Title: **Disorderly analysis: how might we best understand the riots in August 2011?**

Abstract:

Purpose:

The general consensus amongst policy makers regarding the causal explanations for the involvement of young people in the August Riots of 2011 seems to have centred on 'mindless criminality' and 'thuggery'. These explanations have tended to be quite one dimensional where complexity has been avoided in favour of simplicity. Issues of structural inequality, poverty and social injustice appeared to be negated by political figures in favour of an emphasis on neo-liberal, individualistic explanations and solutions. Understanding that there have been very different interpretations of the riots, where some have come to very different opinions from the same data, this paper revisits the causes and meanings of the rioting that took place over a five day period in August 2011. Secondly by drawing on social democratic perspectives the paper stipulates several factors that if not dealt with may give rise to future rioting.

Design/methodology/ approach:

The paper takes the form of a conceptual analysis. I draw on the work of a number of key academics and commentators to enrich the analysis.

Findings:

Within the paper it is argued that the policies that emanate from neo-liberal political ideologies have impacted disproportionately on working class children and young people. More specifically the paper finds that problems experienced are deemed to be the responsibility of the individual, side-lining the influence of ecological and socio-economic factors.

Originality:

In the light of the criticisms of neo-liberalistic approaches, social democratic perspectives are drawn upon in order to consider new ways of approaching the issues facing children and young people within contemporary society. Such perspectives are concerned with addressing structural inequality, poverty and social injustice.

Key Words: Young people, youth crime, youth justice, English riots of 2011, neo-liberalism, social democracy, social exclusion, youth exclusion.

Introduction

Young people (or 'working class yobs' as the media tend to call them (Cohen, 2006)) are often targeted for press reporting due to their newsworthy status (Muncie, 2009). Based on

limited evidence, generalisations are made regarding the state of youth today, often portraying a negative perception of young people. In addition to this negative press coverage government ministers have tended to sensationalise incidents of youth crime (Muncie, 2009). In the light of such negative press reporting, and politicians demonstrating their commitment to punitive criminal justice sanctions, it is somewhat unsurprising that the general consensus amongst policy makers regarding the causal explanations for the involvement of young people in the August Riots of 2011 centred on 'mindless criminality' (Cooper, 2012) 'thuggery' and 'mindless idiots' (Benyon, 2012). Commentators have assumed somewhat that young people were responsible for the riots. Furthermore the government and media's response to the riots was similar to that generally reserved for young people. Dominant media and political explanations for the disturbances revolve around descriptions of the rioters as being a 'sick breed' who are 'mindless thugs' and who lack compassion and respect. For example Theresa May argued that 'the vast majority were not protesting, they were thieving' (Benyon, 2012:14). Understanding that there have been very different interpretations of the riots, where some have come to very different opinions from the same data (C.f special issue on the English Riot 2011 in the *Safer Communities* journal) this paper revisits the causes and meanings of the rioting that took place over a five day period in August 2011. Secondly by drawing on social democratic perspectives the paper stipulates several factors that if not dealt with may give rise to future rioting. Such perspectives are concerned with addressing structural inequality, poverty and social injustice.

Re visiting explanations and perspectives

The shooting of Mark Duggan by police officers was highly suspicious, in particular there was concern as to whether race played a part or not in the killing (Smith, 2011). Resulting from the murder was a peaceful protest by members of the local community, including Mark Duggan's family. It has been argued that a significant trigger for the protest was police failure to engage with, and provide proper up-to-date information to the family of Mark Duggan. Some have argued that by providing incorrect information to the family, the police inflamed the situation (Smith, 2011). Indeed, even at this early stage there were concerns that this peaceful protest could result in rioting if not dealt with appropriately. The situation was not dealt with properly and soon escalated into violence. The initial rioting began shortly after the protests. The police became the key target for the rioters where initially chants were directed towards them (Smith, 2011). The Riots spread quickly from Tottenham and onto other parts of England (Manchester and Birmingham for example) (Metropolitan Police Service, 2012). Rioting also occurred in other parts of London such as Enfield and Brixton (for an insightful analysis of the places where rioting occurred see Briggs, 2012).

