



European Civil Liberties Network

Essays for civil liberties and democracy in Europe

The state of ASBO Britain - the rise of intolerance

Max Rowlands

Introduction

Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) have become the cornerstone of New Labour's campaign to restore a culture of "respect" to British society. Introduced six years ago, but little used before the last three, they have become increasingly popular among both the agencies in charge of their application and the general public (a June 2005 MORI poll showed that 82% of people support their use [1]). And yet while every set of government statistics reports a proportional rise in the number being issued, and anecdotal evidence in the press indicates a steady growth of behaviour deemed incorporable under the anti-social 'umbrella', there has been very little public debate regarding their appropriateness and effectiveness.

The reality is that ASBOs are being used far beyond their initial remit of dealing with vandals and nuisance neighbours. Behaviour that is overtly non-criminal is being criminalised and society's vulnerable groups are being targeted. Increasingly it is behaviour that is different rather than 'anti-social' that is being penalised. The form such punishment takes is perhaps of even greater concern because ASBOs effectively bypass criminal law and operate within their own shadow legal system. In effect, we no longer need to break the law to go to jail. In this sense they typify a growing abandonment of the rule of law that writers such as Magnus Hörnqvist have warned against [2]. They reflect a blurring in the distinction between crime and nuisance behaviour that has resulted in greater significance being placed in how objectionable behaviour is, rather than how lawful. It is on this basis that the previously tolerable behaviour of minority groups, such as beggars, the homeless and travellers, is being targeted.

What are ASBOs?

ASBOs were introduced under the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) and have since been significantly amended by the Police Reform Act (2002) and the Anti-Social Behaviour Act (2003). Orders can ban any individual over ten years of age both from carrying out specific acts and from entering certain geographical areas for a minimum period of two years. They can be applied for by police forces (including the British transport police), local authorities, housing action trusts and registered social landlords to a magistrates' court or county court. The decision, whether or not to make the order, is made at a full court hearing but because ASBOs are intended as a "quick-fire" solution to immediate problems within a community, an interim order can be made ahead of it. A typical order contains multiple restrictions to an individual's movement and actions along with the general stipulation that they must not cause "alarm or distress" to others. In some cases a curfew is also imposed. The scope and jurisdiction of each order can vary dramatically. In some, an individual will be banned from carrying out a specific act throughout the whole of England and Wales, in others the restriction is limited to within the local authority's boundaries. There is similar variation in geographical restrictions, with bans ranging from streets to cities to counties. There are multiple cases of individuals being banned from their own home [3]. In short, the applying body can concoct virtually any set of restrictions it deems fit.

ASBOs can also be made on conviction in criminal proceedings where the defendant is made subject to an order in addition to their sentence. There is no formal application process for this, so usually the Crown Prosecution Service asks the court to impose the order. Although coming into effect on the day it is made, it is possible for the court to

suspend its prohibitions until the offender is released from custody. Orders on conviction, despite often being somewhat erroneously referred to as “criminal ASBOs” or “CRASBOs”, are, along with all forms of ASBOs, civil orders. This means that in their application process hearsay evidence is admissible in court and there is no jury. This, together with the government’s loose definition of ‘anti-social behaviour’ as that “which causes or is likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress”, has facilitated an extraordinary high success rate in the application process. For the 2,455 orders issued by the end of March 2004, only 42 requests were turned down by the courts [4]. This is a disturbing statistic when you consider both that breaching an ASBO is a criminal offence, punishable by up to five years in prison for adults and a two-year detention and training order for children, and that their use continues to rise rapidly. Nearly 20 per cent of the 3,826 orders issued between April 1999 and September 2004 were made between July and September 2004 [5]. The most recent Home Office statistics illustrate a similar quarterly rise with the total number at 4,649 by December 2004 [6]. 42 percent of those given ASBOs will breach their order, of which just over half will then receive custodial sentences [7].

In terms of distribution ASBOs are a geographical lottery. Manchester has issued more than five times more orders than Liverpool (where fear of anti-social behaviour is lower and has fallen faster than in its neighbouring city), while the borough of Camden is responsible for around a third of the whole of London’s [8]. Increasingly the qualification for whether your behaviour merits an order depends on the enthusiasm for them of your local council. This worsens the potential for manipulation already inherent in the admissibility of hearsay evidence. A woman in Wales was cleared of seven charges of breaching her order, all of which were made by her neighbours. Another in Dagenham claimed that her ASBO was based on the lies of a malicious neighbour with whom she had been involved in a long running dispute: “The only reason I was in court rather than her was because she got to the police first”.

