The Respect Drive: The Politics of Young People and Community

A study based in the London Borough of Hackney

By Louisa Thomson

Goldsmiths
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

THE RESPECT DRIVE:
THE POLITICS OF YOUNG PEOPLE AND COMMUNITY

A Study based in the London Borough of Hackney

By Louisa Thomson

THE RESPECT DRIVE:
THE POLITICS OF YOUNG PEOPLE AND COMMUNITY
A study based in the London Borough of Hackney
By Louisa Thomson

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"People want a society of respect. They want a society of responsibility. They want a community where the decent law abiding majority are in charge; where those that play by the rules do well, and those who don't, get punished." (Tony Blair, 'A New Consensus on Law and Order' Speech, 19th July 2004)

In May 2005, immediately after the General Election, Tony Blair announced that respect would be high on his third term agenda. At the beginning of 2006, the Respect Action Plan was published, a cross government commitment to 'bring respect to the communities of Britain' (Blair, 2006). Since 1997, Labour has emphasised the need to tackle anti social behaviour (ASB) - a raft of legislation has been introduced with the aim of bringing 'swift and effective enforcement action' (Home Office, 2003b: 19) and clamping down on low level disorder that is seen to be undermining communities and creating an environment of fear (eg: Home Office, 2003a: 2004). Increasingly, a lack of respect has been framed in government discourses as being an explanation for ASB, alongside a narrowing sense of what behaviour is acceptable.

The expectations for the respect drive are ambitious, calling for a cultural change. The site for intervention was spatially bounded – in the communities and neighbourhoods where ASB is seen as ruining the lives of the 'law abiding majority'. My research was driven by a desire to understand how respect operates in an urban context, and to interrogate what this implies for young people in particular, as many of the measures in the Respect Action Plan were targeted towards them. The main argument put forward here is that there is a disjuncture between the Government's conception of respect and community, and the way that these are experienced in the 21st century city – a site of difference, heterogeneity, fleeting encounters, and 'a vast sociology of hopelessness and misery' (Amin, 2006: 1011). The conflicting understandings around the idea of 'community' are often left unchallenged, and the message frequently returns to the need to enforce respect on those who are seen to be lacking it.

My research started with two main questions: how do young people define respect; and how do they relate to their community? The aim was to find how these views compared to the interpretations of young people found in the respect agenda; to deconstruct some of the values that are implicit in government policy that affects urban life, and explore how these might be interpreted differently in a local context. I spent six weeks at a youth club on the Marshside Estate in the London Borough of Hackney, interviewing young people, and also analysed how the respect agenda was being implemented locally.[1]

The empirical research focused on one very specific area, locally constructed as in need of attention and intervention. However, the understandings of respect, community, the rights to spaces, and territorial identities do help think about some of the normative assumptions in the government's approach to responding to communities, young people and ASB. For Blair, respect represented 'the very possibility of life in a community' (2006), and the case study enabled me to think about whose community is being protected, whose definition of respect is being promoted, and how we might think more openly about encounters with difference in cities beyond community, allowing for disconnection, dissociation, anonymity and change (eg: Young, 1986). The analysis draws on literature on urban policy, crime, community and urban space to help explain some of the tensions and contradictions in the 'respect drive' for communities.

In the spirit of Keith's belief that 'the landscapes of the city (of powerful and powerless) may be read, but they may also be lived, smelt, heard and haunted' (2005: 21) – the views of the young people in my case study have been interpreted and read from a position that lies outside their social world. There are boundaries, inevitable misrepresentations and betrayals, and this should be taken into account when reading.

---

[1] All places and names in this study have been changed to protect participants' anonymity

THE RESPECT AGENDA: CRITICAL CONTEXTS

Government interventions in urban communities have been justified through the link between high crime rates and 'hard pressed areas' where social capital (networks, norms and social trust that facilitate cooperation and mutual benefit) is found to be lacking. Action is required to reverse the spiral of decline (NRU, 2002). Labour's approach to ASB has been criticised on numerous fronts – for the punitive emphasis (eg: Jamieson, 2006), the demonisation of young people as the main agents of ASB (eg: Make Space, 2004), and the tensions inherent in a focus on improving city life by regenerating spaces and empowering communities on the one hand, and an enforcement drive targeted at urban neighbourhoods on the other (Bannister et al, 2006). However, the Respect Action Plan promises to go 'broader, deeper and further' (Respect Task Force, 2006: 7) with more powers against the behaviour of the 'selfish minority' in communities, alongside early interventions targeted at problem families.[2] In this section, I will examine three main themes – the socialisation of youth in the Government's approach to ASB; the forms of governance that are at the heart of the respect agenda; and the moral discourse that is invoked in the characterisation of the urban community.

Socialisation of youth

The Government's approach to community safety has been largely focussed on resolving the problems that young people cause for adults (Squires & Stephen, 2005a). Research on community perceptions of ASB find that young people are labelled as the main culprits but that 'fear and suspicion is often more of a problem than the behaviour itself' (Millie et al, 2005: 25). There have been recurring fears about youth being out of control (Muncie,

---

[2] The Respect Action Plan could be interpreted as being more sensitive than earlier policy documents (eg Home Office, 2003a) in the need to address the risk factors and causes of ASB, and provide more intensive support. However, the dominant media message to emerge was still one of cracking down on yobs – during the summer of 2006 when this research was being completed, there were announcements under the respect banner of a summer campaign against mini motos (http://www.respect.gov.uk/whats-being-done/news-events/articles/mini-moto.html); withholding housing benefit from problem families (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/5047858.stm) and controversy over senior police officers wanting more powers for 'instant justice' (http://society.guardian.co.uk/crimeandpunishment/story/0,,1851120,00.html).

4

2004), and displaying a disregard for 'rules which have been carefully crafted over generations guaranteeing order in the public space' (Field, 2003: 22). The notion of a moral panic clusters these fears together and amplifies them, and youth is reaffirmed as an object for intervention in need of moral improvement. Youth crime can become a 'virtual metaphor for the condition of contemporary Britain' (Squires, 2006: 151).

Community safety is therefore underpinned by common sense assumptions about youths as the agents of violence (Back & Keith, 2004). The aim of the respect agenda is for young people to 'contribute to their communities' (Respect Task Force, 2006: 3) and be diverted from ASB into more appropriate forms of behaviour. However, the messages in this socialisation process are often confusing (Edwards & Hatch, 2003; Muncie, 2004) - young people appear as lacking in self responsibility and acting like thugs, but also as in need of control and protection. Such & Walker (2005) suggest that young people occupy a problematic place in the Government's rights and responsibilities agenda. More responsibility is demanded, but with young people 'we also engineer situations in which adults are least able, or least willing, to cope with or tolerate them' (Squires et al, 2004: 77). Cohen describes youth policy interventions resting on a conception of youth as a unitary category (1997: 182), and this can lead to an oversimplified view overlooking the ambiguous placement of youth and the complex transitions of adolescence (Hall et al, 1999).

The Government has been criticised for allowing a blame culture to arise around young people and ASB – a 'toxic mixture of institutionalised intolerance and public predispositions' (McMahon, 2006). Muncie (2004) highlights that whilst the majority of those who go through the youth justice system are males from lower class backgrounds and ethnic minorities, much of the offending by young people tends to be transient and minor. The reality is that many young people do not commit crime, and at the same time are likely to be victims of it (Edwards & Hatch, 2003). The fluid definitions surrounding ASB – 'it means whatever the victim says it means' (Hazel Blears MP, then Minister of State in the Home Office, quoted in Charkrabarti, 2006)

5

allow a space for any behaviour that is alarming or distressing to come under the punitive gaze of the respect drive. Young people inevitably are caught up in this enforcement, entrenching discriminatory understandings of their behaviour. The result is that they may feel unfairly targeted (Millie et al, 2005), resentful of the negative perceptions that label them all as troublemakers (Edwards & Hatch, 2003), and misunderstood by adults (Squires et al, 2004).

The response to youth crime under Labour is regarded as prioritising fast track punishment, and dealing with petty crimes (Savage & Atkinson, 2001).[3] However, government policy is also intervening to address situations that may lead to ASB, and aiming to give young people a say in shaping services that provide 'things to do and places to go' (DfES, 2005). The Respect Action Plan accommodates elements of this, attempting to move away from essentialising young people in terms of their deviant behaviour, and recognising some of the pressures they face. Ultimately, a positive story is still lacking – the Respect Action Plan sets out contributions that young people can make, but with the implication that they are not doing enough of these things at present to fulfil their obligations as citizens. The socialisation of youth remains divided between sanctions and protection in policy. Back & Keith stress the need for 'an understanding of the public sphere which thinks more contextually about the arenas in which the citizenship of young people is both given and restricted' (2004: 69).

Forms of governance in the respect agenda

The New Labour emphasis on 'rights and responsibilities' is firmly entrenched in the respect agenda, reflecting a new politics of conduct, where a common set of values is promoted. The expectation is that the community should set clear standards of behaviour, and that there is a responsibility for all to tackle ASB in a 'something for something society' (Home Office, 2003a: 1). The implication is that there is a strong community behind this action that will be

---

[3] The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 introduced a more coherent approach towards preventing offending by young people with the establishment of the Youth Justice Board and Youth Offending Teams (YOTS) at local level – largely in response to the Audit Commission's Report 'Misspent Youth' (1996) which identified that the youth court process was too slow, too expensive, that there was a need to monitor re-offending and ensure that more intensive support is in place.

made stronger through its collective endeavour. Governance is extended across a range of behaviours – dispersing the 'tasks of knowing and governing through a myriad of micro-centres of knowledge and power' (Rose, 1999: 190). The disciplinary net widens across certain populations and social contexts, and the networks through which this is supervised and maintained tightens (Squires, 2006). These governance practices have been interpreted as being driven by the middle class and elites - reflecting an intolerance of deviance in punitive measures, and withdrawal – for example in the form of gated communities (Fyfe, 2004; Whitehead, 2004).[4]

The disciplinary techniques in the Respect Action Plan can be interpreted as part of a governmentality regime - Foucault's concept that expresses the infusion of government into social life; a complex form of power that targets the population and acts upon individuals (Foucault, 1991). These range of practices and rationalities of rule are characteristic of modern society – the strategies that subject citizens to more regulatory controls (McNay, 2004). Rose expands the idea of governmentality with the notion of 'ethico-politics' – a field in which the new game of power operates, concerned with 'the self techniques necessary for responsible self government, and the relations between one's obligations to oneself and one's obligations to others' (1999: 188). When ethico-politics operates towards the pole of morality, 'it seeks to inculcate a fixed and uncontestable code of conduct' (ibid: 193). In contrast, at the pole of ethics, you would expect to find minimal codification and a reluctance to govern too much. Rose locates the Government's moralising policies towards the first pole. The idea of governmentality can be applied to ASB legislation – for example, Flint (2002b) discusses the role of social housing agencies as a form of regulated freedom for tenants, where actors are expected to have self regulating capacities, but also be subject to direct interventions. The overall effect of governmentality regimes on neighbourhoods is homogenising, reinventing everyday places with generalisations about the nature of that space (Back & Keith, 2004: 68).