It seemed there were a number of young people involved in the disturbances with the intention of taking control of certain places (Smith, 2011). However unlike Brixton of 1981

participation in these riots it was argued was driven by the desire to loot from high-profile customer outlets (Fitzgibbon, et al., 2013). The reasons for this are contested and in turn have been interpreted in many different ways (Fitzgibbon, *et al.,* 2013). Most notably was the opinion of government ministers describing the rioters as 'mindless criminals' of a 'feral underclass' (Clarke, 2011). This viewpoint was given credibility when it was found that a significant number of rioters had previous convictions (73%) or served a prison sentence (25%) (Travis, *et al.,* 2011). However, the Guardian/ London School of Economics' study, *Reading the Riots*, reported that a significant proportion of individuals involved in the riots had previously been abused and assaulted by police officers and as a result voiced particular anger at the police (Guardian/LSE 2011:20). The Riots Communities and Victims Panel, set up by the deputy prime minister found that relationships had broken down amongst the police and young people as a result of the practice of 'stop and search' (Riots, Communities and Victims Panel, 2012). Indeed, Waterton and Sesay (2012) point out that *'the unacceptably low 'hit rate' or 'arrest rates' only adds to the injustice felt by many young people today towards the police when only 10 per cent of stop and searches lead to an arrest (Delsol and Shiner, 2011).* Indeed it would be fair to say that if the police continue in their pursuit to target 'low hanging fruit' young people will become further disengaged and in turn disrespect authority in response to excessive forms of criminalisation (Waterton and Sesay, 2012). Individuals involved in the riots referred to the practice of stop and search being a key source of discontent (Riots, Communities and Victims Panel, 2012:24). The study conducted by the Guardian/London School of Economics captured the voice of a young man involved in the riots in Manchester – arguably expressions that are 'indicative of a more widely held attitude' (Collett, 2013:172):

> *I became involved in Salford because it was a chance to tell the police, tell the government and tell everyone for that matter that we get fucking hacked off around here and we won't stand for it (Guardian/LSE 2011:20)*

The findings of the Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010) review uncovered that individuals who are stopped and searched are being subjected to inappropriate and discriminatory police tactics. The review noted that underpinning this unjust treatment of members of society was negative racial stereotyping of black and Asian people. Another reason for young people initially wanting to take part in the disturbances was resentment towards the police regarding the disproportionate use of dispersal orders – overwhelmingly targeted at young people - and their stigmatising effects (Crawford and Lister, 2007). Indeed wanting to get their own back on the Police was a motivating factor for the onset of the disturbances. I will now begin to discuss these issues in more detail and explore the different explanations and perspectives regarding the involvement of young people in the riots.

Ward (2012) has noted that young people participated in the disturbances as a result of excitement, where it seemed that all members of society were taking part, reflecting somewhat the impulsive and risk-taking tendencies of being young. Furthermore some commentators (see Zizek, 2011) described the rioters as having no message to deliver. David Cameron believed that the disturbances were not a political protest or a riot about politics (Newburn, 2012). Indeed, as Bateman (2012:3) notes: 'participants… were significantly less likely to be actively associated with a political campaign or cause...' and perhaps, if asked, would not be able to offer any logical justification for behaving the way they did. Despite this, there was 'a widespread feeling that some rioters had no hope and nothing to lose' by taking part (Singh, 2011:13).

