criticised severely because a number of white readers felt that the newspaper had overstated the Asian case and not balanced it enough with views of how the white community felt about the situation. However, the publication of letters like those above helped to redress that imbalance.

Maintaining Good Relations II:

Community Relations Between the Police and the Asian-heritage Population

An important aspect of conflict analysis is an awareness of how coverage could impact on the future course of the conflict. As the conflict at a very basic level was about relations between the police and the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community in Manningham, it is interesting to look at how the *Telegraph & Argus* reported on that relationship in the context of the riots.

From the outset the *Telegraph & Argus* employed a very even-handed approach to covering the competing explanations of the riots which were put forward by the police and members of the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community - mainly because the newspaper found it impossible to determine the cause of events, as editor Perry Austin-Clarke explained:

To be honest I think our decision to keep it that well balanced purely arose out of the fact that there was no clear cut answer either way. It was almost as if the police had blundered into this by accident, and the Asians overreacted without really thinking about it. It just grew out of all proportion. In that sense you have got to be balanced. It would be very easy to take sides, edge your coverage one way or the other. We just felt that it wasn't a clear issue and therefore we needed to keep our coverage as balanced as we could. I actually believe both sides respected that. I don't think the police felt that we were underplaying their case, and I think the Asians felt they had a fair hearing, and we didn't oversell the police.⁸⁹

The editor, as well as the *Telegraph & Argus'* crime reporter, were quick to reject any suggestions that by virtue of their status as one of the newspaper's most important providers of news stories, the police's version of events would be considered more correct and trustworthy than that of members of the Asian-heritage community:

No. We never do that. I am the crime reporter, and I am the one who deals with them [the police], and I am fully prepared to write the truth. I never bury stuff to keep on their good side. There is no danger of that happening. They use us, and we use them.⁹⁰

Despite such protestations, it remains a fact that the police were not subjected to serious questioning by the *Telegraph & Argus* on the events in Garfield Avenue which triggered the disorders, or the subsequent decisions by the police to arrest people who went to the police station to protest peacefully about police behaviour during that incident. Nor did the *Telegraph & Argus* publicly comment on the curious amnesia which seemed to affect police recollections of events in Garfield Avenue until the case was finally presented - and dismissed - by the Magistrate's court four months later.

The even-handed approach was also employed by the *Telegraph & Argus* in the period immediately after the disorders when one of the main complaints of the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community in Manningham was that the police had behaved, and continued to behave, in a racist manner when dealing with members of their ethnic group. The police vigorously denied any suggestions of racism within its ranks, and the newspaper worked hard to ensure that the debate in its columns on this issue was carefully balanced between claim and counter-claim. After claims of police racism and lack of inter-cultural awareness had appeared in five different articles over the course of three days,⁹¹ the *Telegraph & Argus* published an interview with Assistant Chief Constable

Norman Bettison, who felt it would be unfair to “stereotype police as racist because of one incident”, but that as a result of the riots the police had “vowed to redouble all the efforts already being made to make police officers racially aware.”⁹² The following week the newspaper attempted to further broaden the discussion about police attitudes to ethnic minorities by including an article detailing training courses for police officers in matters of race relations as well as publishing an interview with a young Asian-heritage man who explained some of the reasons why it is difficult for the police to recruit people from the ethnic minorities. Rafaquat Hussain, who would like to train as a police officer - preferably in Bradford - said:

Theoretically that’s perfect, but it can’t be done. It would put me in an awkward position knowing so many people. I would lose my friends. It could be difficult for my family and myself if I arrested someone we know. I would be sworn at because I am Asian.⁹³

The disorders led to a number of legal actions and here, too, the *Telegraph & Argus* was treading very carefully in its coverage. The first indication of this came with the report shortly after the disorders that thirty eight people had been arrested and charged with offences ranging from arson, robbery, violent disorder, possessing offensive weapons to indecent assault and conspiracy to commit arson.⁹⁴ Rather than being a straight-forward account, the article was expanded to include statements from the police and community leaders that they were united in their desire to see those who had committed violent acts punished.⁹⁵

If police and community leaders were united in their desire to see perpetrators of violent crimes punished, there was still considerable disagreement over the charges of public disorder brought against the eight people arrested outside Lawcroft House police station on Friday night. Mid-July, the Crown Prosecution Service decided that it was not in the public interest to pursue these charges. This was reported in the *Telegraph & Argus*, but in a very understated manner that only mentioned the names of the defendants and the fact that five of them had successfully applied to have defence costs paid for them.⁹⁶

A similar understated manner was applied to the coverage of the court cases of the four people arrested in the original incident in Garfield Avenue. As opposed to the competing local newspaper, the *Yorkshire Post*, the *Telegraph & Argus* did not cover the prosecution’s case in any great detail - despite the fact that the story held plenty of potential for sensationalising. Readers of the *Yorkshire Post* learned that the police thought that the youths had behaved aggressively and violently - “repeatedly punching one officer on the back of his head”⁹⁷ - and that one of the four young men had behaved “like a wild animal.”⁹⁸ Readers of the *Telegraph & Argus* learned only little about these details; instead the newspaper focused on the story of the youths and that of

independent eye-witnesses.⁹⁹ When the Magistrate's Court cleared the four youths of all charges because there were "serious doubts about the reliability of police evidence and ... their case had collapsed like a pack of cards",¹⁰⁰ it was reported in the *Telegraph & Argus* under the headline *Public are urged: Look to the future*. Readers of the *Yorkshire Post*, on the other hand, learned of the events under the heading *Police evidence collapses 'like pack of cards' as four cleared over arrests which started rioting*.¹⁰¹ Considering the events which followed, it could have been tempting for the newspaper to use the court's decision to blame the police for having caused the riots, but editor Perry Austin-Clarke saw that as detrimental to fostering good community relations in Bradford:

I think it would have been wrong to give the impression that the whole thing was manufactured and this was the bad old police trying to cover their tracks. The police thought they had a genuine prosecution and they were proved wrong. It didn't seem in any way constructive or productive to perpetuate the idea [that they had been wrong] in the situation because the danger of that was it would be more ammunition for those people who wanted to get at the police.¹⁰²

However, Mr. Mohammed Taj - one of the three original members of the Bradford Commission - was highly critical of the behaviour of police during that trial, and in his report *A 'Can Do' City* he maintained that much more "public comment" should have been made on the fact that police officers had been misleading the court:

[Police] officers are selected and trained to observe events accurately, record those events accurately and present an account of those events accurately. It is a function of the oath they take to uphold the law. When a defendant or witness misleads it is immoral and illegal. When a police officer misleads it is immoral, illegal and constitutes a threat to policing itself and society as a whole.¹⁰³

From the peacemaking point of view it was probably important that the *Telegraph & Argus* kept a careful balance between the views of the police and those of the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community whilst still allowing the question of racism in the police to be aired rather than pushed under the carpet. In the tense and volatile situation immediately after the disorders, it could have been very counter-productive to give more public credence to one party than the other - in particular since, short of being present at every encounter between police and members of ethnic communities in Bradford, there was no way in which the *Telegraph & Argus* could verify whether the police were or were not carrying out their duties in a manner which could be described as racist. It is also interesting to note that in most of the articles dealing with the question of racism in the police force, journalists asked their interviewees to put forward ideas for solving the problem.¹⁰⁴

Supporting Efforts to Resolve the Conflict

From the very beginning, the editorial line at the *Telegraph & Argus* focused on preventing further violence through an understanding of the underlying causes of the riots. In an editorial on 12th June, the newspaper condemned the violent behaviour but stressed that:

their [the rioters'] grievances need to be listened to and the real problems identified ... All sections of the community now need to look hard for the answer and work together to ensure that the events of last weekend, which have done tremendous damage to Bradford's reputation in the outside world, don't happen again.¹⁰⁵

Soon the newspaper put its full weight behind the efforts of Bradford Council and the local Labour MP, Max Madden, to get Home Secretary Michael Howard to set up a judicial inquiry into the two nights of violence. In an editorial on June 13th, the newspaper argued that the resentment among young Asians needed to be aired through constructive suggestions to an inquiry rather than through violence. And the *Telegraph & Argus* continued:

The danger is that if this formal opportunity for them to express their feelings and opinions is not given, the tension will continue and there will be a constant danger of it erupting again. If that happened, it would do further damage to both Bradford's fragile racial harmony and any prospects of a revival from which we could all benefit.¹⁰⁶

On 19th June, Bradford MPs met with Home Secretary Michael Howard to ask for an independent inquiry to be set up. On that day the *Telegraph & Argus* published an editorial which again stressed the need for a public hearing. Copies of the editorial were sent to Mr. Howard and Mr. Madden before the meeting, and both Mr. Madden and local council leader Tony Cairns praised the editorial for its contents and the support the newspaper was giving to the call for a public hearing.¹⁰⁷ The editorial pointed to a number of peacemaking functions that an independent judicial inquiry could fulfil. According to the editorial, an inquiry could "examine the social, economic and religious issues which most believe form the confusing malaise of tension and unease which came to a head in the appalling over-reaction of a group of hot-headed young men." The editorial pointed out that at the very least an inquiry could act as "a cathartic exercise, allowing those involved to air their grievances and showing the whole community - not just the ethnic minorities - that Bradford's ills are taken seriously." In the view of the *Telegraph & Argus*, an independent inquiry would also prevent attention being focused too narrowly on the police, who could not be blamed for all the problems which led to the riots. However, the editorial also concluded that, ultimately, a public inquiry might do no more than prove that the problems facing the Muslim youth of Bradford are little different from those facing disaffected youth in any other inner-city area. Still, the newspaper felt that "such an inquiry would help show the outside world that Bradford's problems are not unique and that, in fact, good race relations normally apply - an

important message if the city is not to be blighted with a 'that's-a-dodgy-place-to-live' stigma and we are to continue attracting business and social investment."¹⁰⁸

When it became clear that Home Secretary Michael Howard was not going to set up an independent inquiry, the *Telegraph & Argus* in an editorial called the decision "disappointingly shortsighted", and the newspaper took issue with Mr. Howard over his suggestion that an independent inquiry could prove to be a source of conflict with various groups criticising each other:

Surely, instead, the formal proceedings would offer the best chance for grievances to be aired and issues discussed in a positive and constructive way.¹⁰⁹

The newspaper then switched its support to the efforts by Bradford Congress to set up a local hearing into the causes of the riots and what should be done to prevent any repeats of the events in early June. When the Bradford Congress announced its commission in early September 1995 the *Telegraph & Argus* made it front page news.¹¹⁰ A week later, the *Telegraph & Argus* helped the commission reach out to people affected by the riots by printing the commission's phone number as well as a coupon which people could send to the commission in order to request a special appointment.¹¹¹

Editor Perry Austin-Clarke explained the newspaper's public push for a judicial inquiry as growing out of a feeling that problems in Bradford needed to be seen to be taken seriously to avoid repeats in the future:

It wasn't enough to dismiss it as a few Asian youths getting a bit over-excited. There was plenty more to it than that and if we were to prevent it from happening again we would have to research it a bit more deeply and find out what was at the bottom of it. And we were concerned, really, that the only way you could get to the root of that would be for the government to publicly acknowledge that there was an issue, a problem, and to put some money into finding out what the roots of it were.¹¹²