---

[4] See Appendix 1 for summary of main ASB powers

Governance of community safety sits alongside, and overlaps with narratives that stress the need for empowered communities, more decentralisation, and a renewal of local democracy - a key theme in Government policy is passing more power, control and influence from the centre to local communities and citizens (Marinetto, 2003; Rogers & Robinson, 2004; Civil Renewal Unit, 2005; Miliband, 2005).[5] New ideas for community involvement are expanded in the Respect Action Plan - community calls for action, neighbourhood charters, and 'face the people' sessions for local crime services (Respect Task Force, 2006: 30). In addition, recent advocates of 'double devolution' have proposed neighbourhood bodies should have powers over 'what matters most locally' – crime, grime, young people, noise and public spaces (Mulgan & Bury, 2006). However, the net effect of decentralising governance in the area of community safety seems to be a proliferation of different sites of decision making, and a diffuse set of interventions, rather than a sense of real engagement and empowerment amongst citizens. As Amin expresses it – 'community participation will become an instrument of political conformity and control rather than a means for inculcating active citizenship' (2005: 621). The danger is that some groups within the 'community' will only feature as targets of enforcement, rather than as partners in the processes of engagement – in reality, a consensus over community interests is hard to find.

The governance of personal life is also apparent in the Respect Action Plan through direct interventions for the 'neighbours from hell' who refuse help (Respect Task Force, 2006: 21). Examples of these interventions include parenting orders to gain compliance from parents to take responsibility for their children's behaviour, national networks of intensive family support schemes and a 'cross Government strategy for the most challenging families' (Respect Task Force, 2006: 23). As respect is assumed to begin in the residential domain, parenting interventions are based on the notion that families have to be accountable to communities (Flint & Nixon, 2006). The parenting approach has been criticised for the risk of stigmatising certain

---

[5] Services are coordinated around the needs of each neighbourhood, with Local Strategic Partnerships bringing together different public, private and community sector initiatives.

families and for failing to take into account the embedded problems that might affect the families that are being targeted (Jamieson, 2006).

Moral discourses in communitarianism

The forms of governance discussed above assume a pivotal role for the community – as a 'practical means of furthering the social and material refurbishment of neighbourhoods' (Giddens, 1998: 79), and suggest a new relationship between citizen and the state. The influence of communitarianism on New Labour has frequently been referred to (eg Driver & Martell, 1998; Little, 2002; DeFilippi & North, 2004). In the political communitarianism of Etzioni, individuals are defined by their membership of local communities, where they have responsibilities to their neighbours, and clear standards of behaviour are set – the aim being to offset the 'moral confusion' that is created when 'communities pull in incompatible directions' (1993, 32). There is the assumption first, that 'community' can be identified as a target for policy (Imrie & Raco, 2003) and second, that social order and responsibility stems from a strong community (Amin, 2005; Johnstone, 2004), as 'civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a dense network of reciprocal social relations' (Putnam, 2000: 19).

The combination of communitarianism and the idea of encouraging communities improve themselves establishes the neighbourhood as a moral space (Whitehead, 2004), and 'binds people into durable relations' (Rose, 1999: 170). Little (2002) has drawn attention to the danger of moral authoritarianism which he sees as being inherent in orthodox communitarian theories – the motivation to protect tends to be backward looking and regressive. The moral space of the neighbourhood is defined according to the wishes of the 'law abiding majority'. The fact that the 'normality' of the majority can also be deeply problematic is also overlooked (Young, 2001). Rather than fostering greater social inclusion, encouraging members of the community to play a role in 'rescuing the public realm from the tyranny of the few' (Bannister et al, 2006: 921) risks the establishment of 'more stringent understandings of virtue (Boyd, 2006: 868) and deeper forms of exclusion (Johnstone, 2004).

A community based on 'shared activities, shared public spaces and shared institutions' (Miliband, 2005), fails to recognise that 'community' is rarely rooted in a geographical locale, engendering the same set of attachments for all. As Back & Keith explain – 'community is as much a narrative product as an organic achievement' (1999: 133). Amit (2002) also encapsulates the fact that 'community' can exist between idea and action – it does have an emotive impact, but it can no longer be seen as all enveloping; communities are contingent and changing. The moral notions of the communitarian make a different imagining of neighbourhood space hard – as the strong community/safe area link precludes a consideration of other discourses in that neighbourhood space, and different ways that forms of social capital might be fostered outside a responsible social citizenship. Amin argues that instead of defining neighbourhoods in terms of their worst features, they should be seen as 'socially and culturally heterogeneous, complex and conflicting in their needs and interests' (2005: 626), something that other community based studies have discovered (eg: Edwards & Hatch, 2003).

Understanding respect in communities

The understanding of a spatially bound, homogenous community can be challenged without necessarily undermining the benefits that are assumed to be linked to the idea of community. Power & Mumford's (2003) study of community relations in two East End neighbourhoods found that community is important – small scale, localised actions and contacts, but with an awareness that these do not have clear boundaries and rules. Cohen et al's *Finding the Way Home* project (1996; 1999) looked at the spatial narratives that young people construct in particular areas, within an understanding that people 'don't just live in places, but in the description of places' (1996: 3), modified by the material urban infrastructure, which influences individual orientations (ibid: 4). These two studies problematise 'community' and the claims that are made in its name. My decision to interview young people in a community setting was inspired by these studies – exploring the different ways that community is made meaningful, and remaining open to the different forms that it might take.

There were several gaps in other research in the area of ASB and young people that helped to frame my case study. Listening to voices that tend not to be heard is often prioritised in research, but a recent attempt to encourage young people's comments on ASB relied on an online survey (Wisinewska et al, 2006). The findings point to some of the limitations of self report – namely that it is dependent on a willingness to admit criminality. The survey unsurprisingly concluded that young people are unlikely to participate in ASB. Another study (GLA, 2005a) included focus groups with young people, but was based on general perceptions of ASB and not linked to a neighbourhood setting. This led me to focus on one area, and one youth club, where it might be possible to appreciate how respect relates to the particularities of the urban environment. This approach also seemed relevant given the lack of clarity over the extent of the 'ASB problem' – whether it is due to difference in opinion, media hype or pervasive stereotypes (Wood, 2004), which helps to shape specific understandings in a locale.

A NOTE ON THE FIELDWORK

A case study inevitably involves a degree of arbitrary selection (Silverman, 2004: 127) and I focussed on Hackney partly out of convenience as I live there. However, Hackney has a reputation as being a high crime area, and an initial search revealed that the figures for ASBOs were lower than neighbouring boroughs.[6] The year of the research had also seen the launch of a prominent 'I love Hackney' campaign by the Council, aiming to restore pride in the Borough. This seemed an interesting context to see how central government policies on ASB and respect were being interpreted in a local setting.

The research was based on four approaches:

- interviews with young people from the youth club on the Marshside Estate.[7] These were conducted between 29th June and 3rd August 2006.[8] I also kept a detailed diary of encounters and conversations after each visit to the club.
- interviews with the manager and youth workers at the youth club; representatives from a tenants' organisation (TO) on the estate; three members of the Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) for the ward in which the Marshside Estate is situated.[9]
- interviews with local practitioners, councillors and police involved with ASB in Hackney.[10]
- a review of relevant documents and policy reports for Hackney Council.

---

[6] Figures for the number of ASBOs issued between April 99-Sept 05. Hackney: 14; Tower Hamlets: 39; Islington: 20; Haringey: 37; Camden: 107 (http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/asbos/asbos2.htm)
[7] Please see Appendix 2 for details of the interviewees, and Appendix 3 for more details about the youth club on the Marshside Estate
[8] This involved 12 visits to the youth club of between 2-5 hours duration on each occasion.
[9] See Appendix 4 for demographic information about the ward.
[10] Interviews were conducted with a representative from Hackney Council's ASB team; two councillors who are members of the Cabinet on Hackney Council; a senior police officer based at a Police Station in Hackney working specifically in the field of community safety; two representatives from Hackney Council for Voluntary Services; and a representative involved in the Hackney Youth Parliament initiative.

The manager at the youth club on the Marshside Estate helped me to identify willing interviewees, and I found a quiet room at the club to interview people individually, or in pairs. These informal interviews started with some general questions about life on the estate and at the club, and then more detailed questions about their interpretations of respect, ASB, and their understandings of community, and interpretations of spaces on the estate. In this sense, my research represents one group of young people's ideas, there was no textbook methodological approach (though Silverman, 2004, made me appreciate the value of a case study), and there were many barriers that complicated the research process and the nature of the accounts from the young people at the youth club on the Marshside Estate.

I was conscious about my distance from the young people I interviewed - being white, middle class, and female at a youth club largely frequented by young black men. In some cases, I was only a few years older then my interviewees, which made the focus on 'young people' feel uncomfortable – as I would also define myself as a 'young person', but also because it made the difference in circumstances between us feel more acute. My presence there was unusual, despite the fact that I lived very nearby.[11] The fact that I had chosen a setting that had few formal boundaries (as maybe a classroom would have provided) invariably made my task harder. There was the added (and unexpected) complication of a film crew being at the club during the same period, making a documentary. Their presence did have a noticeable effect on the atmosphere in the club, and meant that certain young people were staying away, whilst others were excitable.

---

[11] One of the Safer Neighbourhood Team officers I interviewed expressed alarm that I had been going to the estate on my own.

