

**POWER Inquiry Witness Session – Glasgow**

**Witness Session  
10am-4pm, 28 January 2005**

**Centre for Contemporary Arts  
350 Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow, G2 3JD**

**People least likely to vote**

**Witnesses:**

Audrey Bronstein – Director, Oxfam UK Poverty Programme  
Raji Hunjan – Co-Director, Carnegie Young People Initiative  
Professor Shamit Saggat – Sussex University & Yale University

**Abbreviations**

AM	Audience Member [individual names indicated]	
BF	Ben Freeman	Commissioner
BM	Bano Murtuja	Commissioner
EB	Emma B	Commissioner
FM	Ferdinand Mount	Commissioner
HK	Helena Kennedy	Commissioner
PC	Phil Carey	Commissioner
PB	Paul Boakye	Commissioner
AB	Audrey Bronstein	Witness
RH	Raji Hunjan	Witness
SS	Shamit Saggat	Witness

**Afternoon Q&A Session**

AM: [Willie Sullivan] I take your point about the media being the kind of only... it's the only cultural link in a way, I mean you're talking about a huge population, how do we all identify with each other and how do we get to develop any sort of identity, it can only be through the mass media...in Scotland and people in the South of England... yes that's true but what sort of cultural identity has the media developed?

And we're all talking about the political media here and that's because that's what we're interested in but to be honest the majority of people aren't really interested in that, they don't read it, they don't look at it.

The media that I'm more concerned about is the media my daughter watches advertisements on the TV for toys and immediately says 'I want that' because I just feel that she's being brainwashed into being a consumer. The identity that's developed for us... I feel like my identity's been stolen sometimes, you know my identity is what I wear, what I drive, where I live... is that really what we are, you know? I think that's a big problem and my only solution to that is we need to... people are starting to become aware on the whole, the way reading research that has been done by the New Economics Foundations and stuff as well... people are becoming aware that just acquiring and having more things is actually not making them any happier and that level of awareness-raising is when we really start to challenge where the real power is because the people that aren't participating, they've come to realise something that perhaps you haven't and that is that power isn't very much more in institutions and politics.

HK: I'm going to ask a few questions and a few comments and ask people to reflect on them. Anyone else? Yes, the woman and then the gentleman at the front.

AM: [Martha Wardrop] I have nothing to discuss at all, it's just to look at electoral reform and to try to look at proportional representation for the UK parliament and also for gender balancing. I'd like to see that being taken forward as one of the solutions.

PD: Sorry, as one of the solutions of what?

AM: [Martha Wardrop] Basically to revitalise democracy – that was have to look at a structural approach for the whole decision-making and also the power of London, which nobody has really touched on. An extension of that is the Olympic bid and all the media coverage around focused on London as the centre where everything happens, it means that a lot of people in Scotland and the north don't have a link, we don't have any say, London has the say.

AM: [Richard Speight] I'm Richard Speight from Hull University. It's quite interesting listening to a lot of comments being made, and especially the comment you made about the atomised society and the fact that there's 60 million different peoples opinions having to be accommodated in the system. I think this lends itself to some of the models of democracy developed by David Held, for example, who's talking very much about self-government and how actually extending self-government and devolving power to the lowest possible level, the atomised level, and up to the highest level in terms of some of the issues that especially some of the young people are interested in, in terms of global poverty and environmental issues. I mean if you redevelop at the highest level and at the lowest level in terms of developing active communities and participation can only be done through having self-government where control is done at the appropriate level but at the lowest level possible, so closer to the individual to make it more relevant and I think that's something that the Commission should take on board.

HK: So the idea coming out of that being that there are some issues which you do need Executive Government type thing for but that much more should travel down the line and bring it closer to the individual person to be getting more and

more control over the decisions that are closest to their lives. Right the gentleman on the back row?

AM: [Dylan Jeffrey] Yes, going back to some of the points. I think there has been some sort of re-invigoration of democracy where we've seen a... not carbon copy but a copy within local government has replicated central government as a scrutiny so that's where the Executive are held to account and certainly the parliamentary system is probably the most volatile area in terms of holding the Executive to account. We try to replicate that within local government. Similarly I think...