When the Bradford Commission Report was published in November 1996 it was a major event for the *Telegraph & Argus*. On the day of the report's publication, the *Telegraph & Argus* published a ten page news special with key points from the report and reactions from a wide range of people in Bradford including politicians and the police. The next day the newspaper went one step further and on its own initiative published a twelve page supplement which summarised the main sections of the 216 pages long report. The rationale was to give the majority of Bradfordians an opportunity to read and assess the report for themselves. An editorial comment on the front of the supplement argued that:

Without it, readers will be left to judge its importance purely on the basis of reaction and response. You will not know whether those responses are correct because you will not know enough about what they are based on ... We have done our very best to

ensure that our paraphrasing is as accurate and objective as possible. We hope there are no crucial omissions; we hope to have offended no-one. Above all, we hope that the people of this city will be, at least, better informed for our efforts.¹¹³

Again, the efforts of the *Telegraph & Argus* are better appreciated by looking at how the *Yorkshire Post* covered the publication of the Bradford Commission Report. *Yorkshire Post* coverage was sparse indeed, with the main article headlined *Riots report 'a waste of money'*.¹¹⁴ The article covered the publication of the report as an event and did not go into any detail as regards its contents. Yet, the article did find the space to include severe criticisms of the report from members of the Asian-heritage community who attended the press launch of the report. The chair of Bradford Young People's Forum, Mohammed Amran, called the report a "cover-up", and research consultant, Manawar Jan-Khan, said that the report was "a very amateurish attempt - a farcical charade irrelevant to the community."¹¹⁵ From the journalistic point of view, the *Yorkshire Post* used a very traditional formula for covering the press launch of a report on a community issue, and it is this fact which, in comparison, makes the *Telegraph & Argus's* efforts so much more impressive and interesting in the context of community peacemaking. Of course, it should not be forgotten that the *Telegraph & Argus* also had a bigger economic interest in promoting the Bradford Commission Report than the *Yorkshire Post*: in Bradford, there was significant consumer interest in the commission report and coverage was therefore likely to boost sales significantly for a day or two (indeed, five and a half pages of the supplement consisted of special advertising), whereas the mainly Leeds-based audience of the *Yorkshire Post* probably did not have the same interest in reading at length about the problems of inner-city Bradford.

As mentioned above, one of the members of the Bradford Commission, Mr. Mohammed Taj, refused to sign the final commission report. A few days later he published his own report, *A 'Can Do' City* with suggestions for action as well as a number of criticisms that had been left out of the main report, and the *Telegraph & Argus* accorded Mr. Taj's report significant attention too and provided careful summaries of its main points.¹¹⁶

In the report, the Bradford Commission thanked the *Telegraph & Argus* for assisting them in their work even though the newspaper had "no pre-commitment to our work." The report called on the newspaper to continue its commitment to serious, independent, explanation of the grave issues raised in the report,¹¹⁷ and at the press launch of the report, the secretary of Bradford Congress, Charles Forgan, called on the media to keep the authorities in Bradford to task and help ensuring that the report was followed up.¹¹⁸ In as far as this is a peacemaking task, it is one that journalists at the *Telegraph & Argus* were happy to undertake:

We are the only people who can ensure that anything is actually done from that report. Otherwise, everybody will want to forget it. The police will want to forget. The council will. They have done bugger-all, anyway. All the different agencies in Bradford, which should be involved will want to forget it. It is down to us to keep the pressure on because we all know people who will be coming up and saying: "What's happening", and that makes an instant story, which needs a response [from these agencies]. So therefore they will be held publicly accountable by us.¹¹⁹

Prize and Praise

The efforts of the *Telegraph & Argus* did not go unnoticed. From very early on the newspaper was praised for its coverage of the riots. During a House of Commons debate on community relations in Bradford on 21st June 1995, Max Madden, the Labour MP for Bradford West, paid "tribute to the extremely responsible coverage of the local and regional media, including the newspaper and broadcasting media within the Bradford area and region" and went on to quote extensively from articles in the *Telegraph & Argus*.¹²⁰ Meanwhile Saeed Anwar in a letter to the *Telegraph & Argus* congratulated the paper for its positive journalism and said that he found that "the news, reporting and editorials on the two nights of rioting has been very fair."¹²¹

But the coverage also withstood the test of time. In April 1996 the *Telegraph & Argus* won the Commission for Racial Equality's Race in the Media award for regional and local newspapers. All the *Telegraph & Argus'* reporting, photographic and editorial production teams involved in the coverage of the riots were jointly nominated, and the judges praised the newspaper for its "indepth and responsible" coverage of the riots and its attempts at analysing the reasons for events and finding a way forward.¹²² Back in Bradford, the award was greeted with much enthusiasm by another reader of the newspaper, Dr. Mohammed Iqbal. Pointing out that Bradford had come a long way since the riots, Dr. Iqbal went on to stress that Bradford still needed a helping hand from the media to sort out the local and cultural divisions and misunderstandings:

We need a new spirit of co-operation and harmonious integration, and for this to emerge journalists have a responsibility to report the news fairly and accurately. If there is inaccuracy in the media, then this needs to be pointed out. In my experience the T&A has been willing to listen.¹²³

The praise was tempered by the Bradford Commission who said that they had encountered much local disappointment at the way the accounts of violence obscured the widespread anger with the police. The commission also reported that several people talking to them had criticised the local media for failing to take seriously the issues which confront Bradford.¹²⁴

Journalists at the *Telegraph & Argus*, however, felt that they deserved the prize and consider some of the above criticism to be the inevitable sour grapes of people who have themselves come in for criticism in the media. One journalist said:

The sad thing about it is that we got the credit from the Council for Racial Equality but I don't think we have got the credit from the city for what we did. Everyone is involved in it, so everyone is receiving criticisms and in turn they are critical of us. But it was good to get the credit because at least somebody recognised that we had taken this different stand-point in looking at the problems.¹²⁵

Section 5:

Limitations to Peacemaking Through the Media

No one should expect peace to be a result of newspaper writings alone. No media organisation exists in a vacuum when covering community conflict, and much depends on the attitudes of the media consumer, the actors in the conflict, and what other media are saying about the situation as well. After a brief summary of the *Telegraph & Argus*' peacemaking efforts after the Bradford riots, this section will nevertheless proceed to discuss whether the newspaper could have done more as a way of identifying some key limitations to resolving community conflict through the media.