THE RESPECT AGENDA IN HACKNEY

The interviews with practitioners and stakeholders involved in coordinating Hackney's response to ASB and young people, and the review of policy documents were aiming to give me a sense of the nature of the problems faced in the Borough; how these were being addressed in the respect/ASB framework; whether these responses differed from the national narratives; and to set the context for my case study on the Marshside Estate. It was often hard to see how the different organisations and partnerships fitted together, and who was responsible for what – maybe reflective of the diffuse working that is now obligatory for local authorities.[12]

The Borough of Hackney carries a heavy burden through its reputation and representation. For example, Power & Mumford found that Hackney is among the ten boroughs in England where people have the most dissatisfaction with neighbourhood conditions and services (2003: 145). Channel4 recently included Hackney in a list of the 10 worst places to live in Britain.[13] Every ward in Hackney is among the 10% most deprived wards nationally, and the main problems in the Bsorough are focussed around poor skills and attainment levels, high crime levels and poor environmental conditions (Hackney Council, 2004). Although crime statistics are not always the best measure, they do illustrate the extent of the problem in Hackney – street crime is six times the national average.[14] Nearly half of the Borough's residents state that they feel unsafe walking in their area after dark (Team Hackney, 2006a).

Within this picture, the problem of young people and crime visibly emerges. Between April 2001-March 2004, it was estimated that 10-17 year olds were responsible for 28% of all crime in the borough (SCPLP, 2006). However, the emphasis in the policy documents is on encouraging law abiding and positive behaviour, recognising the context specific pressures 'to get involved in criminal and anti social activities' (Hackney Council, 2004: 29) and that sustained support is required to stay out of crime. In discussions about the role of the Youth Crime Reduction Task Group the priorities were framed as being preventing, deterring and rehabilitating, rather than always prioritising use of ASB legislation. The Council seemed keen to distance itself from negative media portrayals of young people as criminals and challenge Hackney's reputation – 'we want children and young people to feel good about themselves and about their diverse heritage' (HCYPS, 2006).

During the course of my research, I spoke to a representative from the Council's ASB team, a councillor who was a Cabinet member of Hackney Council, and a senior police officer based in the Borough, specifically asking them about the policies and interventions in Hackney relating to ASB and the respect agenda. There were differences in emphasis, but overall broad agreement that Hackney favoured support measures over an enforcement drive:[15]

> Police officer: *"There is no blanket bombing of the legislation in Hackney… I'd like to think that every case is very bespoke. We would never go for an ASBO or dispersal order without community consultation and buy in."*

Of course, it is possible that I was being told what they expected me to want to hear, but this approach is also consistent with the London ASB Strategy

---

[12] In the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) were established, aiming for a more coordinated approach to crime reduction. They bring together police, local authorities and the voluntary sector to produce a local strategy and set targets. They are also required to conduct an audit of crime in their area. In Hackney the 'Safer and Cleaner Place to Live Partnership' is part of 'Team Hackney' the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) in the Borough which has six main work areas – a good place to grow up; a dynamic and creative economy; thriving healthy communities; better homes; safer, cleaner places to live; and a sustainable borough (http://www.teamhackney.org)
[13] http://www.channel4.com/4homes/ontv/best&worst/best&worst_hackney.html
[14] Crime statistics only reflect reported crime, and are sensitive to factors such as changing attitudes to reporting crime, which can impact on statistics even if the actual number of crimes has not changed.

[15] The Council's ASB interventions are mainly through the ASB Intervention and Support Team (ASBIST) which responds to ASB complaints in the borough, working on individual cases. If cases are severe, and an Acceptable Behaviour Contract (ABC) or Anti Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) might be required, neighbourhood case panels are convened to discuss the approach.

which sees the need for sensitivity when young people are perpetrators of ASB (GLA, 2005b).

Hackney was one of 14 areas that have been chosen to implement the Respect Action Plan. The political response from the councillor, whilst not denouncing the views expressed above, was that there is strong support for robust action on ASB:

> Councillor: *"Being able to show that firm action is happening, and being able to point and say this is what we're doing against the criminal faction in Hackney is very popular on the estates."*

However, he also voiced his concerns that the Home Office were appearing to lecture the Council about what they were doing wrong over ASB. The representative from the Council's ASB team similarly spoke about his wrangles with the Home Office who were demanding to know why more enforcement measures were not in place. Given this context, the response to the Respect Action Plan was not that positive:

> Councillor: *"it's designed to appeal to the people that want respect – the older constituency – not young people."*

> Police officer: *"If it is about throwing money at things, then it may not be effective. You have to create the right environment to get that motivational event which makes people review what is important in their lives and what they want to pursue."*

In the discussions, it became clear that 'respect' was something already being worked out and negotiated in the context of Hackney, which the interviewees saw as having its own unique set of problems and issues. During the period of my research, this was illustrated through the TRUCE initiative that brought a team of former gang members from New York to perform concerts on estates in Hackney. The senior police officer was involved with this, and described the

effect as *"phenomenal"*.[16] Elsewhere, there was scepticism about faith based outreach, but the councillor's response was *"at least we tried"*. The representatives I spoke to from Hackney Council for Voluntary Services (HCVS) were also in the process of planning a Peace Week in September 2006, approaching young people to be involved through radio stations, text messages and clubs, keen to move away from the *"misnomer that young people are hard to reach."*

The respect drive in Hackney is already evident in the myriad forms of intervention and support that are happening across the Borough.[17] The lack of enthusiasm for the Respect Action Plan can partly be explained by the 'crime leap' in Hackney:

> Police officer: *"unfortunately, our young people tend to go from the minimum of ASB straight into major crime, which is selling class A drugs, street crime and other forms of criminality. They seem to do a quantum leap."*

The responses in Hackney stress 'soft interventions' in the form of diversion, prevention, and continued commitment to tackling the root causes of ASB on the one hand, but also have to deal with the escalating gun crime and gang membership on the other.[18] The Respect Action Plan appeared to be telling the practitioners things that they were either already aware of and trying to address, whilst being inadequate to cope with the main crime issue of guns and gangs, the effect of which goes beyond causing alarm, distress or harassment to people as implied in the ASB discourse.

There is recognition in the partnership approach to local government, that local councils are best placed to interpret their problems, but the case in

---

[16] However, the presence of TRUCE in Hackney was not without controversy. The leader – an evangelical preacher – was found to have homophobic views on his website. The Council insisted that he signed their equalities statement before appearing at a central venue in Hackney.
[17] See Appendix 5 for examples.
[18] In 2005/06 there was a 34.24% increase in gun crime in Hackney. Met figures show that from June 05- June 06, the count for gun crime in Hackney was 231, compared with 114 in Tower Hamlets; 111 in Islington; and 142 in Haringey (http://www.met.police.uk/crimefigures/)

Hackney demonstrates that there is considerable tension when attempts are made to impose central definitions or conceptualise problems into a wide ranging agenda (Newburn, 2003). Nationally, the problem may be framed as a lack of respect in many communities across Britain, but these communities are also interpreted and seen as sites for intervention in a local framework that may produce a different narrative. The case study on Marshside Estate encapsulates some of these tensions.

THE MARSHSIDE ESTATE CASE STUDY

The Marshside Estate is framed in Hackney policy documents as one of the problematic pockets in the Borough. The Floor Target Action Plan on guns and gangs highlights the need for specific intervention in the ward where the estate is located (Team Hackney, 2006b). The area has a distinct mythology – near the notorious 'Murder Mile' in Clapton, the site of numerous shootings. Physically, the estate is isolated at the east of Hackney, and badly served by public transport. As Tonkiss has expressed, 'edges and border zones have a particular grip on the urban imagination' (2005: 46), and the Marshside Estate could be interpreted in this way. In Government narratives it would be seen as the kind of council estate (low income and multi ethnic) where problems with most types of disorder could be perceived (HO RDS, 2004), and on demographic measures it is classified as 'poor'. A recent Joseph Rowntree Foundation study found that 50.5% of children in the ward were living in families on benefits, compared with 21% nationally.[19] However, the estate can also be seen as a micro space of the city, defying easy classification as a uniformly 'bad' area.

The youth club is a central focus for many of the young people on the estate, and also subject to localised myth making and narratives – in particular a negative interpretation by older residents on the estate. Back and Keith have argued against generalisations 'in favour of a much closer focus on the processes of narrativisation of local culture in stories that are told by young people, policy elites, community activists and others' (1994: 68), and the importance of this became apparent in my case study. The older residents I spoke to in the tenants' organisation drew on national understandings of youth and ASB, as well as selectively employed local stories to fit in with their common sense assumptions.[20] The young people were also aware of 'official' understandings – nationally, and how other people saw them on the estate –

[19] http://www.jrf.org.uk/child-poverty/documents/London.doc
[20] When I refer to the views of the tenants' organisation, this was based on a discussion with two members of the organisation, and therefore should not be taken as an official, representative view of the group.

and incorporated these into their own explanations for their behaviour. A cohesive urban community was far from being present, or even a realistic aim and a lot of the subsequent discussion here is framed in terms of the different interpretations of respect and rights to spaces on the estate between the young people in the youth club and the tenants' organisation (TO). This reflects the fact that common definitions of acceptable behaviour and tolerance of that behaviour might be hard to find.