HK: What do you mean scrutiny?

AM: [Dylan Jeffrey] Scrutinising decisions of the Executive, effectively... because we've gone more towards the Executive Government, the local regional or national level and then there is the ability certainly for more scrutiny to take place following recent changes in legislation.

My second point is just looking in terms of the volatility of society, I think it's less volatile now in terms of actions, whether it be demonstrations, direct action because of these professional lobbyist groups or consultant groups or focus groups or whatever you want to say or call them, because there's more engagement and interaction with them in terms of listening to what they say and it's worth noting as well and I don't think anyone's mentioned the disabled which is another key group who are often excluded but have recently got it together in terms of joining together as one approach in terms of being responsive to national issues.

HK: The disabled were mentioned, they were mentioned in the context of where government has been responsive and yet they haven't to the poor, and of course the difference being that there is under it all this subtle feeling that somehow the poor have got themselves in this mess because of their own fecklessness, there's that undercurrent.

AM: I was interested in the earlier discussion when you were talking about trying to hold this government more to account, I was wondering whether having a federal chamber to replace the House of Lords, that proportional representation, and perhaps get a mix of other parties and in that second chamber hopefully we won't get new Labour or Conservative dominating it, and we might have a bit more of a mix.

AM: [Andy Thompson] Andy Thompson, Edinburgh University. I just think that we also have to think about asking people themselves how involved they want to be because it's all about setting up systems, mechanisms, constitutional change and so on, and I think again there's often a mistake made that people either are totally involved or they're not involved at all and there are often many shades of willingness or desire to be involved and I think a lot of it is if you actually look at what are the enablers and the barriers to people's involvement and I say this from my own research in healthcare, it's very often very simply to do with personal capacity issues which isn't just about resources which were mentioned this morning but also about confidence, assertiveness, often based on education and

so on and also organisational opportunities – so we've got to get both of those right. And within that then we have to think about the level of involvement they do want, and it may be they want a very minimal involvement but having got involved in a minimal level, they then have built up the experience and the confidence to say I could do a bit more here now, it's really interesting, I feel I can do this – but it gives them the option to say no I don't want to do anymore.

HK: Yes, the hand up there?

AM: Yes I was interested in what you were saying about consultancy exercises and how adequate they are and it made me think about contemporary examples in the Scottish hospital closures issue of last year. I actually went to a couple of those meetings held by pressure groups and what came out of meetings was the dishonesty within the standard consultancy arrangements, I mean they were called early in the morning when people were at work and they couldn't go and they were held in city centres behind closed doors – and doctor after doctor of the meeting I went to, said well I was asked to go but I was only given 20 minutes to prepare my report and these were people who were against the hospital nationalisation programme. You know there were strong feelings given at those meetings that consultants were thinking the decision had been taken already by the bureaucratic quango that was the Health Authority and so what I thought was perhaps representative democracy that we have is just no longer enough and there should be a... all of these authorities like the Health Authority should be required to have an elected element within them or perhaps be totally elected because the idea that representative MPs, MSPs, councillors can effectively exercise authority and supervision over all these different perforating bodies that we have, perhaps is just...

HK: I mean there's been a huge expansion of appointment in all these areas and that in itself is an exercise of power and patronage. Right well we've got a whole set of questions here, I'll take one more, sorry yes, how's your cough!

*[Laughter]*

AM: [Catherine Duffy] Thank you and I'm sorry for interrupting you. Again, I grew up in a mining community and I think what's happened is bargaining has moved out of the work place into the community but bargaining in the workplace, you were bargaining over the primary distribution of income, you had a power base and you were bargaining over a real primary distribution of resources, when you move bargaining to the community over soft money, the community doesn't have a... community centres and communities as a place don't have the central power base and nor are they fighting over the primary distribution of resources so they can always be cut off at the neck.

HK: They haven't got the leverage.

AM: [Catherine Duffy] They haven't got the leverage so I think that's one thing.