The *Telegraph & Argus* made major contributions to the overall peacemaking efforts of the Bradford community in the wake of the Bradford riots. Less responsible media might have fallen into the trap of trying to capitalise on the sensational aspects of the riots and let the coverage be dominated by stories of violence, black-and-white descriptions of rioters versus police, and the grievances of victims of the riots. Instead, the newspaper framed its riot-coverage as a community-issue which all Bradfordians - including the media - should not only be concerned about but should also feel obliged to help resolve.

The *Telegraph & Argus* contributed to both negative and positive peacemaking. In the first weeks after the riots, the emphasis in the community was on avoiding a repeat in the build-up to the Mela. Repeated calls for calm and condemnations of the violence sent a powerful message to the youths that their behaviour was not acceptable, but at the same time the newspaper acknowledged their cause for grievance through editorials and opening their columns to the views of members of the young Muslim Pakistani-heritage community in Manningham. Similarly, the newspaper did at no point favour the police account of events over that of the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community and allowed both parties a fair hearing - something which did not go unnoticed in this community.

In terms of positive peace, the *Telegraph & Argus* took several valuable steps. Firstly, the newspaper helped maintain an atmosphere within the community which conveyed the message that the riots were something that could be overcome - it did not spell the end to either good race-relations or investment in Bradford. Secondly, the *Telegraph & Argus* went to great lengths to ensure that the public picture of the Asian-heritage community was more complex than that of a riot-mob on the rampage. Thirdly, the paper pushed hard for the establishment of some form of public enquiry into the underlying social causes of the riots as a way of addressing these problems in a more long-term manner. And when the Bradford Commission finally reported eighteen months later, the *Telegraph & Argus* published an extensive summary of the whole report to allow people throughout Bradford to be able to read the commission's findings for themselves.

The Role of Media Audiences

The question remains though, whether the *Telegraph & Argus* as gatekeepers of a forum for public communication could have done more to promote peaceful relations in Bradford. The Bradford Commission's main conclusion about the problems facing Bradford pointed to an overwhelming need for improved communications and mutual understanding between the city's different groupings:

Bradford's problems are inadequately perceived, and inadequately bridged, and Bradford's problems are actually shared across wrongly perceived divides, with the result that Bradford's economy, public services, and local politics have not come to terms with the nature, the circumstances, or the potential of Bradford's present and future population.¹²⁶

The Bradford Commission went on to say:

We suggest that the themes we have identified in our Report, coming as they do from the concerns expressed by many people from a variety of backgrounds, are worthy subjects for urgent *mutual* exploration. The extent to which this challenge is accepted will identify the bridge builders. Only in this way can the solutions be developed to the problems which are shared.¹²⁷

A community newspaper like the *Telegraph & Argus* would seem an obvious forum for starting such a process of exploring Bradford's social and economic problems and building understanding between different ethnic groups in the city. Whereas the editor of the *Telegraph & Argus*, Perry Austin-Clarke agrees, in principle, that his newspaper should be an integral part of the communication process in Bradford, he also points to limitations that arise out of the fact that the primary function of a community newspaper is not to be an agency of social change, it is a business set up to supply consumers with a particular product. To have devoted even more

resources to detailed descriptions of life in Manningham for people of Muslim Pakistani-heritage in the name of building awareness and understanding of the situation there, would have made his current readership turn away, he believes:

It is very difficult for us as a newspaper to very actively pursue detailed issues within the ethnic communities to any greater extent than we would have a white issue. You have got to balance the level of interest across your readership. We know, as a matter of fact, that we have a higher proportion of readership in the white community than we do in the Asian community. Even now we have people who say: "I have cancelled the T&A because there are too many Asians in it." I don't believe that we should actively go out and upset that balance. It is in nobody's interest if we end up having a large minority of ethnic readers and the white readers all desert us. That would knock the balance completely and we would not achieve any integration.¹²⁸

Under such circumstances, building mutual understanding through newspaper articles necessarily becomes subordinated to the overall news agenda which is accepted by the majority of the readership, regardless of how much journalists might have wanted to pursue the issues raised in a number of reports which say that almost every indicator of stress and poverty shows the Manningham area to be faring worse than the city as a whole.¹²⁹ Austin-Clarke felt there was a limit to how much the *Telegraph & Argus* could justify continuing coverage of issues raised by the riots without an event - or newspeg - which was widely accepted by the readership as a reason for bringing up the issues again. Anniversaries of particular events are often considered valid newspegs and on the first anniversary of the disorders the *Telegraph & Argus* published a week-long series of articles about life in Manningham under the theme "One Year On",¹³⁰ talking to women, youths, police, business people and a member of the Bradford Commission to find out what people thought about the situation now. But the newspeg did not hold up with all the readership, some of whom criticised the paper severely for the articles, and the editor was therefore looking forward to the publication of the Bradford Commission Report as a way of justifying further coverage of issues raised by the riots:

We came in for criticism for going back and raking over the coals again and bringing up issues that people had hoped were swept under the carpet. I think we had a responsibility to ensure that they did not just slide under the carpet ... but I don't think you could deal with it constantly. I think there are issues that will arise out of the report that we will then go back on in a bit more depth. But that's on the back of the official report highlighting the issues and therefore the paper is not open to charges of "you are just dredging it up again for sensationalism" which is the sort of thing you get, if you don't get that balance right.¹³¹

The above points also underline why it would have been difficult for the *Telegraph & Argus* to have volunteered its services and columns for a community inquiry, even if many of the peacemaking functions that the newspaper itself ascribed to a public inquiry (see above), at least in theory,

could have been carried out by the newspaper - such as the examination of social, economic and religious issues and providing a public forum for a cathartic exercise where everybody involved could air their grievances. The limited acceptance by readers and advertisers of a newspaper devoting scarce journalistic resources to one issue, to the exclusion of others over a long period of time, would probably have led to lost sales and advertising revenue for the *Telegraph & Argus*. Similarly, an inquiry carried out by a newspaper (or another media organisation) would probably suffer from a number of other drawbacks: as an essentially self-appointed inquiry it would lack the prestige society confers on an inquiry set up by the political establishment; it would probably not be considered independent in the same manner as an official inquiry and thanks to widespread suspicion of the motives of the media in general, a newspaper inquiry might have problems attracting statements and testimonies from all sectors of society; and finally neither the training of journalists, nor everyday newsgathering practices are currently geared towards undertaking such a long-term exercise.

Another example of the limitations on peacemaking imposed by the composition of a given media organisation's audience can be seen in the fact that in 1997 West Yorkshire Police chose the Bradford-based Sunrise Radio rather than the *Telegraph & Argus* as partners for a fifty two week series of programmes aiming to educate the public about the work of the police. The series was put together specifically in the wake of the disorders which had exposed huge gaps in the general knowledge within Asian-heritage communities in Bradford about police practices and how to go about expressing concerns about police behaviour.¹³² In principle, there are no reasons why the *Telegraph & Argus* could not have embarked on a similar project with the aim of improving relations between the police and ethnic communities in Bradford with an Asian heritage - in particular since much of the information contained in such articles would probably be interesting and new for many other people in Bradford too. However, the police wanted in particular to reach out to the Asian-heritage communities in Bradford, and Sunrise Radio was probably the best choice as 80% of the Asian people in Bradford listen to the radio-station.¹³³ It should also be acknowledged that it is a general problem in Bradford that many people of Asian heritage do not speak or read English very well, and therefore the oral medium of the radio, combined with the radio's willingness and ability to broadcast information in different Asian languages, made Sunrise Radio better suited to this particular peacemaking task.

The above discussion implies that whilst being very real and commendable, the *Telegraph & Argus'* efforts of peacemaking during and after the Bradford riots were also limited to periods of time when the editor believed the majority of the readership would accept that issues raised by the disorders were newsworthy. Peacemaking thereby became an editorial angle on a story that

would be run regardless, not an aim in and by itself. This is an important distinction because journalists at the *Telegraph & Argus* found it possible to justify peacemaking angles on stories but were in general very uneasy about being called peacemakers. To them peacemaking implied something more active and overtly political than what could be justified by traditional journalistic norms of impartiality, as one of them explained:

It makes out like we are going out proactively searching for peace and getting everyone round the table, and all we did was to collate the facts and present them in a certain way, and in the reporting afterwards we just gave voices to people. We didn't come down and take a line saying: The police is terrible, the Asian community is terrible, and the council is terrible. We just behaved as the Fourth Estate reporting and voicing people's opinions on what had happened.¹³⁴

Another journalist said:

I think it is for us to report the picture fairly and in an unbiased manner and to let the public know what they can do. It is not up to us to do it. We give them the information, it is up to them to do it.¹³⁵

Moving on to more practical issues, it should also be pointed out that the *Telegraph & Argus'* peacemaking efforts were probably hampered by the widespread distrust of the media on the ground in Manningham. As mentioned above, journalists generally found it very difficult to make contact with young people in Manningham, but other people too withheld their cooperation. The Bradford Commission Report remarked on how instant commentaries by the media on the situation caused great local anger, and that, as a consequence, many local people involved in calming things down refused to cooperate with the media. From the point of view of utilising public communication for peacemaking purposes, it is a problem if the voices of responsible people working for reconciliation are not heard in the public forum and the platform is left open to more extreme points of view. As mentioned above, the *Telegraph & Argus* did in fact present the views of many of the conflict-resolvers on the ground, but reporters had to work hard to point out that the *Telegraph & Argus* was taking a different approach to covering the disorders than most other media as one of them said:

One thing in the Commission report that annoyed me a great deal because I had never heard of it...was the criticism of media for stunting up pictures. We had a difficult position because of the way everyone sees the media. We were tarred with that brush even if we struck our own path which was totally different to everybody else.¹³⁶

The general scepticism about the media also boiled over during the two nights of rioting and probably caused some journalists to question the degree to which they personally wanted to be involved in efforts of peacemaking. One *Telegraph & Argus* photographer was threatened twice

when covering the disturbances and had his film removed from the camera - the first time at knife-point.¹³⁷ Another *Telegraph & Argus* journalist described to a trade journal his four hour duty that night as “the most frightening experience I have ever had as a journalist.”¹³⁸ And one *Telegraph & Argus* journalist declined to be interviewed for this research with these words:

As I am not interested in peace-keeping roles for journalists there’s little point in talking to me about the 1995 riots. My principal concern was not getting a knife in the ribs or a bottle in the face. The line of riot police was a joy to see.¹³⁹

Journalists are traditionally assumed to be neutral when covering events, but it is legitimate to question the degree to which that is possible at times when parties to a conflict choose to turn on individual journalists and make them targets too. In fact, the decision by the *Telegraph & Argus* to pursue an agenda of peacemaking despite the distress its personnel experienced during the disorders should be considered a tribute to the newspaper.