Understandings of Respect

"Respect is:

- *treating others the way you want to be treated*
- *showing kindness and consideration*
- *liking yourself enough to be yourself*
- *accepting others for who they are."*

(notice on the wall of the youth club on the Marshside Estate)

The mutuality of respect

In the Respect Action Plan, respect is seen as instinctive, a value that everyone shares, and understands – the arrows in the logo surround 'Give Respect, Get Respect' suggesting that what goes around comes around (Assinder, 2006). At the youth club the response when asked about the meaning of respect reflected this mutuality and reciprocity:

Sarah: *"If you respect me, I'll respect you, simple as. If someone's nice to you and treats you with good manners, that's respect."*

Nico: *"You have to show respect to someone before they will show it to you. It's always been like that."*

As discussed earlier, Government policy draws a link between respect and behaviour, with the assumption that young people display a lack of moral understanding about civility. However, in the interviews, respect and ASB were rarely seen as being connected. Most had experiences of ASB and could list various things that bothered them on the estate (motorbikes, vandalism, assault, graffiti) but these were not a major cause of concern, merely part of the noise that came with living on that estate. Their behaviour - smoking outside the club, 'jamming' in the main square on the estate - was seen as acceptable whilst reluctantly acknowledging that it could effect others, or prevent them from using the area. Distinguishing between normal youthful

activities and anti social acts is a central problem in responses to ASB (Harradine et al, 2004), and one that the young people were aware of:

> Calvin: *"ASB – basically – some people don't like the way other people socialise. People socialise in different ways. If you don't like it or don't understand it, it is labelled as anti social."*

The tenants' organisation had very different views about the effect of the noise on the estate, and made it clear that they were engaged in a campaign against this, and ASB in general – collecting evidence and encouraging other tenants to do likewise. Although, the Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) confirmed that there was only one ASBO in operation on the estate, the impression from the tenants' organisation was that they were a good solution:[21]

> TO: *"It works to perfection – we go to court, give evidence, and they work. They make a hell of a lot of difference, alongside the police that walk the estate everyday."*

It was clear that some young people on the estate were 'up to no good' – there was drug taking outside the youth club, and the noise from inside was considerable on occasions. However, for the tenants' organisation, the very presence of young people was anti social, related to them having nothing to do – 'it is the seeming lack of productive activity as much as anything specific which infuriates and prompts allegations of deviance' (Hall et al, 1999: 507). The problem here is that ASB becomes 'the manifest behaviour of those who do this sort of thing' (Squires, 2006: 157), paving the way for strong interventions. This resonates with the strong public support, and the impression of action being taken. What is significant here is that the tenants' organisation are firmly aligned with the enforcement narrative and have bypassed the prevention and intervention approach of Hackney Council. The tenants' organisation would probably agree with the head of the Respect Task

---

[21] The SNT explained that most of their attention was focussed on drugs, knives and more serious crime. Their figures suggested that car thefts and burglaries were the biggest problem on the estate.

Force that ASBOs bring 'peace and security to people's lives' (Casey, 2006), rather than the more critical view that recognises the potentially harmful effects for young people in the 'naming and shaming' approach.

The sense of there being a 'stand off' between the old and young people is in line with findings in other studies (Edwards & Hatch, 2003; Squires et al, 2004). This situation seriously challenges the mutuality implied in 'give respect, get respect'. The young people on the estate were aware of what respect means, but there was no evidence in their eyes of respect from others towards them:

> Sarah: *"They complain about everything. At the end of the day, they've had their youth, they've got to let us have ours. They've got a fixed opinion of us that we're just loud and noisy. They don't have no respect for no one apart from themselves."*

For Mulgan and Buonfino (2006), 'the best way to strengthen respect is through activity: projects and tasks that give people reason to recognise each other as human beings rather than as categories', but they feel that modern society does not allow sufficient opportunities for this to happen. On the Marshside Estate, it was apparent that creating the conditions for shared activities between different age groups to negotiate their interpretations of respect and behaviour would be hard to achieve.

Respect and community values

In the interviews, the young people's understanding of respect was closely bound up in their sense of community as growing up together, knowing each other, looking out for each other, rather than institutional community values:

> Vernon: *"to an outsider, every community has its turmoil. But at the end of the day you look out for each other, because you see the same faces. You might come out one day and one of those faces is gone. But no matter what problems, disagreements – they are part of the community. It's just the way it is."*

This was manifested in respect for elders within the community – parents telling them that they have to be in at a certain time for their own good; the manager at the youth club who most of the young people had known all their lives; and local figures who inspired fear, such as the former cleaner at the club. Whereas the youth workers from Hackney Council struggled to keep control on their evenings in the club, the manager and the treasurer (who both lived on the estate) were listened to and trusted.[22] In this sense, respect is more complicated than the cycle image suggests – instead it could be seen as being present in dispersed networks of understanding that have built up through seeing people every day and knowing that they share your social environment.

This is not to suggest that this community understanding was idealised in the eyes of the young people. Several identified the problem with teenagers on the estate having children of their own, and that this was having an effect on standards of behaviour:

> Lauren: *"I weren't allowed to be rude. I've seen people now, kids in the street being rude, and their mums just don't say anything. My mum would have clapped me around the head. It's different now."*

However, at no point did anyone express the need to intervene in the lives of these families.[23] A lot of life on the estate was about making your own way, learning from your mistakes, with a resistance to being told how to do something, especially from 'outsiders'.

Undeniably, there are negative aspects of the strong, inward looking respect for each other (as I will discuss later), and in the context of the estate, it

---

[22] On one occasion, the treasurer lined up a group of ten 7-9 year olds outside the club and lectured them about the nature of respectful behaviour. They were silent, listening (maybe not taking it in!), but he was in a position to be able to do that, whereas the youth services workers would have not been able to get that attention in the first place. From what I observed, they did not have much interaction with the young people.
[23] However, it was evident from the interview with the one of the Council's Cabinet members, that family intervention projects had been successful in other parts of the borough, and that funding was being sought to extend this.

serves to further distance the young people from other social groups on the estate such as the tenants' organisation. But the latter's definition of respect also excludes the young people, and these both contribute to the lack of consensus over shared values on the estate. However, the danger within the Respect Action Plan framework is of not recognising that any value can be found in the young people's understandings of respect, and placing too great an emphasis on their obligations to be respectful towards others, rather than the other way round. The young people's ideas of respect on the estate were accompanied by a strong sense of injustice:

> Lauren: *"they (the government) don't understand. If they were doing like what you're doing now, they could see what each person goes through, and what each person feels. They don't care, because they don't come here at all, they don't put nothing in. That's why no one would put nothing out to them."*

Denying the existence of respect (however problematic its form might be) is to overlook where it comes from, how it is linked to specific evocations of community and how it can sometimes just be a defence mechanism when no one else seems to care.

Lack of Respect for authority – encounters with the police

The lack of respect for outside authority was most acute in discussions about the police. The local SNT were generally seen as being unobtrusive by the young people. The SNT regularly played football matches against teams from the youth club and relations appeared largely positive. The SNT made it clear to me that they had a commitment to the area, and had a long term view about their role on the estate. However, there was a widespread resentment of the Rapid Response Unit sweeping onto the estate on a regular basis, although the accounts of these raids did inevitably suffer from some degree of amplification as they were retold amongst the young people and to me.[24]

---

[24] I made a note of the raids on the estate on the occasions when I was at the youth club. 7th July: the night before there had been a raid on the estate in the middle of the night and guns and cash had been found in a boy's house. 12th July: two people had been stopped by the police and held to the floor with guns pointing at them. They were released with no apology. On the same day, the police had arrested

Carla: *"Some police are corrupted. They're going out saying they're upholding the law, but they're kicking people. If they're in plain clothes, they think they can get away with more, and taunt people 'yeh, mate, you think you're tough, do you want to go to the marshes and do something', you get me? It's aggravating."*

Vernon: *"If you're living your everyday life and you find you can't do this, and the police are going to come up to you, always going to pull you up – it's not nice, trust me, it's not nice at all."*

Relations with the police came up in discussions outside the estate too. There is the 'Hackney history' to be taken into account when explaining the responses of the young people, as well as a wider context of mistrust between ethnic minority communities and the police. The particular situation in Hackney is explored in Keith's (1993) ethnography of policing in the context of the 1980s riots in London, where he describes the notoriety surrounding Stoke Newington Police Station and the confrontations between the police and all sections of the black community over SUS laws, knock on offences and provocation. Thirteen years later and this notoriety was still being referred to:

Police officer: *"The resentment built up from the seventies. The Colin Roach issue – the young man who died in the front office of the old site of the police station. It went around for years that the police had shot him. The investigation has shown that it was suicide, but the community has never believed that… That siege mentality is still there – a lot of people haven't had a chance to air their views. Maybe they need that opportunity."[25]*

---

someone leaving the youth club who was smoking cannabis. 13th July: the Police raided the post office on the estate's main square. 14th July: a young person from the youth club was arrested for being in possession of cannabis.

[25] In the youth club some of the older ones were planning to make a board to display in the club spelling out what young people's rights are when they are stopped by the Police, and the Hackney Youth Parliament representative also spoke of efforts she was making to educate people about correct stop and search techniques – positive measures in a situation where young people are often left feeling powerless.

It has been suggested that nothing had changed in improving relations between ethnic minority communities and the police, even in light of the Macpherson Report (Fitzgerald, 2004), and this was echoed in the Hackney context:[26]

HCVS: *"There now seems to be a post Lawrence Inquiry backlash here, where the police have gone into reverse on a number of policing strategies. These approaches to community management are incendiary devices – the community's not stupid, word gets around, people know about it."[27]*

Addressing poor relations with the police is absent in the Respect Action Plan. There is a call for citizens to hold services to account, but only if these 'do not deliver on community safety' (Respect Task Force, 2006: 3). This is not a call for action for young people to express their grievances about the Police, or their feelings that their community is being disrupted on the estate, but rather a place for the 'law abiding majority' to state that not enough is being done in their name. The young people at the youth club on the Marshside Estate were clear where the boundaries of respect were – they did not receive it from the police, or the older people on the estate, and subsequently did not give it back in return.

The implications of not showing respect

In Sennett's writing on respect, he has been concerned with showing the relationship between respect and inequality, with the central propositions being that 'the inequalities of class and race clearly make it difficult for people to treat one another with respect' (2003: 47). The Respect Action Plan gives the impression of short term visible action rather than a longer, problem solving approach, and thus seems insensitive to the wider social problems of

---

[26] The 1999 report into the police investigation of the death of teenager Stephen Lawrence, which found that the Met was institutionally racist.

[27] Met figures for the number of stop and searches in Hackney for the period March-May 2006, show that there were 7.26 per 1000 white searches; 28.69 per 1000 black searches; 7.92 per 1000 Asian searches; and 49.61 per 1000 in the 18-24 age group, compared with 16.47 per 1000 in the 25-44 age group. 'Stops and Searches Monitoring Mechanism, May 2006 Hackney' available online at http://www.met.police.uk

living in poverty (although the link between ASB and deprived neighbourhoods is firmly established). In many ways, this focus is doing the Government's work elsewhere an injustice - particularly the strong social exclusion agenda (eg SEU, 2001; 2004) that is committed to improving the material conditions of poverty, and is sensitive to the risk factors involved. There is an obvious tension between this focus, and the approach in the Respect Action Plan that does not appear to recognise that the main thing that people living in poverty feel is a lack of respect from others (Lister, 2006) and that respect cannot occur by simply commanding it to happen (Sennett, 2003: 260).[28]

Sennett also identifies a lack of respect in the treatment that people receive from welfare institutions – 'it is not liberation from formal constraint but a better connection to others which the welfare client requires' (ibid: 203). This example could be extended to other forms of authority – the point is that there is something lacking in the quality of these interactions.[29] Young people need to be seen as equal partners in the cycle of respect, with opportunities to express their responsibilities, and to be listened to (Halpern, 2005a). The implication that some people are lacking respect is saying 'that they are neither our equals, entitled to moral dignity, nor full-fledged members of the same moral universe' (Boyd, 2006: 867).