The second thing I wanted to say was that – the poor don't vote. I've had experience of been working class, being a poor homeless teenager and now being a member of the professional middle classes – the only time anybody

wanted our votes when I was working class up in Scotland was when the Communist and Labour party fought for it and the Tories didn't bother to come to the town. When I became a poor person, nobody wanted my vote, you don't get asked for your vote, if there's nobody representing the interests then you don't vote, now that I'm a woolly white Labour Liberal professional middle class person living in red-neck country, nobody wants my vote either and it's impossible to exercise any political voice because the party structure... it won't matter if you devolve government down the levels, if the party structure controls it at every level. The parish council is one political party, the district council is one political party, the MP is one political... he doesn't even bother to come to the surgeries, he runs his business... that's one political party and the only person, there's one independent, one person who has become a councillor and is not an independent because he said it is impossible to be taken seriously unless you're part of the party structure. All the appointments to boards, hospital boards, everything else, are done through the party structure, so these communities are not inclusive, one party structure controls them at every level everywhere so devolving down will not change access to politics for most people.

HK: Well there's a real challenge. Okay so let's run through that collection of interesting questions, some of them have come together and I'm going to pull them into strands because there's an overlap.

Let's just look at that and pull out the issue of electoral reform: does PR make a difference; would it change things? And the main parties are pretty resistant to it – the Liberal Democrats aren't but Labour having played footsie with it for a little while has abandoned it, the Conservatives certainly don't seem... sometimes in opposition the Conservatives play with it again but the main parties don't seem very interested. Do we think that this would be a way of re-energising our democracy? And that links in with the business of the House of Lords, unelected, I mean it used to be a hereditary principle, now it's basically almost completely appointed under the party patronage. How do you renovate that? And how do you do it without undermining the power and authority of the House of Commons? So I think that's a question that I'll ask you to take on first of all, on the reinvigoration of democracy using structures. Who would like to come in?

AB: From a very cynical perspective, it feels a little bit like deckchairs on the Titanic because while yes we might get some real change in a certain context within a particular frame, whether it will really tackle the fundamental underlying malaise I have some doubts. That's not to say that it mightn't do some good, whether it will really crack the issues...

HK: Well the evidence this morning remember from those involved on the periphery of the Scottish Parliament was that there were some benefits from it: that you had seen more women going in, that it allowed for a few more personalities, independents who stood, people who stood in the Green Party, you got more character back in there rather than the kind of bland vanilla-flavoured politicians of...

SS: I think I disagree to some extent with Audrey, I think it would make a difference for the simple reason that I think it's a bit difficult to convince yourself that we're in

the 21<sup>st</sup> century, that one half of parliament has not caught up in the democratic principle, I think it's just a bit too much to swallow in one go.

We set up or we've democratised the House in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, we extended that democratisation principle right up to 1928 where women got to vote in the same places as men and in the late 60s we moved the franchise down to 18 year olds rather than 21 year olds. So we're living in the democratic age and in the middle of all of this we say part of parliament has not caught up with the democratic age, I think it's as simple as that. So I'm in favour of doing something fairly radical with the House of Lords. I am not opposed to saying that a part of it, but only a part of it may be retained for... appointments may be retained on the basis of expertise or elder statesmen contribution or whatever but really a very small element. But to fail to embrace the democratic principle in one half of that parliament a century and a half after we started the democratisation of our other chamber is too much for me to hold in my head at the same time.

And while you're at it you may want to tackle with the electoral reform issue by saying well in terms of pushing the democratic principle into the House of Lords, why not be at liberty with the electoral process there – after all we've done it in the European Parliament, lots of people predicted the end of the world... the end of the world hasn't come about. It would be an important strengthening, a checking balance on the House of Commons and in particular on the Executive. I don't think it would compete with the House of Lords specifically because I think the constitution is very clear, the 1911 Parliament Act says that the Commons is supreme and in relation to Finance Bills that the House of Lords has no ability even to delay. I think that's clear enough for me.

HK: Right and I'll throw in my tuppence worth on that in that I'm a Democrat and I have always advocated that the House of Lords should be elected.

