

Territory, Locality and Citizenship

Richard Yarwood

University of Plymouth, UK

Published as: Yarwood, R (2002) Territory, locality and citizenship in Storey, D (ed) *A Research Agenda for Territory and Territoriality* Elgar Research, Cheltenham, 145-158

Introduction

Citizenship is territorial. The idea binds people into particular territories and, in so doing, strengthens both the status of the individual and territorial expressions of power (Smith, 2000; Isin, 2012; Painter, 2002). Citizenship is defined by territory but is also a means of creating political and social attachments to that territory. Thus, Painter and Philo (1995: 111, emphasis added) view citizenship as ‘the construction of an identity, complete with a related package of known rights and obligations, which posits residence in a definable place or (commonly quite sizeable) *territory* as the basis for the nurturing and preservation of this identity.’ Citizenship originated in the territory of Greek city states of the classical period but it became an important element of state-building as the modern nation-state emerged, providing ‘the social glue and medium that enables citizens to interact on equal terms in the life of the political community’ (Bellamy, 2008: 71). In some states, as Marshall (Marshall, 1950 [1992]) argued, this was through the affirmation of civic, social and political rights; in others practicing duties, such as national service or civic participation, helped create attachments to the territory of the state (Staeheli, 2005). In doing so, national rather than local territories became the container for citizenship (Cresswell, 2009; Marshall, 1950 [1992]). The nation-state also provides the political and legal-judicial apparatus for implementing and supporting the rights and duties of its citizens (Isin and Turner 2007; Isin 2012a).

Despite the significance of the nation-state, some commentators are questioning whether new forms of citizenship are emerging that challenge its territories and

conventions (Sassen, 2009; Closs Stephens and Squire, 2012a; Desforges et al., 2005; Yarwood, 2015). Two main themes are apparent.

First, some commentators have expressed concern at the way that national territorial borders are used to demarcate and control citizenship (Staeheli, 2011). Desforges et al (2005: 422) argue that the policing of national boundaries has led to 'forms landscapes that demarcate the territorial limits of national citizenship. In this way, landscapes of national citizenship have tended to reproduce a model of citizenship as a singular identity awarded and controlled by the state.' They continue that this is at odds with a growing base of evidence that suggests citizenship crosses national boundaries and is increasingly imagined and performed at a global, transnational level (Closs Stephens and Squire, 2012b; Ho, 2008; Painter and Jeffrey, 2009). Global social and political movements, such as the Fairtrade Movement, Occupy or Extinction Rebellion (Clarke et al., 2007; Pickerill and Krinsky, 2012; Desforges, 2004), seek to persuade national citizens that they have political and moral obligations beyond the boundaries of their state (Linklater, 2002). Isin (2012: 567) recognises that 'it has now become very difficult to imagine citizenship merely as nationality or membership in the nation-state'. If this is the case, has citizenship lost its territorial moorings?

Second, territories of citizenship have been re-shaped as the nation-state has withdrawn as the main provider of citizen rights. They argue that the 'hollowing out' of the state and its infilling with private and voluntary actors has led to a 'weakening of the conventional association of citizenship with the nation-state' (Desforges, 2004: 440). Instead, a greater emphasis has been placed on local territories, often articulated through ideas of neighbourhood and community, in the provision of welfare rights through non-state actors. Here, 'active citizens' are expected to help provide for their own, tightly defined and territorial, communities through voluntary action or working in partnership with other agencies (Fyfe and Milligan, 2003b). The implication here is that local territory is becoming increasingly significant to the mobilisation and outcome of citizenship.

In light of these changes, this chapter examines the changing territories of citizenship. While changing national borders and privatisation have important implications for citizenship, these themes are examined in other chapters of this

book (Storey, this volume). Instead, this chapter considers how territory is reconfigured at the local level as a result of changing practices and policies of citizenship (Storey, 2012). The chapter is divided into two main parts. The first uses the example of policing to examine the ways in which forms of active citizenship rely upon and redefine local territories. Consideration is given to the ways in which these new spaces exclude as well as include. The second part of the chapter examines resistance to these new territorialisations of space. Drawing on the example of Black Lives Matter, it examines how new, activist forms of citizenship are emerging that use and transcend territory to challenge current orthodoxies of citizenship and territory. This reflects how territory is an outcome of social and political process that are created, reconfigured and contested as a result of social and political practices (Elden, 2010a). Throughout the chapter, ideas of policing and security are used to exemplify these issues.