It seems prudent to finish this extensive analysis of the *Telegraph & Argus*’ peacemaking efforts with a word of caution from editor Perry Austin-Clarke not to overestimate what the newspaper did. Academic analysis generally wants to impose order on complex realities by careful combing through the evidence retrospectively, and in this case study that has been a useful tool for identifying some potential peacemaking roles for newspapers covering community conflict. However, time is a luxury which newspapers seldom have when dealing with unfolding events, which is why the editor’s words are worth keeping in mind when discussing peacemaking through the media:

If I am completely honest about it we would have blundered into doing the right or the wrong thing in a number of ways throughout our coverage. We are not so clever that every word we write is carefully analysed to make sure we get our lines right. I have to say that the whole thing was probably influenced by the fact that most of the journalists on this paper live in the community as well, and - for all that a riot makes a jolly good story, for all that macho journalistic instinct - none of those journalists wanted it to happen again, for it to be repeated and continued in that part of the community. So I am sure that would have moved them just in subtle ways, subconscious ways.¹⁴⁰

Notes

1. The term Asian is used widely in Bradford as a way of referring to people of South Asian heritage without making distinctions between national backgrounds or religious affiliations. However, the approximately 14% of the Bradford population who have South Asian heritage have their roots in many different places such as Bangladesh, the Punjab areas of Pakistan and India, Gujrat in India, and Mirpur in Pakistan, and the group not only contains Muslims but also Hindus and Sikhs. The largest of all Bradford's South Asian heritage communities is the Muslim Pakistani-heritage community who also make up the majority of the population in Manningham, where the riots took place. For information about the population of Bradford see Bradford Commission Report: *The Report of an inquiry into the wider implications of public disorders in Bradford which occurred on 9, 10 and 11 June 1995*, November 1996, The Stationary Office, London. Section 1.7 deals at length with the problem of terminology and in particular with the inaccuracy of the term Asian in the context of Bradford.
2. Bradford Commission Report, op. cit., p. 66, paragraph 4.25.1
3. Ibid., p. 57, paragraph 4.17.16, and p. 73, paragraph 4.30.5
4. Ibid., p. 64, paragraph 4.22.3
5. Bradford Congress partners are Bradford Council, Bradford and District Training and Enterprise Council, Bradford Chamber of Commerce, Bradford Breakthrough Ltd., Bradford University, the Health Authority, West Yorkshire Police and Bradford Trades Council
6. Ibid., pp. 70-71, section 4.28
7. "Riots began with minor incident, PC tells court", *Yorkshire Post*, 26 September 1995. Police only gave their version of events in public when the four youths originally arrested were put on trial in late September and early October 1995.
8. Ibid.
9. "Riot-case man 'was like wild animal'", *Yorkshire Post*, 27 September 1995
10. "Riot Police or Police Riot? A critical study of the recent riots in Bradford", *Trends*, Issue 6:5, July/August 1995, pp 4-7
11. "Public are urged: Look to the future", *Telegraph & Argus*, 7 October 1995 and "Police evidence collapses 'like pack of cards' as four cleared over arrests which started rioting", *Yorkshire Post*, 7 October 1995.
12. The Bradford Commission Report, op. cit., p. 36, paragraph 4.8.8
13. Ibid., p. 40, paragraph 4.9.3
14. Ibid., pp 33-35
15. Ibid., p. 35, paragraph 4.7.15
16. Ibid., p. 34, paragraph 4.7.17
17. Ibid., p. 41, section 4.10
18. Ibid., p. 42, paragraph 4.10.7
19. Ibid., p. 45, paragraph 4.12.1
20. Ibid., pp 45-46, section 4.12
21. Ibid., p. 53, paragraph 4.15.2
22. Ibid., p. 54, paragraph 4.16.3
23. Ibid., pp. 54-55, section 4.16
24. Ibid., p. 72, paragraph 4.29.5