The Children's Society (2011) draw on perspectives linked to hedonistic desires (self-indulging/pleasure-seeking) and materialism (the need to own and obtain goods), to argue that the reason why young people got involved in the disturbances was 'to get goods and possessions they could not afford to buy' (Children's Society, 2011:2). The British Youth Council (2011) conducted some research with young people on the causes of the Riots, and found that 'getting free stuff' was a causal factor, alongside inadequate parenting, lack of respect and limited career and job opportunities. Indeed, with regard to socio-economic factors Matthews (2011:7) notes that 'a continual lack of education, ineffective parental guidance, poor role models, ill-discipline, unemployment and a host of social and developmental ills created the ideal conditions for a riot'. Some argue that the rioters, in accordance with 'our preoccupation with consumerism', set out to acquire property at 'seemingly any cost' (Lowe, 2013:288). However, discriminatory policing has been highlighted as being a significant contributory factor - some arguing that unlawful policing ignited the disturbances (Guardian/LSE, 2011). Indeed, the general public have been somewhat disappointed with how the Police responded to the disturbances. In turn the Government, by early 2012, noted their intentions to reform policing by reviewing the practice of stop and search (Lewis, 2012). The policing tactics used during the student protests in 2010 were highly suspect and ethically problematic. Most notably, 'thousands were held for hours without access to food, water or toilets' (Lewis, 2012c, cited in Cooper, 2012:15). This practice is not in line with the core role of policing where officers 'are supposed to enforce the law fairly and protect all citizens' (Lowe, 2013:288). What is more, heavy policing of certain groups within society exists (most notably back members of society). The Police appear committed towards the use of control and surveillance tactics, predominantly targeted at deprived areas, rather than targeting serious white-collar crimes attributed to a more powerful 'elite' class of people. One could argue that 'in many ways, the rioters' behaviour mirrored the greed, lawlessness and lack of compassion of bankers, politicians and the police' (Lowe, 2013:288). Indeed, there is widespread mistrust of powerful groups within society. Most notably, the actions of these powerful groups were dishonest (for example as evidenced in the cases of the 'expenses scandal' and 'phone hacking') and understandably 'left the public outraged' (Lowe, 2013:287).

In terms of attempting to try and prevent further occurrences, we should accept that the disturbances have some deep political significance, especially when we consider that the government's austerity programme has impacted 'disproportionately on the poorer and weaker members of society (e.g. cutting public services, reducing tax credits)' (Lowe, 2013). Youth support work is one profession that advocates for social democracy by being committed to embedding 'a social responsibility to include young people, a concern to empower them and enable them to participate' (Cooper, 2012:20). However, despite this clear intention and the widely understood benefits of youth work (including the promotion of personal, social and emotional development) the Coalition and Liberal Democrat government appear committed towards decimating the service: an estimated three thousand youth work posts have been cut in 2011/12 where some local authorities have reduced their youth service provision by as much as one hundred per cent (Williams, 2011). One reason why the rioting may have not occurred in all areas experiencing high levels of social deprivation could be the impact of youth work professionals (and their commitment to equality for all and principles of anti-discriminatory practice) and their desire to communicate in a warm and open way with young people to prevent any conflict.

It could be argued that the culture of consumerism, discussed above, encouraged by the government and media creates a need within the population but withhold the means to attain it. This need is more acutely felt in deprived sectors. The response from the government is to attribute the cause of the crime to 'mindless criminality' firmly rooting the problem within the individuals involved (dispositional attribution) - an overly simplistic explanation that does not acknowledge such things as economic forces.

Beyond neo-liberalism: Towards a Social Democratic perspective on youth exclusion

When discussing the youth of today politicians and the public continue to refer to an apparent moral decline within society. In turn, they appear fixated on a traditional 'previous golden age' whereby harmony and respect for authority existed (Cunningham and Cunningham, 2012:118). Contrary to the research evidence, the conclusion reached by members of the public, and politicians is that 'youth' is in some sort of crisis (Cunningham and Cunningham, 2012). Here, debates tend to be centred on matters of youth (or social) exclusion where problems are identified, and ideas as to the appropriate solutions are put forward (Cunningham and Cunningham, 2012:120). Social exclusion is often *'what can happen when individuals or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health and family breakdown'* (DSS, 1999:23). Indeed, the Social Exclusion Unit (2000) note how in addition to increasing general feelings of unhappiness social exclusion can increase the chances in young people committing crime and/or developing mental health issues.

These debates regarding appropriate solutions are often segregated into two schools of thought or ideologies, one being a neo-liberal perspective and the other a social democratic.