The arguments that you hear, particularly when people get in and they get their feet under the table and they get to love it, and what you hear is that if you had an elected house you won't get the expertise and my belief is that actually people would stand who felt they were bringing some expertise and then people would choose from hopefully a panel of possibilities of people who came from a background of expertise in different areas.

However the problem again would be that is for parties, that if it is going to be that you have proportional representation of party list systems and here am I, a rebellious Labour person who doesn't really take the whip except very lightly... what would happen to someone like me? Would I be on a list or would they think oh God she gives us a bad time, let's make sure that we get more compliant people on those lists. And so there are worries about how you would configure it but...

SS: Well why not give those new representatives longer term limits so they wouldn't have to worry too much about being dropped off those lists, never mind getting on to start with. Ordinary backbench members of the House of Commons do worry about the part at which the... you could sort of loosen that worry slightly to the members of the House of Lords. So you can deal with that...

- HK: You can find a way. Okay I don't want us to get bogged down with the House of Lords reform because it is certainly one of the things that we will deal with but I think that we are hardly going to be a democratic commission for democracy and advocate no democracy in the House of Lords, so I think that one shouldn't take too much time [laughs]. But one of the things that really is present in a whole lot of your questions is this business of too much power at the centre, can't we devolve more power down to the local level, the business of David Held's idea, that on certain issues which are international and so on, where you do have central government deal with those, but that more and more should be passed down the line to the local and then the concern about our friend there who said yes but even down there the party has a strangle hold and these parties that don't have very big membership, have tin pot dictators within them who actually have them by the throat and who can often prevent a real local democracy operating. So what do we do about that? There are three questions that came out of that which were new models of democracy – do we actually try to get things down the line, how do we do that?
- RH: Well I was quite surprised that the North East said 'no' to a regional assembly, sometimes you get the impression that people get a bit frustrated with too many layers of elected representatives and not quite getting to grips with who is supposed to be doing what. I keep wanting to say something really clever about the issues issue because it seems to me that particularly young people and from what people here have said as well, just generally, people are interested in *issues* and yet we have a system where we're forced to vote for *parties* and so something's not adding up. So some of those things like PR, devolved powers, some of those things seem to be useful in helping us to cope with the fact that we live in a new world and people see the world differently and people care about *things*, whether that's war or whether that's poverty, whether that's housing, that's what they care about so they might be interested in one party's views on one thing but one thing only and something's not adding up and I just can't think what the answer is but that seems to be our problem.
- HK: Yes but even in that, just for a minute, even in that people will say they felt very, very strongly that they were against the war and so on but that's over here almost and yet will it make a difference on running the trains, running the health service, making sure education is good for your kids and so on and who would you rather was involved in the doing of that stuff. And so that even though they may be furious with the government over here on that, some of the polling is suggesting that at the end of the day it won't affect how people ultimately vote because they know that the daily grind is actually about education, health...
- RH: It's a bit like with anything, we can pick and mix, we can pick and choose, we're consumers, we can take what we want but we can't seem to do that with politics and that seems to be the frustrating thing. We're told no you can only have this and this or this and this and you choose, you can't somehow say well I'd like a bit of that, that works for my community, that works for me, that bit works, I can see how that works for the country as whole, not necessarily for me at all and somehow...