It has been suggested that respect should be seen as more than just a liberal, individualistic disposition to tolerate others, and instead as a genuine engagement with others – an 'acceptance of the right of individuals to formulate conceptions of the good and to express them in the public domain' (Little, 2002: 49). However, the definitional confusion over ASB, and the civilising morality in the Respect Action Plan contribute to a sense of respect being hierarchical rather than an equal negotiation with a plural underpinning. The emphasis is on the respect demanded by the majority – 'the ones who

---

[28] Sennett was name checked in the Prime Minister's speech launching the Respect Action Plan (2006a), but made it clear in a Guardian interview that he saw the plan as 'too blunt an instrument' (in Jeffries, 2006)
[29] The Conservatives have picked up on unease with the way institutions can treat young people. A recent speech by David Cameron, called for institutions and people to 'show more love' and think about the emotional quality in relationships with young people (Cameron, 2006).

treat others with courtesy and good manners and expect the same back' (Blair & Porter, 2006) and ASB is defined according to their toleration levels (Hancock & Matthews, 2001). On the Marshside Estate it seemed that respect would not reach across the barriers between the young people and the tenants' organisation, unless the forms of respect and community that exist already among young people were acknowledged, and not defined exclusively in terms of what they were perceived to be lacking.

The Rights to Spaces

"Space cannot be dealt with as if it were merely a passive, abstract arena on which things happen." (Keith and Pile, 1993: 2)

The sense that social ties are declining and that modern life brings increasing risks can evoke as nostalgic need to return to former networks and spaces of community where damaging effects are lessened. This implies that a common set of interests can be found, without necessarily recognising that 'everyday ethical habits need renewal in every generation' (Halpern, 2005b). Arguments have been put forward for seeing the spatial as an 'ever shifting social geometry of power and signification' (Massey, 1994: 3), constructed out of social relations that are never still, containing 'relationships and separations, presences and absences' (Tonkiss, 2005: 3). In the interviews on the estate, stories about different kinds of spaces emerged. These are explored below based on an appreciation that modern life might be about accepting that we cannot find 'stronger sources of commonality' (Kymlicka, 2002: 272) that the communitarian model and the narratives in the Respect Action Plan strive for. Instead we might need to think about the organisation of urban life around an 'easy spontaneity' (Boyd, 2006: 878) and find accommodation for difference within this sense of detachment (Lees, 2004).

Estate Space

The burdens of representation of the estate as a criminal area were found in some of the young people's accounts. Although they were generally positive about *their* life on the estate, with their peers and families, they were aware that others did not feel the same.

> Nico: *"If I had just moved here, I wouldn't feel safe. I've lived here 18 years though, and I know everyone. But others don't feel safe because of what they hear – about crime rising, knives, guns, groups carrying things. It's based on fear rather than what they've experienced."*

In one discussion, the sense of outside threat to the space of the estate came up quite forcibly. Wesley felt that there was an inevitability that black families would be placed on the Marshside Estate rather than other parts of London, and that now the Olympics development was taking place, there would be a long term 'clean up' of the 'black' estates situated next to the wealth of the new Olympic village. Ultimately, he felt that the message was that the black community did not have the right to stay.

In the community imagining of the tenants' organisation the absence of ties on the estate was attributed to the presence of black families, who had disrupted the sense of common belonging and responsibility:

> TO: *"It used to be lovely at first. I'm not racist, but they were all white people that moved here. Gradually, as black people have moved in – that's when the problems started. If there was any trouble in the past, the men would go down and stop the kids. Now they won't. They're too scared."*

There is a deeper historical context here. Smith (1993) describes the residential segregation and differentiation that have socially reproduced race and inequality in Britain - the transformation of certain areas into 'alien' territory, establishing a representation of black neighbourhoods as hotbeds of violence and unrest. This spatialisation has left a complicated legacy, associating parts of the city with 'race' (Tonkiss, 2005). For Keith there is 'an ongoing struggle around the terms on which the presence of blackness in the body of the social was to be made visible' (2005: 78). The feelings of the tenants' organisation need to be understood in this context, which helps to shape their preconceptions about the young people on the estate, and their inextricable connections with forms of black criminality. However, there is also a danger that the Respect Action Plan, in legitimising the claims of the 'majority', can risk elevating the excesses in their views – in this case the tenants' organisation's opposition to black residents. The appeal to a strong community cannot negotiate the tensions between common norms and recognition of cultural diversity, and the differences in status could be seen as

destructive of attempts to improve social capital as well as undermining mutual respect. It can also be related back to Wesley's comment – that there is a certain liminality – of youth, and race - in spaces that are adverse to these presences (Back, 1993).

Attempts to find shared space

In a study of two South London estates, Back (ibid) found on one a discourse of 'neighbourhood nationalism' in the white working class community around the presence of ethnic minorities. It is hard to assess the extent of the neighbourhood nationalism amongst the white community on the Marshside Estate, bearing in mind that my information on this was obtained through one tenants' organisation. However, the tenants' organisation and the manager at the youth club both described a dispute over a failed attempt by the tenants' organisation to run another youth club in the main square on the estate, which illustrates some of the rights claims that are at play. The tenants' organisation leased a shop and invited young people on the estate to form a committee to manage it. However, six months later, the club was shut down, and had become a known site for drug dealing. The tenants' organisation had worked with the young people's committee, but found that:

> TO: *"They wouldn't make guidelines. They were unwilling to keep names. They complained it was boring – but it was theirs – it's what you make of it."*

The manager from the existing youth club had an explanation for the failure of the new club:

> Club manager: *"It was a crazy idea. They set it up with no youth workers in place, but interfered all the time with the young people. It's not surprising that it flopped, with that lot involved."*

The tenants' organisation had wanted a new youth club because of their distaste at the existing youth club being a 'black club' – they wanted a space that reflected the diversity of the estate more accurately.[30] The tenants' organisation are now focussed on campaigning for a community centre, that everyone could use. When questioned further on this, it transpired that young people would only be able to use it at weekends, and the main justification was that older people on the estate (like the tenants' organisation) had nowhere to go to meet up. These attempts to make spaces and insert a presence reflect a sense of moral superiority in the tenants' organisation – that they could influence activities of the young people on the estate, unquestioning about their right to do this.

In response to the older people on the estate, the young people in the youth club were defensive about their space. Although the building that the youth club inhabits is in disrepair, and the manager is struggling to pull together funding for activities, the people who went there valued it as a space that offered a degree of protection:

> Sarah: *"there's a different atmosphere here. [the manager] won't have no fighting, no arguing none of that. Out there – they can do what they want."*

In the discussions, the young people's own form of neighbourhood nationalism emerged. For Leroy, the solution to the old people complaining about the club could be resolved by moving them to Leyton, an assertion of his right to the estate.

The Square

In the absence of a community centre, or a shared space to bring people together, the youth club sits on one side of the estate's main square, with the tenants' organisation on the other. The space of the square is a site of anxiety. The SNT team joked that they would know they had made an impact on the quality of life on the estate if the square could be seen as a plaza with fountains and cafes, instead of being identified as suffering from problems

---

[30] The attendance figures for the youth club on the Marshside Estate do show that the largest group using the club are black and male, but not to the exclusion of others.

32

33

with groups of youths and increased gun activity. The young people defended their right to be in the square and saw the fears as being unjustified - *"it's just that hype you have with your peers"*. The girls I interviewed were more sensitive to the perception of the groups in the square as their parents disproved of the lack of activity associated with 'jamming':

> Sarah: *"my mum thinks they're just a waste of space… they just sit there all day and everyday doing what they're doing… but I say to her, don't judge them because you don't know them. Until you sit there and have a conversation with them you don't know them."*

The tenants' organisation had put wardens in place on the estate who were supposed to engage with the youths in the square, and *"see if they could put them on a different track"*, but these were fired after they became too scared to patrol the estate. The manager at the youth club had a different take – the problem had been that the wardens became too friendly with the young people and were not surveying them in the manner which the tenants' organisation would have liked. Crawford (2006) has an optimistic interpretation of wardens if they are able to engage with different community groups and help form bridges between these. However, the danger also is that wardens 'will automatically involve the promotion of some citizens' values and interests over those of others' (Flint, 2002a: 258).

The tenants' organisation were engaged in attempts to regulate and control public (and private) spaces on the estate. Public space can be seen as vital to facilitating exchanges, but not if attempts are made to influence behaviour in these spaces (Mean & Tims, 2005). Sennett (1970) has warned against the danger of sanitised cities arranged into functional neighbourhood spaces, as these form a buffer against painful surprises and disorder. Others have stressed the need for different perspectives to be brought into the public sphere – Berman wants to see public space used to bring all sorts of people, behaviour, impulses, ideas together, to break down barriers of race, class, age and sex – 'a society of split men and women badly need a terrain on which people can come together to heal their inner wounds' (1986: 476).

Competing rights/fluid spaces

Urban areas contain conflicts over the use of space and the rights in those claims. These ideas recognise that some groups have less freedoms and rights in the city (Harvey, 2004). On the Marshside Estate, the reactions of the tenants' organisation to the young people in the square and in the youth club, and their sense of having a right to control spaces, could be seen a stemming from a perceived lack of choice. Having lived on the estate for decades, the older residents might feel that they cannot move on, or should not have to, whereas, in contrast, young people are seen as being more mobile and able to leave. The ideal of a cohesive community based on shared values is hard to sustain if some groups have prior claims to a better lifestyle, and to more respect – one of the explanations for the conflicts over space on the Marshside Estate relate to the fact that there is not a sense of the same investment, costs and outcomes for the different groups living there.