25. Foundation 2000: *Disturbances in Manningham: A Community Response: "The Voices MUST Be Heard!"*, 1995, p. 9
26. "Night of fear then back to business", *Telegraph & Argus*, 12 June 1995
27. "Riot damage bill reached £1m, police chief reveals", *Telegraph & Argus*, 17 June 1995. In an article "Terrible tally of weekend's violence" in the *Yorkshire Post*, the damages were listed as follows: thirty cars damaged, fifty buildings damaged, six business premises burgled, eight arson attacks, five cars burnt out, two reports of assault and wounding, four reports of robbery, two cars stolen, and three homes damaged and one flat burgled.
28. Bradford Commission Report, op.cit., p. 58, paragraph 4.18.3
29. "We must heal these wounds", *Telegraph & Argus*, 12 June 1995
30. "Charges linked to riots dropped", *Yorkshire Post*, 22 June 1995
31. "Public are urged: Look to the future", *Telegraph & Argus*, 7 October 1995
32. Bradford Commission Report, op. cit., pp. 65-66, paragraphs 4.24.4 and 4.24.5
33. "Riots: No action against officers", *Telegraph & Argus*, 10 April 1996. See also section 4.4 in the Bradford Commission Report, op. cit., pp. 30-31
34. "No riot charge for PCs", *Telegraph & Argus*, 23 January 1996
35. "Congress to probe cause of city riots", *Telegraph & Argus*, 7 September 1995
36. Ibid.
37. The Bradford Commission Report, op. cit., paragraphs 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 1.13.2
38. M. Taj: *A 'Can Do' City: Supplementary observations, comments and recommendations by M. Taj to the Bradford Commission Report*, Bradford, November 1996, p. 3
39. "Council declares war on inner city poverty: Now it's time to act", *Telegraph & Argus*, 21 March 1997
40. The riots were covered with news-stories, analysis and editorials in the *Observer, Times, Today, Daily Express, Daily Mail, Daily Mirror, Daily Telegraph, Guardian* and *Independent*.
41. The Bradford Commission Report noted that one of the particular regrets in Bradford about the disorders was that they created one more item for the national media to add to a longstanding fascination with bad news about Bradford. Bradford Commission Report, op. cit., p. 202, paragraph 7.17.3
42. See for instance "Simmering tensions boiled up into violence", *Daily Telegraph*, 12 June 1995
43. It is interesting to note, however, that the Bradford *Telegraph & Argus* described the campaign as originating amongst residents and community groups and never called campaigners Muslim or Asian, whereas the *Yorkshire Post* called the campaign the "escalating conflict between Bradford's prostitutes and the city's Asian population". See "Death fears as city prostitutes conflict grows", *Yorkshire Post*, 10 May 1995
44. For instance, the *Independent* wrote under the headline "'Volcano of tension' was ready to erupt": Dissatisfaction with police action on kerbcrawlers is a growing source of conflict between police and religious leaders. ...Many in the community feel that the police have not displayed a high enough profile or considered the problem a particularly serious one. Faqir Mohammed, acting president of the Bradford Council of Mosques, said: "Youngsters and even their parents are not happy with the police and they are tired with their behaviour and attitude. The situation was like lava in a volcano waiting to erupt." *Independent*, 12 June 1995
45. Bradford Commission Report, op.cit., pp 104-107, section 5.22, and pp 112-115, section 5.26
46. Ibid., op.cit., p. 74, paragraph 4.31.5
47. "Riots: No action against officers", *Telegraph & Argus*, 10 April 1996
48. "Flame mobs fight police", *Telegraph & Argus*, 10 June 1995

49. Interviewed on 11 December 1996, journalist Alam Khan said: “*It was mainly Asian people, we can’t hide that, but there were other people. I feel a bit offended by this sometimes because we were at the scene and there were English people as well [throwing stones].*”
50. Interview with the editor of the *Telegraph & Argus*, Perry Austin-Clarke, 5 August 1996
51. Ibid.
52. Interview, 11 December 1996
53. “Urgent pleas for peace as community leaders gather to find the way ahead after a weekend of turmoil: We must heal these wounds”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 12 June 1995
54. “Plea for peace: The Bishop of Bradford asks for violence to be put aside and dialogue to begin: Act now to deal with grievances”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 14 June 1995, “United plea for weekend of peace and calm”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 16 June 1995, and “Religious leaders’ call for understanding”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 17 June 1995
55. Foundation 2000, op.cit., p. 37
56. “Mela fee to be dropped”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 24 June 1995
57. “Marvellous”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 3 July 1995
58. “Developers give vote of confidence”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1995
59. “It’s business as usual, say riot-hit traders”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 15 June 1995
60. “Planning to build a brighter future”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1995
61. “‘Terrible blow’ to city businesses for years ahead after clean-up”, *Yorkshire Post*, 13 June 1995
62. “Riot-area traders ‘on brink of folding’”, *Yorkshire Post*, 11 July 1995
63. Ibid.
64. Interview, 11 December 1996
65. “Cries we must all listen to”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 12 June 1995
66. Interview, 5 August 1996
67. Ibid.
68. Contrast for instance: “Death fears as city prostitutes conflict grows”, *Yorkshire Post*, 10 May 1995, with “Call for ‘vice zone’”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 25 May 1995
69. “Frustrations that fuelled the riots”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 12 June 1995
70. Ibid.
71. “Women’s role in healing the scars”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 15 June 1995
72. Interview, 11 December 1996
73. “Frustrations that fuelled the riots”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 12 June 1995
74. “We want a bobby on the beat here”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1995
75. “Women’s role in healing the scars”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 15 June 1995
76. “Frustrations that fuelled the riots”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 12 June 1995
77. “We want a bobby on the beat here”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1995
78. “Women’s role in healing the scars”, *Telegraph & Argus*, 15 June 1995

79. Interview, 11 December 1996
80. "Ajeeb's anger at violence", *Telegraph & Argus*, 14 June 1995
81. "What happened was so wrong", *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1995
82. Bradford Commission Report, op.cit., page 69, paragraph 4.26.14
83. "Beyond spark that fired the tinderbox", *Yorkshire Post*, 13 June 1995
84. R. Stephens: Letter to the editor, *Telegraph & Argus*, 15 June 1995
85. Ann Noon: Letter to the editor, *Telegraph & Argus*, 15 June 1995
86. A.J. Clarke, letter to the editor, *Telegraph & Argus*, 23 June 1995
87. Interview, 5 August 1996
88. Ibid.
89. Ibid.
90. Interview with Alun Palmer, 11 December 1996
91. For instance, in the article "We want a bobby on the beat here": *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1995, a young man in Manningham explained: "The police were being racist and incited the gangs and they responded with aggression. People were sick of being pushed around." Meanwhile young women talked to reporter Lucy Ward who reported under the headline: "Women's role in healing the scars", *Telegraph & Argus*, 15 June 1995: "All say that they have experience of male friends or relatives being treated heavy-handedly by police in incidents prior to the riots". The same day Lucy Ward also reported from a meeting in Manningham under the headline: "Police accused of continuing to harass Asian community", and a few days earlier the newspaper reported on a call from Asian business leaders for improved inter-cultural skills training for Bradford police officers under the headline: "Help build bridges with youth, police told", *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1995.
92. "The police 'are not to blame' ", *Telegraph & Argus*, 16 June 1995
93. "All change in 30 years of training" and "Why Asians fear to join the police", *Telegraph & Argus*, 21 June 1995
94. "38 people face court as riot probe goes on", *Telegraph & Argus*, 12 July 1995
95. Ibid. In the article Chief Constable Keith Hellawell said that he was "encouraged by the level of cooperation from the community". Councillor Altaf Hussein said about the police's investigations: "Generally, the police are doing a thorough job in finding these people. I don't think there will be any problems in the community over this."
96. "Prosecution drops riot case charges", *Telegraph & Argus*, 15 July 1995
97. "Riot began with minor incident, PC tells court", *Yorkshire Post*, 26 September 1995
98. "Riot-case man 'was like wild animal'", *Yorkshire Post*, 27 September 1995
99. "Court told of boy's agony as police car 'ran over foot'", *Telegraph & Argus*, 2 October 1995, "Court awaits the outcome of 'riot' trial", *Telegraph & Argus*, 6 October 1995
100. "Public are urged: Look to the future", *Telegraph & Argus*, 7 October 1995
101. "Police evidence collapses 'like pack of cards' as four cleared over arrests which started rioting", *Yorkshire Post*, 7 October 1995
102. Interview, 5 August 1996
103. Mohammed Taj, op.cit., p. 9