The potential for abuse is just as strong once an order has been made because the police are dependent on the cooperation of local communities for their effective enforcement. In Peterborough, the city council even offered people CCTV cameras and dictaphones to gather evidence against their neighbours. ASBO recipients are also frequently ‘named and shamed’ with their name, photograph and the

terms of their order distributed in leaflets, published in the local press and posted on the internet. A June 2005 report by the Council of Europe’s human rights commissioner, Alvaro Gil-Robles, believed this practice to be a breach of human rights [9]. Whole families become stigmatised and at risk of vigilante attacks. For example, in Chester up to 30 youths vandalised the house a 49-year-old ASBO holder shares with his brother and mother.

Britain appears to be in the grip of “Asbomania” (to use Gil-Robles’ term). Certainly the absorption of orders into mainstream culture is increasingly evident. In June 2005 the word ‘Asbo’ was both added to the Collins English Dictionary, and recognised as a pet dog name. More importantly it has become the knee-jerk reaction for anyone in dispute over another’s supposedly unreasonable behaviour. A Halifax Pet Insurance survey found that four out five people wanted ASBOs to be given to the owners of ill-mannered pets. In Harlow, residents angry at the state of their area’s recycling bins have tried to serve their council an order. It is on this growing wave of intolerance that Bluewater shopping centre’s ban on hooded tops was widely welcomed. Orders have served to alter perceptions of what behaviour is tolerable and become a blanket solution for any social dispute.

And yet despite these dangers, the government seems intent on making it even easier to serve them. The Home Office strategic plan “Confident Communities in a Secure Britain”, published in July 2004, both sped up the application process and made it easier for the media to report ASBO recipients. In July 2005, changes to the application process, originally outlined by Lord Chancellor Lord Falconer in October 2004, came into force under section 143 of the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act (2005). Witnesses are now able to give evidence from behind screens and by video link and use intermediaries when communicating with the police. These practices, although not new, have previously been confined to use in criminal proceedings. Legal distinctions between the two are being eroded.

The use of ASBOs

Writing in *Race & Class*, Magnus Hörnqvist argues that the rule of law has been weakened through the blurring of lines between criminal acts and minor public order offences. Further, what constitutes crime is being redefined. He highlights the ‘European Council decision setting up a European crime prevention network’ in which

crime is said to include “anti-social conduct which, without necessarily being a criminal offence, can by its cumulative effect generate a climate of tension and insecurity” [10]. Under this fudging, Hörnqvist argues, crime is no longer synonymous with penal law breaches. It is now security, rather than the law, that dictates the use of force in society. The ‘undesirable behaviours’ that governments are increasingly intervening against have been defined not through their accordance with the law but the perception of what generates (feelings of) insecurity. The effect of this is that:

“At the most fundamental level, the focus is shifted to what a person might do instead of what a person has done. The central question to be asked in the context of a possible intervention is not ‘has this individual committed a crime?’ but, rather, ‘does this person constitute a risk?’” (pp.37)

ASBOs can best be understood as part of a movement away from the rule of law, democratic standards and the fundamental notion that we will not be punished if we abide by our society’s penal code. Under its simplistic mandate virtually any behaviour can now become criminal if someone can convince a court that it has caused them either to be alarmed or distressed. The effect of this is that we now have in place a shadow legal system that is criminalising more behaviour by the day. Being sarcastic, using the word ‘Taliban’, feeding birds in your garden -all of these actions, outlawed by ASBOs in three separate cases, are now capable of incurring prison terms for their holders. But while these extreme examples achieve notoriety and grab the headlines of the national press, it is the quieter, more underhand targeting of society’s vulnerable minority groups that is of greatest concern.

Home Office guidelines for the Crime and Disorder Act stated that ASBOs would be issued to children only in “exceptional circumstances”, but in practice just over half of all orders made between June 2000 and March 2004 have been [11]. Individuals as young as ten are criminalised for their anti-social behaviour, examples of which include playing football in the street, riding a bike, wearing a hood and using the word ‘grass’. ‘Naming and shaming’ is also particularly damaging in these cases; a stigma, at such an early age, that will not easily wear off. The Children’s charity, Barnardo’s, says “all experience suggests that children who gain status from poor behaviour are much more likely to continue with the behaviour if they are publicly labelled” [12]. In July 2005, Section 141 of the

Serious Organised Crime and Police Act came into force and continued this trend by removing a child’s right to automatic anonymity when they appear in a youth court charged with a breach of their ASBO. Further, these methods of publicising cases clearly contravene Article 40 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child which provides a guarantee for each “to have his or her privacy fully respected.”