One response of the tenants' organisation was to appeal to a former sense of community that they saw as being better than the current situation on the estate. They felt 'their' estate had been disrupted, and this served to place the black and white community alongside each other, with little interaction. Sennett has identified an insular take on social life as 'destructive gemeinschaft' – 'emotional relations with other people as a state of being, rather than as actions shared' (1977: 239). In the struggle to be a community, people become more withdrawn and intolerant. Young also warns against the danger of a normative privileging of community, as 'any move to define an identity, a closed totality, always depends on excluding some elements, separating the pure from the impure.' (1986: 430).

The Respect Action Plan does not evoke a sense of space where there is free and equal access for all. Instead it is intent on purifying space, and with a strong community regulating interactions in spaces. One way to think beyond this conception is maybe to accept that weak ties might be 'more conducive to tolerance, respect for difference, trust and an absence of prejudice' (Crawford, 2006: 974). These are not ideas that propose more individual rights, but rather

that sociability is possible within an 'ethics of indifference' (Tonkiss, 2005: 10). This challenges the appeal for 'more respect' in the Respect Action Plan, and does not take community as the panacea for all social ills. Instead a greater sensitivity is proposed - to the differences across race, age and gender, and how we might find the spaces to facilitate debate and accommodate these, rather than more exclusionary outcomes.

Territory and Identity

"Ghetto adolescents are highly sensitive to being 'dissed' that is dis-respected. In places where resources are scarce and approval from the outside world is lacking, social honour is fragile; it needs to be asserted every day." (Sennett, 2003: 34)

Although I had not intended to focus on gang activity, the 'official' location of the Marshside Estate in Hackney understandings of guns and gangs meant it was worth exploring this in the interviews with the young people at the youth club. The explanations relate closely to ideas about spatial ownership, which is relevant when exploring respect and the kinds of spaces that might help to facilitate it. Keith has argued that 'the stories that protagonists of gun crime might tell about the spaces in which they live are not isolated from the representations of the ghetto by bureaucrats, policy makers and politicians' (2005: 63) and as such, folk naming of city spaces and official cartographies should be addressed,

Negative respect

Literature on social capital has drawn attention to the negative side of 'bonding' capital – as inward looking, reinforcing identities and homogenous groups. For Putnam, this social capital can 'bolster our narrower selves' (2000: 23), with strong in group loyalty, and strong out group antagonism. The sense of respect bound into community ties amongst the young people on the estate cannot easily be dismissed as negative in itself – groups might designate outsiders and insiders, but do not necessarily promote damaging behaviour. However, there were sides to the peer group identification (as opposed to the wider community identification which included their elders) that resulted in criminal behaviour. One boy talked about stabbing someone because his cousin had told him he had to in order to 'get respect'. Another explained it as:

Calvin: *"You can beat up someone, and you've got respect. It's totally stupid, but it's the way it works. If someone kills someone, everyone*

would be talking to that person and looking up to them. It's about status too."

If a gang has an identity, and claims rights to a certain space, then the outcomes and behaviour may become more destructive. From the Council's perspective there are only a few gangs involving young people – characterised by disorganisation and volatility, and mostly identifiable through their participation in the drug market and formation in response to adjacent, territorial gangs, (Team Hackney, 2006b: 13). For the senior police officer working on community safety in the Borough, the worrying thing is when the gangs turn to organised crime:

Police Officer: *"there is a clear hierarchy of individuals with clear responsibilities, and crime is their main source of income… They have a grooming process, where they bring in their foot soldiers… it's replicating the American syndrome."*

Neighbourhood rules

During the interviews on the estate, a sense of the neighbourhood rules emerged. The main cause of antagonism amongst the young people related to a 'beef' with a rival youth club on a neighbouring estate. In one account, this had started as an argument between two people, and now everyone was involved. Someone had been stabbed over it.[31] Some of the boys made it clear that so long as there were scores to settle, and a history to take into account, the violence would continue – it was just way that it is. These feelings are focussed on their area, and life within it, which has to be protected at all costs. References to the 'postcode wars' repeatedly came up and for many of the boys on the estate 'EX' was their 'hood' to be defended.

Carla: *"It's a group of people, but basically, it's a gang. You might as well say it – because of the way they move in this area, they're moving*

---

[31] The youth club manager found these patterns depressing, as it reminded him of when the Marshside Estate had a 'beef' with another estate further west in the Borough over selling drugs, and nine people died before it was resolved.

for this area. If they meet any other boy in the area, they will be moving for their area. If anything goes down, they'll do what they do."

The naming and claiming of spaces is an assertion of presence, and the tagging 'EX' appeared on doorways and walls throughout the estate. It was not clear what the gang around the estate was called, but on the adjacent estate, the 'EY Gang' was known to be operating. The postcode in the gang name can be seen as a 'powerful rhetorical device for inscribing myths of origin and destiny in local places of pride' (Cohen et al, 1999: 11).

Although many of the boys liked to claim that they could go anywhere they wanted in the area, the construction of EX as a space to defend meant that, in practice, the rivalries that existed between estates did restrict movement, and entering into another estate meant having to carry some sort of protection – usually a knife. The girls had explanations for these estate vs estate patterns:

Sarah: *"If someone from different ends moved in this end, then these men have got to deal with it. They're not going to just sit there, and say 'he's in front of my boys, I'm going home'. It's not like that, they're going to deal with it."*

Stacey: *"If someone comes and jams with one of us, then everyone gets involved. If someone comes, that you don't know, if you've got a problem with them, then something would happen."*

Paula: *"There are certain boys I know who wouldn't walk towards a certain area because they know that if they walk there something will happen to them… You wouldn't walk into a territory that belongs to someone else, which is ridiculous, but it's a problem."*[32]

For those young people who were not involved, they were beginning to see that their futures might be thought of outside the estate:

---

[32] Paula was the 17 year old representative from Hackney Youth Parliament that I interviewed. She happened to live on the neighbouring estate to the Marshside Estate.

Nico: *"I enjoy living here for now, but I wouldn't like my kids to. I want them to be in a safe environment where they're not scared to go out on the streets."*

Lauren: *"I know there's a better place – it's time to move on and meet new people… I'm not bringing up my child round here. Even the little ones – you can see what will happen. There's something in the air."*

Gangs and respect

These stories provide a brief insight to gang behaviour that was attractive for some of the young people on the Marshside Estate. The problems in Hackney with gangs lie outside the remit of the Respect Action Plan, and as the Council have acknowledged, requires specific attention and interventions. However, the aim in this case study has been to try to understand some of the patterns of behaviour in urban neighbourhoods, and how local understandings are shaped. Ideas about 'respect' are obviously present in gang cultures.

The Guns and Gangs report stresses that a lot of the Council's approach is to demystify gang culture, and find ways to bring crews together in spaces that might allow them to build more positive respect for each other (Team Hackney, 2006b). The Youth Parliament were organising a showcase around postcode wars, in a neutral area, in an attempt to get past some of these barriers. For the senior police officer, a lot of his work focussed on trying to develop "a critical mass of young people":

> Police officer: *"Those peer group collectives with the most influence tend to be the ones that have something dysfunctional to do. Invariably the group runs with that. The real issue is choosing your friends wisely."*[33]

---
[33] Similarly, the youth club's manager saw the solution as trying to encourage the young people not to be limited by the culture of violence, and to use their talents in other ways: *"The biggest skill around here is that street credibility. Most of them think you have to achieve it by making money through drugs. The ones who are really clever are legit and still retain street credibility, without being criminal."*

Gang identities and territoriality can be seen as 'a symbolic process of magically appropriating, owning and controlling the material environment in which you live, but which in real, economic and political terms is owned and controlled by 'outsiders'' (Cohen, 1997: 65). In this case, explanations could be tied to a context of disadvantage and deprivation, where respect to the gang, is more important than respect to a wider society, that treats them as a racialised 'other'. As Halpern explains, violence tends to have roots in 'insults to self esteem or dignity', where these have 'already been eroded by low social status' (2005a: 132).

A slightly different emphasis would be that 'crews' form in neighbourhoods that are lacking positive norms, community associations, and informal adult friendships, filling the void in the absence of social capital (Putnam, 2000). This implies that building the capacity of communities would lessen the circumstances for gangs to form in the first place – in line with the Respect Action Plan's focus on the absence of shared norms in neighbourhoods and on fostering greater civility as a solution. However, I felt that on the estate, even if the 'risk factors' were lessened, gangs might still be significant in organising some young people's ideas about identity, and therefore, respect. Some of their peers could see that these were the 'bad ones', whose behaviour had an effect on the community, but as a study of gangs in London suggests there is a self defence element in gangs that may not be offered to the same degree in other, more constructive pathways (Communities That Care, 2005).

It could be argued that the moralising appeals to community in the Respect Action Plan contribute to a context on the estate which risked labelling most of the young people as being in a 'gang', even though only a few were involved with violent and criminal behaviour. It seemed that various processes were at play - the combination of the gang reputations in Hackney, media portrayals of young people being out of control, and the wider interpretive context established in discourses of the Respect Action Plan, further cementing stereotypes of young people's behaviour on the estate.

CONCLUSION

The Government's assumption that 'prosperity and individual liberty can only flourish in stable, orderly and strong communities' (Home Office, 2003b) and the call 'to put the law abiding majority back in charge of their local communities' (Blair, 2005) was the starting point for the discussion in this study. The experiences on the Marshside Estate in Hackney help to show that these normative claims might pose particular problems for young people, given the fact that these measures tend to position them as an unruly minority, undermining the shared values of respect and civility in communities.

The argument here is not to glorify life on the Marshside Estate or the experiences of the young people. From an outsider's perspective (my own, and also in the demographic measures of the estate), there were undoubtedly social and economic barriers in place, and government, can, and should intervene to help to remove some of these. In the words of Amin, 'the good city has to be imagined as the socially just city, with strong obligations towards those marginalised from the means of survival and human fulfilment' (2006: 1015). Some have argued that the Government privileges crime prevention over poverty prevention (eg Squires and Stephen, 2005b). I am not convinced that this is necessarily the case, but instead some of the problems come down to conceptual confusion and a loosely employed rhetoric, which can lead to this impression being formed. My discomfort is with an approach to furthering social justice in the city which labels places in particular ways, privileges the rights of some neighbours over those of others and implies that wider problems will be ameliorated once the marginalised are adequately incorporated into the mainstream (eg Matthews & Pitts, 2001). The contradictions that are sometimes apparent between different policy agendas have been attributed to an unresolved mix of liberal and communitarian ideas on toleration, rights and justice in Labour's thinking (Hancock & Matthews, 2001).