More specifically, with regard to the former proponents of this ideology assert that problems experienced amongst children, young people and families within society are deemed to be largely the responsibility of the individual. In so doing, this perspective alludes to an idea that the social welfare system (where at the heart is concern for education, health and issues of social care) is overly perverse. It is argued that this system is at fault for it's over generosity, creating a system of dependence. In parallel to this, criminal justice systematic responses have largely failed, where, according to this belief, they excuse offending behaviour: they are in-effective and provide insufficient deterrence. Offenders are not subjected to adequate control and surveillance measures rather; they are offered 'soft' options, given rights and provided with welfare support. The ideas put forward within this discourse to overcome this apparent 'crisis of youth' centre on introducing punitive sanctions, and clamping down on all types of criminal activity (sending out a message that this type of behaviour will not be tolerated). Included within this ideology is the idea that parents will take responsibility (or risk being punished if they relinquish their responsibilities) rights are conditional, and welfare support for individuals should be drastically reduced. This was realised in practice for example when an individual was evicted from her property due to her son's involvement in the English Riots of 2011. This reflects the viewpoint that 'welfare benefits are a privilege not a right and those who choose to break the law should be treated as outlaws' (Travis, 2011:5). Indeed, the issuing of significant amounts of social welfare benefits in England is deemed to have contributed in part to the onset (or aggravation) of social problems (such as criminal activity and anti-social behaviour). In accordance with neo-liberal thinking, the rising of youth unemployment has been linked to an over generous welfare system resulting in an irresponsible culture of welfare dependency (Murray, 1999). Cunningham and Cunningham (2012:121-22) capture the essence of what neo-liberals see as the solution to youth exclusion:

> *the solution to youth social exclusion lies in coercive, targeted interventions designed to deter and control the inappropriate, 'deviant' patterns of behaviour that lie at its heart… what is needed, from this perspective, is less 'welfare' and 'care' and more 'control'.*

Conversely amongst the social democrats there is an argument that the marginalisation and social exclusion felt by many young people within society is largely a result of the policies that emanate from neo-liberalist political ideology. Rather than it being a result of 'soft' policies, social-democrats believe it is a lack of focus on young people's social and economic needs, the negation of structural barriers that prevent young people contributing to society and the minimal emphasis that is given to positive attributes, collectively provide the ingredients for the growth of social exclusion. Indeed, Levitas (2005) notes that New Labour's approach to social policy fits this description, embracing a deficit led model of practice. Proponents of a social democratic perspective argue that structural inequality needs to be acknowledged and addressed. If not it is argued young people will continue to

feel constrained and/or denied opportunities and their personal, social and emotional development will be affected as a result of this. In order to address issues of inequality, though, it seems logical that there needs to be a commitment towards financially protecting social welfare services, this would no doubt help towards ensuring that the most in need young people within society are not further discriminated and their problems compounded.

Rather than promoting a programme that compels young people to find work or risk receiving benefit sanctions (and denying that there is a lack of opportunity to find suitable work), social democrats allude to the idea that the government should aspire towards developing initiatives that comprise commitment to *'provide good, long-term education, flexible training and employment programmes that genuinely enhance skills, knowledge and employability'* (Cunningham and Cunningham, 2012:128). There are a number of potential barriers to achieving this intention, though. One difficulty is financial. This may be more of an issue to overcome in the current economic climate. Nevertheless, the prospect of a more skilled and educated workforce would outweigh the financial investment that it requires. However, the government appear fixated on 'quick fix' solutions and this was evident with the roll out of the 'troubled families' initiative quickly after the Riots occurred. Embracing a deficit led model, laced with neo-liberal undertones, the programme operated by *'targeting some 120,000 families who were seen to be undermining the fabric of society as well as wasting the resources of the state'* (Collett, 2013).

There is an intention - evident in a range of social policy domains - to control as opposed to care and notions of family inadequacy and 'fecklessness' feature heavily (Collett, 2013). The intention appears to be to deal with future problems rather than meet the present welfare needs of young people (Furlong and Cartmel, 2007). There is less emphasis on the structural environment (of which young people have very little control to change) and the impact this has on young people 'securing inclusion'. This provides further justification that the government need to

> *'recognise the cumulative nature of some of the difficulties they (young people) encounter, whether these are the multiplier effects of different aspects of social exclusion…or the impact of unequal and discriminatory treatment'* (Smith, 2008:3).

One would argue that the social world is complex: there are no 'quiz fix' solutions when it concerns young people and offending. In turn, it is not possible to generate a true understanding of the lives young people live without acknowledging the social, economic and political context (Creaney and Smith, 2014).