And for those children whose behaviour really does call for state intervention ASBOs are proving to be an ineffective remedy. There are frequent media reports of orders being treated as little more than a ‘badge of honour’. In one instance a boy in a local authority secure unit proudly pasted local media coverage of his order on the walls of his room. Such cases totally undermine the ASBOs intended role as a deterrent. Indeed, with 42% of all orders being breached in 2004, this led to nearly 50 children being admitted to custody every month [13].

There is also significant potential for victimisation as highlighted by information given to Statewatch detailing three cases in Wales. The families of one 15 and two 16-year-old boys all alleged that the police have been circulating photos of their sons and asking local residents if they have caused disturbances or been guilty of anti-social acts. All feel that their children are being unfairly targeted by a police force intent on making examples. The implications of this kind of harassment, in conjunction with the fact that, to date, 98.3% of ASBO applications have been successful, are highly disturbing. One can only speculate as to how many orders have been made under similar circumstances (to both adults and children), but the potential for manipulation and the settling of vendettas is clearly evident.

Equally alarming is an August 2005 report by the British Institute for Brain Injured Children which details more than 15 cases where children with Asperger’s, Tourette’s Syndrome and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder have been given ASBOs. They warn that there are numerous similar cases. Many of these children cannot properly understand the orders they have been given and yet face custody if they persist in non-criminal behaviour such as staring over a neighbour’s fence and bouncing on a trampoline. Incredibly a child with Tourette’s syndrome (a neurological disorder that can cause the involuntary use of obscene words) has been banned from swearing in public. Adults with mental health problems have been similarly targeted. In February 2005, a well publicised order was made against a 23-year-old woman who had attempted to commit suicide on

four occasions. She was banned from any river, watercourse or canal in England and Wales, and from loitering on bridges or going onto railway tracks. The behaviour of those with personality disorders has also often been met with an ASBO. This use of orders has received universal condemnation from organisations working in the field of mental health. Richard Brook, chief executive of Mind, said, "It is completely inappropriate for those experiencing mental distress to potentially be criminalised rather than receiving the support they so desperately need" [14].

The scope of ASBOs has also extended to combat a wide range of public order offences. Many prostitutes, beggars, homeless people and those with drug and alcohol addiction problems have found themselves barred from the areas they frequent. In August 2005 a homeless man was jailed for three weeks for sitting at the bottom of a fire escape behind a derelict building. In March 2005, a drug addict, who turned to begging to fund his habit, was jailed for three months under the terms of his order for "courteously" asking a motorcyclist for money. A homeless man in Birmingham, forbidden from begging, breached his order and was jailed for two years. Having served eight months he was released but soon breached the order again and was this time jailed for three years - a total of five years custody for a non-criminal offence. Early in 2005, a Manchester prostitute was given an order prohibiting her from carrying condoms in the same area that her drug clinic was based (which provided them to her as part of its harm-reduction strategy). She breached the order and was put on probation [15]. Many others prostitutes have been jailed despite loitering and solicitation being non-imprisonable for over ten years.

These examples represent just the tip of an iceberg and have led to increasing criticism from charities working in relevant fields. The housing charity Shelter has expressed concern that being given an ASBO can lead to eviction and exclusion from housing, whether it is breached or not, because it may violate a tenancy agreement. Further, the social stigma attached to an order may lead a landlord to decide that they are undesirable tenants and evict them. The homeless charity Crisis fears that "ASBOs will create even more obstacles to people obtaining the services they desperately need" [16]. And the manager of Trust, a community project supporting sex workers in south London, warned that they do nothing to improve the housing and drug problems that invariably force women into prostitution. Instead orders serve to make life more dangerous

by forcing many to take greater risks so as to avoid the attention of local authorities [17].

Typical of ASBOs, this targeting of the cause and not the symptom does nothing to help people who live in poverty and are driven to their anti-social behaviour through desperation. Those who have no choice but to beg or solicit themselves must choose between relocating to an area outside the order's jurisdiction or risk incarceration should they be caught breaching it. Historically these social problems have occupied a grey area in criminal law, but in the parallel legal system created by ASBOs, the government can evade the difficulty of legally defining these sensitive issues. Instead, local authorities now have the opportunity to displace their undesirable elements to their neighbours. Travellers seem to have recently joined this list after an order made in August 2005 established a five mile exclusion zone which a family of travellers could not inhabit, thus setting a precedent for their use in this field.