There is a need to develop closer understandings of the different patterns of respect, rights to spaces and strong territorial identities in a neighbourhoods without devaluing them, but also recognising their limitations, exclusions, possibilities and potential. These negotiations might need to think carefully about the kind of norms that we might need in place, whilst recognising that 'community' might be an inappropriate vehicle to promote inclusion and tolerance (Raco, 2001: 241). I hope in some way, I have encapsulated some of these understandings in the case study.

The experiences of the young people on the estate revealed that encouraging a greater attachment and sense of responsibility towards wider civil society would be difficult and challenging, but as Sennett has emphasised the best route to respect may be in empowering people to discuss their own behaviour – 'so there is peer group pressure to behave, rather than imposition by authority' (in Wintour, 2006). This is not to suggest that urban policy should let young people be, but rather that we need closer consideration of the spaces of their interactions in neighbourhoods, and how respect operates in these.

Reflecting back on the case study, there are three issues in particular that I feel would be worthy of further consideration, unfortunately, outside the scope of this discussion. There was one notable omission in the accounts – Keith has drawn attention to the 'globalising networks of sentiment and identification that link places of resident to a transnational sensibility' (2005: 1), and perhaps because my focus was more on respect, rather than identity formations, these remained latent in the interviews.

Secondly, engaging young people around issues of crime and disorder can risk young people being seen as having an entirely negative effect on social life, rather than as an asset that might contribute to the diversity of an area. Therefore, a case could be made for encouraging a greater emphasis on restorative justice principles and community reintegration initiatives when ASB incidents do occur, to contribute to a more positive story about young people's contributions. At times I felt that the approach in the ASB legislation was furthering the divides on the estate – on the one hand, the young people did

not have a clear sense of the nature of the punishments for ASB, and on the other, the tenants' organisation were keen for their use to be expanded. If there was more collective involvement in reaching solutions for bad behaviours, some of the misunderstandings might be broken down.

Finally, the case study also made me realise that there is a story to be told about youth provision – which relates to the value of the spaces that young people inhabit. Hackney Council admitted that their core youth services were *"not fit for purpose"*, and other studies have identified the need for more imaginative options in youth clubs to cut across some of the rivalries and division that separate groups of young people (eg: Edwards & Hatch, 2003; Squires et al, 2004). Although the youth club occupied a contested space on the estate, it did encourage an appreciation of space and place among the young people – but this was largely due to the commitment and charisma of the club's manager, who often felt he was battling against the odds. There is a real challenge involved in developing and funding spaces for young people in urban neighbourhoods.

Community has been given a central place in urban policy discourses. The constructions of respect in the neighbourhood rules and forms of defence help to put forward an argument for a more sensitive understanding of community dynamics and the genealogy of loyalties and divisions – there is no easy story with a straightforward solution to be told about respect, ASB, or finding ways to live with and understand each other's difference in an urban environment. The proximities in city life may leave us uneasy, but a more equally negotiated public sphere depends on being able to accommodate this discomfort, and not privileging some perspectives over others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amin, A (2005) 'Local community on trial' *Economy and Society* 34 (4)

Amin, A (2006) 'The Good City' *Urban Studies* 43 (5/6)

Amit, V. (2002) 'Reconceptualizing Community' in Amit, V. (ed) *Realizing Community*. London: Routledge.

Assinder, N (2006) 'The politics of the 'respect' drive' BBC Online: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4597852.stm

Audit Commission (1996) *Misspent Youth: Young People and Crime* Abingdon: Audit Commission publications.

Back, L. (1993) *New ethnicities and urban culture* London: UCL Press

Back, L. & Keith, M. (1999) 'Rights and Wrongs': Youth, Community and Narratives of Racial Violence in P. Cohen (eds) *New Ethnicities, Old Racisms* London: Zed Books

Back, L & Keith, M (2004) 'Impurity and the Emancipatory City: young people, community safety and racial danger' in Lees, L (ed) *The Emancipatory City? Paradoxes and Possibilities* London: Sage

Back, L & Solomos, J (1993) 'Doing Research, Writing and Politics: the dilemmas of political intervention in research on racism' *Economy & Society* 22 (2)

Bannister, J, Fyfe, N and Kearns, N (2006) 'Respectable or Respectful? (In)civility and the City' *Urban Studies* 43 (5)

Berman, M (1986) 'Take it to the Streets' *Dissent*

Blair, T (2004) 'A new consensus on law and order' 19th July

Blair, T (2005) 'Prime Minister's speech on the Respect Agenda' 2 Sept 2005

Blair, T (2006) Launch of the Respect Action Plan http://www.number-10.gov.uk/output/Page8898.asp

Blair, T & Porter, H (2006) 'Britain's Liberties: The Great Debate' *Observer*, 23rd April http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/story/0,,1760210,00.html

Boyd, R (2006) 'The Value of Civility?' *Urban Studies* 43 (5/6)

Bryman, A (2004) (2nd Ed) *Social Research Methods* Oxford: OUP

Cameron, D (2006) Speech to Centre for Social Justice. http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/5166498.stm

Casey, L (2006) 'Online Question and Answer Session with Louise Casey May 2006' *Neighbours from Hell* website on http://www.nfh.org.uk/interviews/Louise_Casey/index.php

Chakrabarti, S (2006) 'Asbomania: from social and natural justice to mob rule? Lecture to BIHR 10 Jan 2006'

Civil Renewal Unit (2005) *Together we can* London: Home Office

Cohen, P (1997) *Rethinking the Youth Question* Basingstoke: Macmillan

Cohen, P; Keith, M & Back, L (1996) *Finding the Way Home Working Paper 1: Issues of Theory & Method* London: CNER

Cohen, P; Keith, M & Back, L (1999) *Finding the Way Home Between Home and Belonging: critical ethnographies of race, place and identity* London: CNER

Communities That Care (2005) *Findings from the Safer London youth Survey 2004*

Crawford, C (2006) 'Fixing Broken Promises?: Neighbourhood Wardens and Social Capital' *Urban Studies* 43 (5/6)

DeFilippis, J & North, P (2004) 'The Emancipatory Community? place, politics and collective actions in cities' in Lees, L (ed)*The Emancipatory City? Paradoxes and Possibilities* London: Sage

DfES (2005) *Youth Matters* London: HMSO

Driver, S & Martell, L (1998) *New Labour: Politics after Thatcherism* Cambridge: Polity

Edwards, L & Hatch, B (2003) *Passing Time: A report about young people and communities* London: IPPR

Field, F (2003) *Neighbours from Hell: the Politics of Behaviour* London: Politicos

Fitzgerald, M (2001) 'Ethnic Minorities and Community Safety' in Matthews, R & Pitts, J (eds) *Crime, Disorder and Community Safety* London: Routledge

Flint, J & Nixon, J (2006) 'Governing Neighbours: Anti-social Behaviour Orders and New Forms of Regulating Conduct in the UK' *Urban Studies* 43 (5/6)

Flint, J (2002a) 'Return of the Governors: Citizenship and the New Governance of Neighbourhood Disorder in the UK' *Citizenship Studies* 6 (3)

Flint, J (2002b) Social Housing Agencies and the Governance of Anti Social Behaviour *Housing Studies* 17 (4)

Foucault, M (1991) 'Governmentality' in Burchell, G, Gordon, C & Miller, P *The Foucault Effect. Studies in Governmentality* Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf

Fyfe, N (2004) 'Zero Tolerance, Maximum Surveillance? Deviance, difference and crime control in the late modern city' in Lees, L (ed)*The Emancipatory City? Paradoxes and Possibilities* London: Sage

Giddens, A (1998) *The Third Way* Cambridge: Polity

Greater London Authority (2005a) *Anti Social Behaviour in London: Setting the Context for the London Anti Social Behaviour Strategy* London: GLA

Greater London Authority (2005b) *The London Anti Social Behaviour Strategy, 2005-08* London: Greater London Authority

Hackney Children and Young People's Services (2006) *Hackney Children and Young People's Plan 2006-09* London: Hackney Council http://www.teamhackney.org/hackney_children_and_young_people_s_plan-2.pdf

Hackney Council (2004) *Mind the Gap – Hackney's strategy to reduce inequalities and poverty. Community Strategy 2005-2015* London: Hackney Council www.teamhackney.org/xp-community-strategy-final.pdf

Hall, T; Coffey, A & Williamson H (1999) 'Self, Space and Place: Youth Identities and Citizenship' *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 20 (4)

Halpern, D (2005a) *Social Capital* Cambridge: Polity

Halpern, D (2005b) 'A Matter of Respect' *Prospect* 112 July 2005

Hancock, L & Matthews, R (2001) 'Crime, community safety and toleration' in Matthews, R & Pitts, J (eds) *Crime, Disorder and Community Safety* London: Routledge

Harradine, S; Kodz, J; Lemetti, F and Jones, B (2004) *Defining and measuring anti-social behaviour* London: Home Office Research and Statistics Directorate

Harvey, D (2004) 'The right to the city' in Lees, L (ed)*The Emancipatory City? Paradoxes and Possibilities* London: Sage

Home Office (2003a) *Respect and Responsibility: Taking a Stand Against Anti Social Behaviour.* London: Home Office.