In order to grasp the true nature of the problematic behaviour, one should delve deeper into the child's personal, social and emotional development, in order to generate an authentic understanding and explore how the child has become marginalised and excluded by society:

Many require high-quality, well-resourced, tailored support that recognises the particular difficulties they face in, for example, accessing education and employment opportunities and decent-quality housing provision. Instead they tend to be treated as a 'problematic' homogenous 'mass'… increasingly coercive welfare system that is simply incapable of meeting their complex needs. Solutions… should not be based around negative, pathological assumptions, which locate the blame for exclusion with vulnerable young people themselves… there should be an open acknowledgement of the obstacles and barriers that many groups of young people face.

(Cunningham and Cunningham, 2012:131)

In relation to young people who offend or who are at risk of crime, this way of working may be more difficult to implement. At the heart of children's social care - certainly at the practice level – is the need to promote the welfare needs of the client and deliver person-centred care. However, within youth justice - or criminal justice more broadly - there is political and public ambivalence towards whether children who offend deserve or should be provided with the opportunity to have a say on the purpose of their intervention (Creaney 2014). An approach that emphasises the welfare needs and promotes the human rights of young people should be promoted, where young people are encouraged to become involved in decision making processes (Creaney, 2013). Again, this would, in accordance with social democratic perspectives, reduce the chances of young people being further marginalised, and allow stereotypes to be challenged - particularly where young people are 'blamed' for their situation (Smith, 2008).

On a slightly divergent note, Marxist theorists shares similar ideas with social democrats. For example, Marxist theorists note that when young people 'act-out' in a way that contravenes the Capitalist tradition (i.e. teenage pregnancy, unemployment, youth crime); they receive 'swift' targeted governmental measures. Indeed, the government, in accordance with adequate functioning of a capitalist society, are committed to reducing welfare dependency and encourage young people to accept 'low paid' unskilled jobs. Jones and Novak (1999:64-66) provide further insight into the mechanics of this:

The assault on young people has involved the imposition of new work disciplines, lower expectations in terms of both social security benefits and job security, pay and conditions, and a sexual, social and moral agenda that the neo-liberal project has pursued in the face of both uncertain evidence and immense hardship to some of the most vulnerable of the young.

Indeed proponents of Marxist theory argue that the Capitalist society we live in is the biggest obstacle to overcome if marginalisation and inequality are to be eradicated. Within this theoretical framework, there is concern that professionals and young people

themselves are unable to challenge discrimination alone due to being *'trapped in a social structure which severely delimits their power and hence their ability to initiate significant change'* (Bailey and Brake, 1980:7-8). However, professionals working with young people who offend should aspire towards an emancipatory approach, deliver non-discriminatory forms of practice intervention and understand the structural constrains that can severely impact on a young person's offending career and deny opportunities for integration into society.

Concluding Thoughts

> *The failure to understand or be interested in the meaning of the behaviour or the message behind the antisocial act can lead to more sever disaffection and more serious antisocial behaviour.* (Lowe, 2013:291)

Although somewhat contested by Pearson (1983) in his study on 'respectable fears' - where he argued that issue of social disorder and violence are not a new phenomenon - David Cameron described the actions of the rioters as representing a clear lack of moral values which he argued had been traditionally held by the British people. Cameron went on to argue that Britain is now broken where 'the twisting and misrepresenting of human rights …has undermined personal responsibility '(David Cameron, cited in Stratton, 2011:4). Indeed, the riots did cause severe harm and suffering, not just physical harm (five people died as a direct result of the rioting) but also significant financial harm (the rioting cost the country an estimated half a billion pounds) (Lowe, 2013:279-80). Notwithstanding that there have been very different interpretations of the riots, where some have come to very different opinions from the same data, I will conclude by noting a number of factors/characteristics that, if not dealt with, may give rise to future rioting:

First, as noted within this paper, there are high levels of unemployment and in particular youth unemployment (1 million young people below the age of 15 were not in employment in November 2011). Some parts of England have higher levels of youth unemployment than others (Benyon, 2011). Nevertheless, it could be argued that this has contributed to increases in economic inequality (Smith, 2011).