- FM: How do you feel about having referendums as they do in California on specific issues like 'do you want this new hospital?' or... I mean do you think that gives that combination of single issue input?
- RH: Yeah, I think referendums potentially could be a way around that. I suppose the fear this country has about having too many referendums is that you're having voting so you have to also modernise the voting system alongside introducing referendums.
- SS: Helena, you know parties do bundle issues, that's what parties do and we can't be surprised if they then do that. But there's nothing stopping the electorate turning this year's election into a single issue referendum on Iraq – they can do that, they're choosing not to do that or maybe the media is, I'm not sure. But you can use the electoral process to run, to have a single issue referendum, it's rare but you don't have to sort of abandon that process or you can do both. You can have more of these plebiscites that you see in California which have been very, very powerful in terms of making sure state government as Californians would say 'behaves itself'.
- HK: But isn't the frustration that many people in the general public feel is that yes it's about the bundle and if in the bundle you're looking at the collective, the bundles of the Liberal Democrats, the bundles of Labour and the bundles of Conservatives and it's almost like your set of priorities. If for you the war was absolutely a crucial issue, the one party out of those that was against the war was the Liberal Democrats and so there may be a shift by many people in that direction. But for other people it will be I cared about that but I also care about making sure that the health service does not become privatised and I'm very worried that the Conservatives are going to do that, therefore given that I think the Liberal Democrats are not going to get in, I will still vote for Labour. Somebody may say that and so people decide on what their own priorities are but what happens with the manifesto in the bundle is that by voting for one particular party, you end up... it is assumed by that party that you're actually taking their whole bundle and the bits of the bundle that you don't like, your voice is scrubbed on being heard on that. So for example and we all suspect that Labour will be voted back in again in May, they will see it as actually being an endorsement, depending on the level, of an endorsement not just of their policies with regard to health and education but actually it would be 'we've sprung free in relation to the war as well and the general public don't feel we did the wrong thing'.
- PD: Is this true? I'm just wondering, I mean we're slightly wandering off but I'm not sure that's true because it seems to me we go against that idea that actually politicians are polling and polling all the time because either the government is liable to the party's licence at the moment are becoming governed or whatever it does and if that's the case, there's no need for all this polling or this government and/or government in the future are likely to be endlessly provisional, endlessly contingent, waiting on seeing what the people want.

I just want to add at this point because I feel the arguments going my way on that *[laughs]*... this notion of extreme atomisation, now the issue of that and that's what this conversation has been about, Raji's been saying she wants issues or people think about issues, the difficulty with the phrase 'extreme atomisation', it's

already got the values entailed in its description so there's another way of speaking about extreme atomisation which is women don't any longer have to stay in the home and kids can be heard as well as seen and working-class communities don't have to replicate the jobs of their mothers and fathers. In other words extreme atomisation at that level, because I've always thought it fascinating that people have only ever cared about the poorer communities, nobody ever cared if the middle class were atomised or the aristocracy atomised, it was always the working class was a community and that's what we cared about. So I think we've got to be careful of using this term 'atomised' when we're thinking in terms of this Inquiry because it forecloses the argument. Because who is in favour of atomisation?

HK: Nobody.

PD: Who is in favour of liberation?

SS: So I think it's a complex issue but when the people are already connected with one another, you can use any language and I'm sure all this becomes a bit babbling, I think my only point is we want to be really careful not to extinguish it. It's quite easy to go in there and extinguish this, you can do this by massive housing programmes, you can do it by getting the local school in the wrong part of the neighbourhood and time and time again you discover twenty years later we've destroyed the networks, the connections that people had already and frankly it's very difficult to replicate it. I always think it's analogous to the vitamin, it has to be at the right dose, you can overdose on it or you can have a lack of the right dose but if you've got those networks already out there, if you've got that connection with one another, in other words individuals understanding that they are more than the sum of their partners, that they rely upon one another in society, neighbours, friends, family, people in the neighbourhood, people in the country in general, they understand that in any degree whatsoever, I'm all in favour of trying to retain that and sort of encourage it as it were, I'm just very, very doubtful that you can create it.

PD: I agree and I don't want to pursue this too much but I think the metaphor of 'extinguish' is a bad one. I don't think this is extinguishable, it's chameleon like, it takes different historical forms; in 1770 nobody would have thought that the working class communities of urban London were imaginable. The truth is the danger is in talking of extinguishing them and the atomisation, we will not see these new communities because they will not look like the old communities and the kind of terror around mobile phones because after all adolescents spend more of their disposable income on mobile phones, because they're connected, it's a metaphor of connectivity.

HK: There are a number of other questions and I'm anxious that before we finalise our session that we try to just bring them in. What about the idea that... I mean we covered it a bit this morning, that consultancy can often be a fig leaf but a member of the audience brought up the idea that really in all of these processes, shouldn't there always be an elected element when you have these boards, quangos and so on?