Home Office (2003b) *Together Action Plan* London: Home Office

Home Office (2004) *Together: Tacking Anti Social Behaviour. A Guide to the ASB Act 2003.* London: Home Office

Home Office Research and Development Statistics (2004) *Anti-social Behaviour: A collection of published evidence.* Online Report: http://www.together.gov.uk/article.asp?c=458&aid=3429

Imrie, R & Raco, M (eds) (2003) *Urban Renaissance? New Labour, community and urban policy* Bristol: Policy Press

Jamieson, J (2006) 'New Labour, Youth Justice and the Question of Respect' *Youth Justice* (5) 3

Jeffries, S (2006) 'With Respect – interview with Richard Sennett' *Guardian* Jan 14th

Johnstone, C (2004) 'Crime, Disorder and Urban renaissance' in Johnstone, C & Whitehead, M (eds) *New Horizons in British Urban Policy*

Keith, M (1992) 'Angry writing: (re)presenting the unethical world of the ethnographer' *Environment and Planning: Society and Space* 10

Keith, M (1993) *Race, Riots and Policing: Lore and Disorder in a Multi-racist Society* London: UCL Press

Keith, M (2005) *After the Cosmopolitan* Abingdon: Routledge

Keith, M & Pile, S (1993) 'The Politics of Place' in Keith, M & Pile, S (eds) *Place and the Politics of Identity.* London: Routledge

Kymlicka, W (2002) (2nd ed) *Contemporary Political Philosophy* Oxford, OUP

Lees, L (ed) (2004) *The Emancipatory City? Paradoxes and Possibilities* London: Sage

Lister, R (2006) 'A New Politics of Respect' *Soundings* 32

Little, A (2002) *The Politics of Community* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Lunch, N & Lunch, C (2006) *Insights into Participatory Video* London: Insight

McMahon, W (2006) 'The Politics of Anti Social Behaviour' *Safer Society* 28

McNay, L (1994) *Foucault – a Critical Introduction* Cambridge: Polity

Make Space (2004) *Youth Offer for the 21st Century* London: 4 Children

Marinetto, M (2003) 'Who Wants to be an Active Citizen? The Politics and Practice of community involvement' *Sociology* 37 (1)

Massey, D (1994) *Space, Place and Gender.* Cambridge: Polity

Matthews, R & Pitts, J (eds) (2001) *Crime, Disorder and Community Safety* London: Routledge

Mean, M & Tims, C (2005) *People Make Places: Growing the public life of cities* London: Demos

Miliband, D (2005) 'Power to Neighbourhoods – the challenges for Urban regeneration' Speech on 12th Oct

Millie, A; Jacobson, H; McDonald, E; & Hough, M (2005) *Anti Social Behaviour Strategies: Finding a Balance* Bristol: Joseph Rowntree Foundation Policy Press

Mulgan, G & Buonfino, A (2006) 'Goodbye to all that' *Guardian* Jan 18th

Mulgan, G & Bury, F (eds) (2006) *Double Devolution* London: The Smith Institute

Muncie, J (2004) (2nd ed) *Youth And Crime* London: Sage

Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (2002) *Fact Sheet No 7 Crime and Neighbourhood Renewal* London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Newburn, T (2003) 'Criminal Justice Policy' in Ellison, N & Pierson, C (eds) *Developments in British Social Policy* 2 Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Power, A & Mumford, K (2003) *East Enders: Family and Community in East London.* Bristol: Policy Press

Putnam, D (2000) *Bowling Alone* New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks

Raco, M (2003) 'New Labour, community and the future of Britain's urban renaissance' in Imrie, R & Raco, M (eds) *Urban Renaissance? New Labour, community and urban policy* Bristol: Policy Press

Respect Task Force (2006) *The Respect Action Plan* London: Respect Task Force

Rogers, B & Robinson E (2004) *The Benefits of Community Engagement* London: Active Citizenship Centre, Home Office

Rose, N (1999) *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought* Cambridge: CUP

Safer and Cleaner Place to Live Partnership (2005) *A Safer Community: Working for a safer and cleaner place to live 2005-2008* London: Hackney Council

Safer and Cleaner Place to Live Partnership (2006) *Hackney Crime and Disorder Reduction and Combating Substance Misuse Strategy 1st Year Progress Report 2005-06* London: Hackney Council

Savage, S & Atkinson, R (eds) (2001) *Public Policy Under Blair* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Sennett, R (1970) *The Uses of Disorder* Harmondsworth: Penguin

Sennett, R (1977) *The Fall of Public Man* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Sennett, R (2003) *Respect – the formation of character in the age of inequality* London: Penguin

Silverman, D (2004) (2nd ed) *Doing Qualitative Research* London: Sage

Social Exclusion Unit (2001) *A new Commitment to Neighbourhood renewal* London: SEU

Social Exclusion Unit (2004) *Breaking the Cycle: Taking stock of progress and priorities for the future.* London: Social Exclusion Unit

Squires, P; Cunningham, L & Fyvie-Gauld, M (2004) *Public Perceptions of Anti Social Behaviour within the London Borough of Sutton* Brighton: University of Brighton School of Behavioural Sciences

Squires, P (2006) 'New Labour and the Politics of Anti Social Behaviour' *Critical Social Policy* 26 (1)

Squires, P & Stephen, D (2005a) 'Rethinking ASBOs' *Critical Social Policy* 25 (4)
Smith, S (1993) 'Residential Segregation and the Politics of Radicalisation' in Keith, M & Cross, M (eds) *Racism, City and the State* London: Routledge

Squires, P & Stephen, D (2005b) *Rough Justice: Anti Social Behaviour and young people* Cullompton: Willan Publishing

Such, E & Walker, R (2005) 'Young Citizens or Policy Objects? Children in the 'Rights and Responsibilities' Debate' *Journal of Social Policy* 34 (1)

Team Hackney (2006a) *Hackney Borough Profile* London: Hackney Council.

Team Hackney (2006b) *Floor Target Action Plan Guns and Gangs* London: Hackney Council

Tonkiss, F (2005) *Space, the City and Social Theory* Cambridge: Polity

Whitehead, M (2004) 'The Urban Neighbourhood and Moral Geographies of British Urban Policy' in Johnstone, C & Whitehead, M (eds) *New Horizons in British Urban Policy*

Wintour, P (2006) 'No More misbehaving' *Guardian* July 26th

Wisniewska, L; Harris, L & Oliver, C (2006) *Respect? Young People's views on anti social behaviour, the media and older people* London: YouthNet and British Youth Council

Wood, M. (2004) *Perceptions and experience of antisocial behaviour: findings from the 2003/2004 British Crime Survey* Home Office Research and Statistics Directorate

Young, I. M. (1986) 'The Ideal of Community and the Politics of Difference' in Bridge, G & Watson, S (eds) (2002) *The Blackwell City Reader* Oxford: Blackwell

Young, J (2001) 'Identity, Community and social exclusion' in Matthews, R & Pitts, J (eds) *Crime, Disorder and Community Safety* London: Routledge

APPENDIX

APPENDIX 1: Anti Social Behaviour: Summary of Main Powers

Anti Social Behaviour Orders: Introduced in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998. ASBOs are court orders which prohibit the perpetrator from specific anti-social behaviours, and are issued for two years. An ASBO is a civil order, not a criminal penalty – this means it won't appear on an individual's criminal record. However, a breach of an ASBO is a criminal offence punishable by a fine or up to five years in prison.

Acceptable Behaviour Contracts: An ABC is a written agreement between an anti-social behaviour perpetrator and their local authority, Youth Inclusion Support Panel, landlord or the police. The ABC consists of a list of anti-social acts that the offender agrees not to continue and outlines the consequences if the contract is breached.

Fixed Penalty Notices: FPNs generally deal with environmental offences such as litter, graffiti and dog fouling, and can be issued by local authority officers and police community support officers and other accredited persons. FPNs can be issued to anyone over 10 years old.

Penalty Notices for Disorder: PNDs are issued for more serious offences, like throwing fireworks or being drunk and disorderly. PNDs can be issued to someone over 16 yrs.

Intervention Support Orders (ISO): Introduced in the Criminal Justice Act 2003, and made in respect of 10-17 year olds who have been subject of an ASBO, to impose positive obligations on them to address the cause of the anti social behaviour.

Action Plan Order: community sentencing programme for juvenile offenders.

Child Safety Order: for children under 10 to provide a means of moderating behaviour.

Referral Order: requires the young person to attend a Youth Offender Panel

Parenting Orders: imposed where an ASBO or Child Safety Order has been made.

Parenting Contracts: statement by parents to comply with requirements specified by Youth Offending Team or LEA.

Local child curfew schemes: to deal with the problem of unsupervised children under 10 on the streets late at night

Dispersal powers: designates an area where there is a significant and persistent problem of ASB.

APPENDIX 2: Details of Interviewees at the youth club on the Marshside Estate

Name	Age	Ethnicity	Nature of contact
Female:			
Nicole	15	Black	Interview
Sarah	16	White	Interview
Carla	16	Black	Interview
Lauren	21	Black	Interview
Stacey	14	Black	Interview
Jasmin	15	Black	Informal discussion
Kiara	15	White	Informal discussion
Male:			
Neil	16	White	Interview
Nico	16	Asian	Interview
Wesley	20	Black	Interview
Anthony	20	Asian	Interview
Vernon	23	Black	Interview
Leroy	17	Black	Untaped interview
Anton	20	Black	Untaped interview
Wesley	22	Black	Untaped interview
Rich	20	Black	Informal discussion
Nathaniel	20	Black	Informal discussion
Jon	15	Black	Informal discussion
Calvin	15	Black	Interview
Anton	17	Asian	Interview

APPENDIX 5: Examples of anti social behaviour and respect interventions in Hackney

1. Hackney Youth Parliament

The youth parliament engages young people as youth representatives, aiming to provide a vocal presence for young people in Hackney. The youth parliament member is supported by a full time youth worker at Hackney Council, who also provide a budget for the parliament's activities. The youth parliament meets through four forums in different neighbourhoods, where any young person can come along to discuss issues. Hackney Youth Parliament organises different showcases – the most recent being 'Streetwise' which focussed on knife and gun crime.

2. CRIB

CRIB is a young people's service aiming to reach groups that are dangerous and violent. They use unconventional approaches towards youth engagement – most involving outreach work in challenging areas in Hackney. The overall focus is on reducing offending behaviour amongst excluded young people who are not participating in mainstream activities. A review of CRIB on renewal.net found that it had contributed to reducing the total crime rate in Shoreditch, and was particularly effective in improving relationships between the police and young people – through 'Trading Places', focussing on stop and search procedures. Police and young people swap places to improve mutual understanding.

3. Crime and Safety Awareness Days

These were held last year with six secondary schools and two Pupil Referral Units. 720 young people took part. They were organised in partnership with the Learning Trust and Prison Me No Way Trust – a charity based in Hull. The overall aim was to raise understanding amongst young people about causes, consequences and penalties of crime, ASB and carrying knives.

4. Family Intervention and support pilot

There has been £25,000 funding from HO to enable pilot. This works with families based in Shoreditch. The aim is for a holistic approach to ASB by combining prevention, support and enforcement, for example, parenting classes, family therapy, mentoring, health training. Action plans are tailor made.

5. Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP)

A national cross departmental programme that was developed in 2003 to engage at risk children and young people in holiday activity programmes. One of main aims is to reduce crime and ASB. This is operational in Hackney - aimed at crime and anti social hotspots.