The government has also tried to categorise the act of political protest as anti-social. In May 2005 the police and Ministry of Defence were unsuccessful in acquiring an ASBO against a 63-year-old peace campaigner protesting outside a US listening base at Menworth Hill, though this may, in part, be because the case received a great deal of publicity. This prompted a member of the House of Lords to ask whether Parliament could ever have envisaged that ASBOs would "be used by government agencies who find a particular protest annoying or embarrassing" [18]. In February 2005, a council tenant who put anti-war leaflets through 50 of his neighbours' letterboxes was threatened with eviction and given an "anti-social behaviour interview" which he was told could lead to an ASBO. And in August 2004 two protesters and a baby were prevented from holding a banner and handing out leaflets outside Reed Exhibitions, the organiser of DSEi (Defence Systems and Equipment International); the world's largest arms fair. Police applied for a temporary ASBO to order their dispersal. Animal rights activists have also been targeted with a seemingly high percentage of successful applications made against them.

Other areas of the law designed to combat anti-social behaviour have also been inappropriately used in this field. In June 2004, when nine Palestine solidarity campaigners staged a peaceful protest outside Caterpillar's Solihull offices against the company's continued sale of bulldozers to the Israeli military they were told by police that they were believed to be acting in

an anti-social manner and as such must provide them with their names and addresses. When asked for the legal basis of this assertion the police were unable to provide them with the correct Act, let alone its appropriate section (it is Section 50 of the Police Reform Act). The protestors refused to comply and were subsequently arrested (although Section 50 carries no specific power of arrest). When their case came to trial in early 2005 the charges were dropped. A number of the activists are now suing the police for illegal arrest, unlawful detention and malicious prosecution. In September 2005, anti-DSEi protestors shifted the focus of their attention up a level from the previous year and campaigned outside the offices of Reed Elsevier, the parent company of Reed Exhibitions. Whilst handing out leaflets to passers by, people were (incorrectly) told by police officers that the Anti Social Behaviour Act required them to provide their names and addresses. And under the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act, from 1 July 2005, all protestors must obtain police permission before staging a demonstration in the half-mile area around Westminster.

The Legal context: a shadow system?

Orders made on conviction provide a clear example of how ASBOs have intruded on traditional areas of criminal law. The ASBO was intended as a preventative measure that would steer people away from damaging behaviour likely to lead to criminal charges, but orders on conviction (which make up 41% of all orders) represent no more than a double punishment [19]. The implicit assumption behind them is that the individual is likely to re-offend upon release, a standpoint that totally undermines the idea of prison as a rehabilitative institution. Serious questions should be asked of the message re-criminalising people, as soon as they have served their punishment, sends both to prospective employers and the individuals themselves about their prospects of reintegrating into society.

There are also many examples of ASBOs being used directly in place of the law. Because they are so easy to obtain and any behaviour can be outlawed, local authorities have increasingly used them to prohibit low-level offences that are already covered under the criminal law. The most extreme example of this practice is the case of a man in Birmingham who was banned from committing any crime in his borough. This extraordinary stipulation meant that, in theory, he could be imprisoned up to a maximum of five years for any minor criminal offence. The homeless man jailed for sitting on a fire escape

had similar clauses in his order, one of which forbade him from shoplifting in West Yorkshire. When his probation officer phoned the government's anti-social behaviour unit to enquire as to the need for this restriction he was told that it was because the courts did not take shop lifting seriously. This he claimed to be a surprise given he regularly deals with shoplifters sent to prison. He also noted that when issuing the order the court "had gone down his extensive list of previous convictions and made everything he had ever been convicted of the subject of an ASBO. The fact that he had already been punished for these acts, often by long terms of imprisonment, was neither here nor there" [20].

Their reasons for doing this are twofold. Firstly, it is easier to secure convictions through an ASBO. Secondly, it means that any criminal offence is punishable by up to five years in prison. Clearly it should not be for council employees, civil servants or indeed the courts to decide that the criminal justice system is not up to its task. Accordingly two recent judgements found against this practice. In July 2005, a man who breached his order banning him from (the already criminal offence of) driving whilst disqualified had his sentence reduced from a year to the six-month maximum penalty the law allows. In doing so the judge ruled it "wrong in principle" for ASBOs to be used simply for the purpose of increasing sentences [21]. In June 2005, an order that included a clause banning a child from committing any criminal offence in England or Wales was deemed plainly too wide and not 'necessary' [22].