- SS: Yes, I entirely agree that we've got government by quango in this country and it's been a huge growth industry and it may have delivered some efficiency but the price to be paid for this is very, very high indeed. I say that as a quangocrat, I mean I'm as guilty as the next person, there's no dispute in my mind about that. But whether you elect all of this stuff, I'm doubtful because look at the way in which the local health trust, the boards and the PCTs nowadays, have been set up and configured more to have some community accountability, you notice the key thing, they've gone right up to the point of saying elect them but haven't crossed that line. I think there's a reason there, the level is quite low and the issues are quite sensitive, likewise we elect the PTAs and we reserve some of the jobs on the governing bodies of local schools for the elective principle, others are appointed. I mean there's a fudge here, there's a compromise time and time again and just be careful how far you take that in one go. In principle it's right to avoid the quango, I understand that, but presumably you want to extend that principle incrementally rather than in one go, no-one knows what would happen if you had elected PCTs at local level.
- HK: Well it goes back to what our friend from Edinburgh University was raising: you've got to ask people how involved they want to be. And it goes back to your comment that people start feeling there's too many layers of government, they don't know what they're for and so on and that if you were to have to elect everybody to every sort of level, then you just again might get less and less and less turning out for that business and then you have very few people actually getting to make the choices and it becomes another kind of fig leaf which is the fig leaf of democracy. So is there an answer to that?
- RH: I mean part of the problem is that if you have too many elected representatives, how can you ensure these elected people are representing, because there's just so many of them? I mean we see that, we see it so much with things like UK Youth Parliaments and stuff, constituencies where it works really well, it works really well but in other constituencies the young people think well hold on a minute, I voted for this person but then I've never heard from them again and they appear to be making decisions on my behalf and that's where the problem starts isn't it, with too much, too many elected representatives, is that you can't make sure they're all doing what they promised to do.
- HK: Our friend from John Prescott's office raised this business that actually there are fragments, there are things filtering through which are about reinvigoration of democracy and he was talking about greater scrutiny of the executive government, it may seem very tentative but there are some things there and he mentioned that the war did create demonstrations and so on. Do you feel that there are suddenly these new growths, that there are shoots coming out, springing up?
- AB: You didn't get it around the issues and around the moments in history, we saw it with the tsunami, the kind of response that we got and it goes back to the local connection and the fact that clearly people, even though the event was a zillion miles away, it touched them in a way that they could relate to in their own lives and I think that's the key that we want to get to. So it's not just about whether it happens at the local or the national, it's actually trying to configure a system

which has relevance to people in their daily lives, no matter where it happens and that's the \$64,000 question.

- HK: And I'm going to finally pick up on our friend there who, well this morning and this afternoon has really raised a concern which is about where he was talking about his child watching television and being forced into being a consumer and how we're all being measured by what we wear, what we drive, where we live and the whole way in which the corporate world has shifted into every aspect of our being and is in many ways creating new values and really if we're talking about who sets the agenda, whether it isn't being set by money interests.
- RH: One of the things we've not picked up on much today is about education and there's been an assumption throughout this, probably because this is the second bit of your day, that people already know quite a lot, that really what they haven't got is the access but they know and obviously for young people in particular things like citizenship education is really important because that's when they're likely to start learning to be more ethical consumers and think a little bit more about the decisions that they are making. So there is that kind of... we need to think a little bit about the type of education and type of access to knowledge people are getting as well as their access to interaction.
- HK: Anybody else want to come in on that?
- BG: I think of the time that we were lacking in that part of the education and I think that's why they felt disenfranchised now, we've got to get that level back up again to make them feel involved.
- BM: I wanted to address this but it was... I'm wondering how much in terms of the citizenship education that we're giving kids today, how much of that is really ethno-centric as well in the sense that how much of it is going to be speaking to the ethnic minorities and kids who are socio-economically below par and what effect that's going to have in the long run.
- HK: What are your concerns because I think you've got to unpack that for us?
- BM: Well my concerns when you... it comes back to the question that was raised earlier on in terms of who sets the cultural agenda. When you've got people who are swearing allegiance to the queen, when citizenship is being couched in particular terms which doesn't necessarily speak to the cultures that people are coming from, that has shaped their views and if that agenda is top-down, that construction of education is top-down, whether we're using education to further alienate some of the groups we really need to be pulling in.
- SS: But if I can just come back, is the criticism or concern that the content that's been provided for this vehicle...?
- BM: I don't know, it's...
- SS: Well a lot of us know, the jury is out pending... the year before last... but if the concern is the content is wrong and it's this upper-white middle-class conspiracy or something like that, I'm not putting words in your mouth, but if that's the