Second, for over 30 years neoliberal 'social restructuring' and the rolling back of the welfare state has widened social inequalities (Cooper, 2012). Arguably, children and young people are denied appropriate social protections 'necessary for living healthy lives in the present and for envisioning a sustainable existence in the future' (Cooper, 2012:11). Indeed, children are socially and economically marginalised and politically powerless (Sandvoss, 2011). There are limited avenues for young people – who are often powerless within society - to challenge 'top down' approaches, where there is rarely an opportunity provided to 'bring pressure to bear on those with political power' (Benyon, 2012). A fatal limitation of the

Riots, was its inability to 'transform itself into a positive programme of socio-political change' (Zizek, 2011:5).

One could argue that the social cultural context has a vital part to play in the onset of the disturbances in England in 2011. Despite this acknowledgment, politicians such as Theresa May believes that these are 'excuses' (Kwesi Johnson, 2012) where it was more about 'instant gratification' and 'greed' rather than protest, service user-cuts and unemployment. Indeed, a number of Conservative-liberal democrat government representatives characterised the individuals who took part in the rioting as lawless and vicious (Slovo, 2011).

Third, there is public mistrust of the Police service. This is more apparent when we consider the deteriorating relationship between the police and younger members of society. Particular anger is voiced at the practice of 'stop and search' and concern has been raised over issues of 'bullying' and 'abuse'.

Fourth, Government support in the form of social, educational and welfare provision has receded. Services for children in need have been decimated. Of particular note, some of these services that have been eroded include: health care, housing, access to higher education provision and generic youth support services. Perhaps most concerning, however, is the issue of child poverty. When we consider that England is one of the richest developed countries in the world, it is unacceptable that an estimated 4 million children continue to live in poverty (Topping, 2012) and it is a depressing thought that the general well-being of children within society is declining (Cooper, 2010). Young people then are left with limited alternative choices and this has included, for example, young people taking part in activities such as begging. Individuals who take part in such activities, however, are responded to in a punitive way and criminalised rather than having their needs met by supportive services: 'even traditional youth leisure activities, such as hanging around public spaces with friends, now risk criminalisation' (Cooper, 2012:13).

References

Bailey, R. and Brake, M. (1980) *Radical social work and practice.* London: Edward Arnold.

Bateman, T. (2012) 'With the benefit of hindsight: the disturbances of August 2011 in historical context' in Briggs, D (ed) *The English Riots of 2011: A Summer of Discontent.* Hook: Waterside Press.

Benyon, J. (2012) England's Urban Disorder: The 2011 Riots, *Political Insight* 3 (1) pp.12-17.

British Youth Council (2011) *Our streets: the views of young people and young leaders on the riots in England in August 2011.* London: British Youth Council.

Briggs, D (2012) (ed) *The English Riots of 2011: A Summer of Discontent.* Hook: Waterside Press.

Children's society (2011) *Behind the riots: Findings of a survey into children's and adult's views of the 2011 English riots.* London: Children's Society.

Clarke, K. (2011) Punish the feral rioters but address our social deficit too *Guardian,* 5 September.

Cohen, S. (2006) *Folk devils and moral panics.* 3rd edition. London: Routledge.

Collett, S. (2013) Riots, revolution and rehabilitation: the future of probation, Howard Journal, 52, 163-89.

Cooper, C. (2012) Understanding the English 'riots' of 2011: 'mindless criminality' or 'Youth Mekin Histri'. *Youth and Policy* 109: 2012.

Crawford and Lister, S. (2007) *The use and impact of dispersal orders, Sticking plasters and wake-up calls. A report for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.* Bristol: Policy Press. Page ix.

Creaney, S. (2013) Beyond pre-emptive criminalisation: towards a child-friendly youth justice, *Safer Communities,* 12 (3) pp.101-10.

Creaney, S. (2014) 'The benefits of participation for young offenders' Safer Communities, Vol 13. Issue: 3. Pp. 126-132.

Creaney, S. and Smith, R. (2014) Youth justice back at the crossroads Safer Communities, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 83-87.

Cunningham, J. and Cunningham, S (2012) *Social Policy and Social Work: An Introduction (Transforming Social Work Practice Series)* London: sage.

Delsol, R. and Shiner, M. (2011) Police stop and search data is needed to account for equality, *The Guardian,* 1 February.

DSS (1999) *Opportunity for All—Tackling Poverty and Social Exclusion: A Summary of the First Annual Report* London: Department of Social Security.

Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010) *Stop and think – a critical review of the use of stop and search powers in England and Wales.* London: Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Fitzgibbon, W., Curry, D. and Lea, J. (2013), Supervising Rioters: The Role of Probation. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice.* doi: 10.1111/hojo.12037

France, A., Bottrell, D., and Armstrong, A. (2012) *A Political Ecology of Youth and Crime* Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke.

Furlong, A. and Cartmel, F. (2007) *Young people and social change: New perspectives*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Guardian/LSE (2011) *Reading the riots: Investigating England's summer of disorder,* London: Guardian/LSE.

Hart, D. and Thompson, C. (2009) *Young people's participation in the youth justice system,* London: National Children‟s Bureau.

Jones, C. and Novak, T. (1999) *Poverty, welfare and the disciplinary state.* London: Routledge.

Kwesi Johnson, L. (2012) Oppression and austerity fed the riots in Tottenham, *Guardian,* 29 March, p.34.

Lewis (2012) Joblessness and "toxic relations" with police are blamed for Tottenham riot, *Guardian*, 5 February, pp. 1-3.

Levitas, R. (2005) *The Inclusive society: Social exclusion and new labour.* London: Macmillan.

Lowe, F. (2013) The August 2011 Riots: Them and Us, *Psychodynamic Practice: Individuals, Groups and Organisations,* 19:3.

Matthews, D. (2011) Reading the riots, writing the book, *Guardian review*, 31 December, p.7.

Metropolitan Police Service (2012) *Statistical bulletin on the public disorder of 6th to 9 August 2011: February 2012 Update,* London: Ministry of Justice.

Muncie, J. (2009) *Youth and crime.* 3rd edition. London: Sage.

Murray, C. (1999) *Charles Murray and the underclass: the developing debate*. London: CIVITAS.

Newburn, T. (2012) *Counterblast: Young People and the August 2011 Riots,* The Howard Journal 51:3.

Pearson, G. (1983) *Hooligan: A History of Respectable Fears,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Riots, Communities and Victims Panel (2011) *5 Days in August: the final report of the riots communities and Victims Panel,* London: RCVP.

Riots, Communities and Victims Panel (2012) *After the Riots: the final report of the Riots Communities and Victims Panel,* London: RCVP.

Sandvoss, C. (2011) The media and the Riots in England: Unordered Thesis on Days of Disorder, 13 August, *Antenna: responses to media and culture,* p.1.

Stratton, A. (2011) Cameron and Miliband go head to head in riot aftermath, *Guardian,* 15 August, p.4.

Singh, D. (2011) *5 Days in August: an interim report on the 2011 English riots,* London: Riots, Communities and Victims Panel.

Slovo, G. (2011) *The Riots – from Spoken Evidence,* London: Oberon Books.

Smith, M. K. (2011). 'Young people and the 2011 'riots' in England – experiences, explanations and implications for youth work'. *The encyclopaedia of informal education.*

Smith, R. (2008) *Social work with young people.* London: Wiley.

Social Exclusion Unit (2000) *National strategy for neighbourhood renewal, Report of Policy Action* Team 12: Young people.

Topping, A. (2012) Kicking out youth deprivation, *Guardian* 4 April p.40

Travis, A., Ball, J. and Bawden, F. (2011) English city riots involved "hardcore" of repeat offenders, first analysis shows' *Guardian*, 15 September.

Travis, A. (2011) 'Human rights groups condemn May's "headline-grabbing" curfew proposals?' *e guardian*, 17 August, p.8.

Ward, A. (2012) The "English Riots" as a communication: Winnicott, the antisocial tendency and public disorder. In Reeves, C. (Ed.) *Broken bounds: Contemporary Reflections on the antisocial tendency.* (pp.129-141) London: Karnac Books.

Waterton, S. & Sesay, K. (2012) Out of touch – a youth perspective, *Criminal Justice Matters*, 87:1, 28-29.

Williams, R. (2011) Teens are left to their own devices as council axes all youth services, Society *Guardian,* 24 August, pp. 36-37.

Zizek, S. (2011) Shoplifters of the world unite, the meaning of the riots. *London Review of Books Online.*