Whether these cases will set a precedent and reduce the encroachment of ASBOs is uncertain, but the functions of "traditional law" are undoubtedly under attack. "Rough" or "summary" justice, as Tony Blair refers to it, is spearheaded by the use of fixed penalty notices with which police officers, community support officers and accredited persons (which can include private security guards) can issue instant on-the-spot fines. According to Blair they are necessary because Britain's criminal justice system is "too complicated, too laborious" and unable to "get the job done" [23]. To this end, in an extraordinary statement in September 2005, he revealed that: "Whatever powers the police need to crack down on this [anti-social behaviour], I will give them" [24].

Given this increasing subversion of due process, it is highly disturbing that those in charge of drafting and enforcing ASBOs do not fully understand their legal implications. In November

2004 a mother and her five children were evicted from their home after two of her sons breached their orders. Her local council, having initially refused to rehouse them on the basis that they had made themselves "intentionally homeless", was later forced to put them up in a hotel at a cost of over £8,000 when a county court judge ruled in her favour. Poor drafting is also evident both in the ASBO application process and in its official form. Solicitor Matt Foot, representing a beggar whom Camden council were attempting to ban from three London boroughs, described the evidence offered against him as "fourth-hand hearsay" [25]. Unsurprisingly the aforementioned homeless man, jailed for sitting on a fire escape and recriminalised for every previous transgression, had no better luck with the drafting of his order of which some parts were unintelligible and others illegible in the form of hand-written unnumbered pasted in clauses. Other drafting errors have achieved comic status and include a man forbidden from not being drunk and an unborn baby threatened with an order. But of greatest concern is whether council employees have sufficient training and understanding of how ASBOs work. In March 2005 a four-year-old boy threw a toy at a council worker's car as she visited his family. His mother says that two days later the official returned and announced she wanted to give the child an ASBO.

Conclusion

Few would deny that a number of ASBO cases have warranted state intervention. The problem with using ASBOs here is that they don't work. Every set of government statistics has shown a progressive increase in the percentage being breached. With almost half currently not adhered to they hardly inspire confidence in their capacity to protect us. At the same time there is no direct statistical evidence to indicate a rise in 'anti-social behaviour' and the ever-increasing number of orders it has supposedly necessitated. What we do know is that while crime fell by 39% between 1995 and 2004 (the longest sustained drop since 1898) [26], over the same period of time the prison population rose by 25,000 people [27]. On 7 October 2005 it stood at 77,373, a gain of 3,270 inmates since the start of this year; an even steeper rise. In June 2005, the Howard League for Penal Reform warned that at the current rate we will require a new institution the size of Brixton prison every month just to maintain current levels of overcrowding [28].

Thus, in their intended role as a preventative measure that would reduce the necessity of incarceration, ASBOs have comprehensively

failed. Again it is worth emphasising that around 50 children are jailed every month. The annual cost of incarcerating each child is £70,000. A case in Manchester appealed both at the High Court and the Court of Appeal eventually cost the council £187,700, while Metropolitan Police estimates cases costing as much as £100,000 should they be breached. Surely these vast sums of money could be better spent attempting to address the root causes of 'anti-social behaviour', such as by improving a local community's resources. In Wythenshawe, Manchester, there are two youth clubs for 8,000 young people.

Yet ASBOs remain popular and accordingly the extent to which they have pervaded British culture is of worry to civil libertarians. Previously the appropriate response to sensitive issues such as begging, homelessness, prostitution, travellers and youth crime was the subject of debate. There was recognition that these were social problems largely created by desperation and poverty, not criminal activity. The wholly inappropriate 'one size fits all' ASBO has removed this distinction. Now anything or anyone that causes others to be alarmed or distressed is targeted; whether the offending behaviour is criminal is irrelevant. And at every opportunity the government stokes the fire, telling us that we have more reason to feel alarmed and distressed than ever before. That children are out of control, 'lager louts' dominate town centres each weekend and our society is overrun by a 'culture of disrespect'.

But ASBOs do not level down people's fear of 'anti-social behaviour'; they exacerbate it. The more ASBOs are issued, the more the supposedly imminent threat 'anti-social behaviour' poses is in the news and the more obsessed with it people become. To this extent ASBOs are a self-fulfilling prophecy. Manchester has managed to issue significantly more orders than its neighbouring cities yet retain a population with a greater fear of anti-social behaviour. And as a result Britain, historically a country with pretensions towards the toleration of social and cultural differences, is becoming increasingly puritanical. ASBOs have given us new definitions of what is criminal, and stringent new guidelines of what is acceptable behaviour for a social being. In doing so they have also provided an outlet for intolerance. The toleration of others, within reason, has always been a part of social life. The consequence of ASBOs, intentional or not, has been to redefine the boundaries of what is deemed to be reasonable.