104. See for instance: "We want a bobby on the beat here": *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1995; "Women's role in healing the scars", *Telegraph & Argus*, 15 June 1995; "Help build bridges with youth, police told", *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1995 and "All change in 30 years of training" and "Why Asians fear to join the police", *Telegraph & Argus*, 21 June 1995
105. "Cries we all must listen to", *Telegraph & Argus*, 12 June 1995
106. "Need for a formal inquiry", *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1995
107. "Urgent move to set up local inquiry into riots", *Telegraph & Argus*, 20 June 1995. In the article Max Madden said: "I was extremely pleased with the support which the T & A gave to the call for a public inquiry." Council leader Tony Cairns said: "I find myself in complete agreement with the editorial comment in the T&A last night. I couldn't have put it better."
108. "Vital need for hearing", *Telegraph & Argus*, 19 June 1995
109. "Refusal a setback", *Telegraph & Argus*, 20 June 1995
110. "Congress to probe cause of city riots", *Telegraph & Argus*, 7 September 1995
111. "Public asked for views on the riots", *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 October 1995
112. Interview, 5 August 1996
113. The Bradford Commission Report, 12 page news special, *Telegraph & Argus*, 21 November 1996
114. "Riots report 'a waste of money'", *Yorkshire Post*, 21 November 1996
115. Ibid.
116. "Why I didn't sign riot report", *Telegraph & Argus*, 25 November 1996
117. Bradford Commission Report, op.cit., p. 202, paragraph 7.17.2
118. Remarks made at news conference at Stakis Hotel in Bradford, 20 November 1996, in response to question from *Telegraph & Argus* reporter
119. Interview with reporter Alun Palmer, 11 December 1996
120. House of Commons debate on Bradford (Community Relations) 21st June 1995, *Hansard*, column 283
121. Saeed Anwar: "Journalism at its most positive", letter in the *Telegraph & Argus*, 24 June 1995
122. "T&A award for riots coverage", *Telegraph & Argus*, 23 April 1996,
123. Dr. Mohammed Iqbal: "How a spirit of harmony can help us to build a better future", *Telegraph & Argus*, May 3 1996
124. Bradford Commission Report, op.cit., p. 74, paragraph 4.31.6 and p. 202, paragraph 7.17.2
125. Interview with crime reporter Alun Palmer, 11 December 1996
126. Bradford Commission Report, op.cit., p. 9, paragraph 1.13.2
127. Ibid., p. 91, paragraphs 5.9.5-6
128. Interview, 5 August 1996
129. Mohammed Taj, op.cit., p. 5
130. "It's time to put it all behind us now", *Telegraph & Argus*, 10 June 1996, "Light at the end of the tunnel", *Telegraph & Argus*, 11 June 1996, "It's been good to talk", *Telegraph & Argus*, June 12 1996, "Picking up the Pieces", *Telegraph & Argus*, 13 June 1996, "One man's search for an answer", *Telegraph & Argus*, 14 June 1995
131. Interview, 5 August 1996

132. "Police in radio link with public", *Telegraph & Argus*, 10 June 1997
133. Ibid.
134. Interview with journalist Alun Palmer, 11 December 1996
135. Interview with journalist Olwen Vasey, 11 December 1996
136. Interview with journalist Alun Palmer, 11 December 1996
137. "Streets turned into urban battleground", *Telegraph & Argus*, 12 June 1995 and Bradford Commission Report, op.cit., p. 58, paragraph 4.17.20
138. Bradford Commission Report, ibid.
139. Letter dated 4 December 1996
140. Interview, 5 August 1996

Bibliography

Reports

Bradford Commission Report: The Report of an inquiry into the wider implications of public disorders in Bradford which occurred on 9, 10 and 11 June 1995, November 1996, The Stationary Office, London

Foundation 2000: Disturbances in Manningham: A Community Response: "The Voices MUST Be Heard!", 1995

M. Taj: A 'Can Do' City: Supplementary observations, comments and recommendations by M. Taj to the Bradford Commission Report, Bradford, November 1996

Newspapers and Magazines

Telegraph & Argus, Bradford

Trends, vol. 6:5, 1995, London

Yorkshire Post, Leeds

Biographical Note

Kirsten Sparre trained and worked as a journalist in Denmark for a number of years before coming to the Department of Peace Studies. She gained an MA in Peace Studies in 1991 and is currently in the final stages of writing up a PhD thesis on potential peacemaking roles for journalists.