concern, then the response should be let's change the content. But if the concern is different, which is that something like this is always going to find it difficult if not impossible to build some degree of common values through the compulsory schooling system, I'd be less certain because I'd be absolutely determined you want to do that and one of the striking things about the compulsory schooling system in this country going back for some time and I understand obviously there's a different model up in Scotland, is that it's not getting off on the right foot about trying to use this as the proverbial laboratory to make people more aware of common values and common identity.

Now if the criticism is that it's ethno-centric, then let's change it, that's fine, that's no problem but the need for something like that I think is a rather different point and it's something that we've neglected for a long time. I rather regret the politics that have brought that about; the Home Secretary has pushed very hard on that pedal and perhaps said things to upset people along the way without a doubt. But I think the point is correct and you have very, very few opportunities other than the compulsory schooling system to get this right. I can't think of other ways in which you then retro fit that kind of exposure to common values, common identities other than with kids who are relatively young and relatively open-minded about these things.

RH: The other thing is and this is more from the point of view of being an ex-teacher, I think sometimes the whole citizenship educational curriculum seems to get lost in a wider citizenship issue that's going on and this whole thing that's coming out of the Home Office and stuff. The actual citizenship educational curriculum itself I think is actually a good thing because it's very much about skills as well as knowledge and it's very much about encouraging young people to be *active*, not good citizens and the rhetoric and the thinking from it is right.

I think that the tension that the subject has within the curriculum and I know it's different in Scotland but I know Scotland has also had its own curriculum review, is that because the rest of the curriculum is so fact-based, by the time you get to the citizenship lesson and you're being encouraged to think differently, learn differently, think about the community differently, go out into the community, not be on a timetable, it's seen immediately as a softer subject, it becomes harder to teach, harder for young people to grasp what it's about and then no-one has any ownership over it. So there's a kind of tension that I suppose could only be dealt with through wider curriculum reviews and a commitment to giving citizenship education a much higher status and not confusing it in the way that David Bell embarrassingly did in England with those kind of wider issues.

BM: Can I then just very briefly come back on that. Kenyon Wright this morning was saying what he wanted to see was citizenship being integrated much more into the curriculum rather than being treated as a separate subject in its own right, would you see that more as a solution?

RH: Yeah, it's a difficult one because I understand that that's what's happened in Scotland because it's one of the five national priorities that it is integrated in that way, it's criticised because apparently sometimes it's invisible, you can't see it. In England OFSTED seems to have found that the only way at the moment to teach it is through lessons and I have already had arguments with the guy from

OFSTED about this and the only thing that I agreed with that he said is that because the whole nature of the subject is in encouraging young people to think differently, it needs a certain type of teacher, it needs an expert teacher who's able to deal with that tension and deal with the fact that suddenly at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the last lesson, he or she is going to have to work with those young people in a totally different way from how they've been worked with when they were in maths or science earlier on.

HK: Well I'm going to close this session by saying that there was a notion in Scottish education and I happened to be at the time a recipient of it, which was that part of the way of teaching was about creating the democratic intellect and that you were being taught to question and to say 'why' and I think it's probably why we've ended up with so many Scots in politics!

*[Laughter]*

HK: But the business of debating and asking 'why' was very much built into every area of lesson, whatever the subject matter was and it may be that we should be thinking about talking about all of that again. Can I thank the audience for coming along and participating in this session this afternoon and for those of you who stayed all day, thank you also and all of your contributions will be added into the general move of this Commission's work and the evidence gathering to be included ultimately in the final report which will be probably about the end of this year. So it's been wonderful being here in Glasgow in Scotland and hearing about the Scottish experience.