Max Rowlands is a volunteer researcher with Statewatch

Notes

- [1] MORI Social Research Institute survey, June 2005: <http://www.mori.com/polls/2005/asbo.shtml>
- [2] Magnus Hörnqvist, "The birth of public order policy" in *Race & Class*, Volume 46 No.1, July-September 2004.
- [3] Details of all cases mentioned in this article can be found on Statewatch's ASBOWatch website: <http://www.statewatch.org/asbo/ASBOWatch.html>
- [4] Home Office statistics
- [5] Hazel Blears written ministerial statements, 1.03.05
<http://www.theyworkforyou.com/wms/?id=2005-03-01.80WS.3>
- [6] Home Office statistics:
<http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/asbos2.htm>
- [7] Charles Clarke, "Yobs will face the consequences of their actions". Home Office press release, 01.03.05:
<http://www.devon-cornwall.police.uk/v3/news/latest/pressrelease.cfm?id=92>
- [8] Home Office statistics - op. cit. [6]
- [9] Alvaro Gil-Robles, "Report by Mr Alvaro Gil-Robles, Commissioner for Human Rights, on his visit to the United Kingdom 4-12th November 2004", 08.06.05:
<http://www.statewatch.org/news/2005/jun/coe-uk-report.pdf>
- [10] Council of the European Union, 'Council decision setting up a European crime prevention network' (26 April 2001, 7794/01)
- [11] Home Office statistics. See also: Independent 20.06.05
<http://www.socialist-teacher.org/news.asp?d=y&id=552>
- [12] Press release, "Children and anti social behaviour". 18.02.05
- [13] Youth Justice Board statistics:
<http://www.youth-justice-board.gov.uk/>
- [14] Richard Brook quoted in John Pring, "Time for Last Orders" in *Disability Now*:
http://www.disabilitynow.org.uk/people/opinion/newsfoc_jul2005.htm
- [15] "Anti Social Behaviour Orders: analysis of the first six years", NAPO (The trade union and professional association for family court and probation staff) briefing for the launch of Asbo Concern:
<http://www.napo.org.uk/napolog2/archives/ASBOs%20analysis%20-%20briefing%20for%20luanch%20of%20ASBO%20Concern%207%20April.pdf>
- [16] Crisis press office quote
- [17] Laura Smith, "Asbos 'are bringing back jail for prostitutes'", *Guardian*, 25.05.05:
http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk_news/story/0,,1491329,00.html
- [18] Question asked by Baroness Miller of Chilthorne Domer, Lords Hansard text, 23.05.05:
<http://www.parliament.the-stationery-office.co.uk/pa/ld199900/ldhansrd/pdvn/lds05/text/50523-01.htm>
- [19] Home Office statistics—op. cit. [7]
- [20] John Bell, "Rough justice", *Guardian*, 10.08.05:
<http://politics.guardian.co.uk/homeaffairs/story/0%2C11026%2C1545737%2C00.html>.
- [21] BBC News Online, "Court criticises driver's Asbo", 26.07.05:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/england/west_midlands/4719315.stm
- [22] (W v Director of Public Prosecutions [2005] EWHC 1333 (Admin) Legal Action August 2005 pp19, Times 20.06.05
- [23] 10 Downing Street press conference, 11.10.05. See also: *The Times* 12.10.05:
<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/article/0,,17129-1821908,00.html>
- [24] Tony Blair, Labour conference speech, 29.09.05.
- [25] Matt Foot quoted in Andrew Gilligan, "How the mania for Asbos is turning children into victims", *Evening Standard*, 15.08.05. Matt Foot is the national co-ordinator of Asbo Concern, a group campaigning for a full public government review of ASBOs.
- [26] Home Office Statistical Bulletin, "Crime in England and Wales 2003/2004", July 2004:
<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/hosb1004.pdf>
- [27] Prison Reform Trust press release, "England and Wales - Western Europe's Jail Capital", 2.02.04
- [28] The Howard League for Penal Reform press statement, 28.06.05:
<http://www.howardleague.org/press/2005/280605.pdf>

European Civil Liberties Network (ECLN)

contact: info@ecln.org
website: <http://www.ecln.org>

The ECLN does not have a corporate view nor does it seek to create one. The views expressed are those of the author

© ECLN 2005