Territory, Security and Citizenship

Although citizenship is formally conferred and enacted at the scale of the nation-state (Isin and Turner, 2007), it is given meaning at the local level. Lynn Staeheli (2005: 196-197) notes that

while nation-states may be where the formal standing as citizen is vested, it is largely through localities that the horizontal bonds of citizenship operate to create identification with the “we”, as in “we the people”.

The emphasis on local action is particularly important in Republican forms of citizenship that emphasise duties over rights, particularly through town-hall meetings, religious congregations, voluntary and civic groups (Turner, 2002). While such ideals have long been valued in countries such as the USA (Turner, 1990; Faulks, 2000), the idea of ‘active citizenship’ has gained greater purchase in many other neo-liberal democracies (Kearns, 1992; Fyfe and Milligan, 2003a; Wolch, 2006). Here a series of policies and initiatives have compelled citizens to take responsibility for providing services at the local level (Scott et al., 2012; Mohan, 2007; Brannan et al., 2006). For example, in the UK, David Cameron’s vision of the Big Society in 2010 proposed to empower communities, redistributing power from the state to citizens, developing a

culture of volunteering to allow citizens to manage their own communities and their amenities (Kisby, 2010). Despite a rhetoric of community empowerment, active citizenship policies have supported withdrawal of state services and their replacement with the voluntary sector (Kearns, 1992; Fyfe and Milligan, 2003b; Cheshire and Woods, 2009). Rather than empowering local places, communities have become both the cause and solution of welfare provision (Lockie et al., 2006). This is problematic as neighbourhoods with greater social and economic capital are more likely to engage with these policies, with implications for future funding and state support (Desforges *et al.* 2005). Active citizenship is territorial and relies on territory to determine who gets what and where (Storey, 2012).

One of the most obvious examples of this is Neighbourhood Watch (NW), which relies on defining and using territory in its daily operations. NW (also known as Block Watch, Community Watch or Home Watch) was established in the 1980s (Yarwood, 2012; Fyfe, 1995; Bennett, 1990) as a community-based crime prevention scheme. The idea originated in the USA and placed emphasis on local communities to work with the police in order to prevent crime. Specifically, NW aims to:

1. “cut crime and the opportunities for crime and anti-social behaviour;
2. provide reassurance to local residents and reduce the fear of crime and anti-social behaviour;
3. encourage neighbourliness and closer communities; and
4. improve the quality of life for local residents and tenants’ (Moley and Budd, 2008: 56).

NW developed in response to the perceived lack of a police presence in many neighbourhoods. This was largely caused by the rationalisation of policing and the introduction of ‘fire-brigade’ or reactive policing that meant the public only came into contact with the police when a crime occurred (Yarwood, 2007). Some members of the public, especially in low crime areas, expressed disquiet that their neighbourhoods appeared to be unpoliced. NW reflected wider policies that encouraged ‘active citizenship’ (Kearns, 1995) through the use voluntary action to improve the delivery of services in a particular neighbourhood. While many forms of active citizenship emphasised locality and community, NW specifically used

territoriality in its daily operations (Yarwood and Edwards, 1995). Specifically, it relies on the classification, communication and enforcement of territory to be effective (Sack, 1983).

First, an area is formally *classified* as a Neighbourhood Watch scheme. This can vary in size from a street to an estate; areas are defined by residents with the support and advice of police. A growing emphasis on neighbourhood or beat management means that NW territories may be defined and established according to police plans. Within these territories NW schemes are run by residents with the support of the police, who recognise the existence of the scheme and often allocate officers to support it. Further recognition may also be gained from private insurance companies who may take the operation of NW into account when calculating premiums. Second, the territory of NW is *communicated* by means of signs that demarcate the boundary of the scheme and properties included within it.

Finally, NW territories are *enforced* through surveillance conducted by scheme members (Yarwood, 2012). Residents are thus encouraged to be aware of activities, or indeed people, that are deemed to be a threat. Should trouble be perceived, residents are encouraged to call the police or inform a scheme co-ordinator who may also relay information to the police. Increased surveillance serves as a deterrent to criminal behaviour. Thus, those who are entering a NW area are made aware that they are being watched and are disciplined to conduct themselves in ways that are deemed acceptable (Foucault, 1991). In some cases, citizen patrols are also carried out to improve surveillance and increase deterrence (Yarwood, 2011).

There is contradictory evidence about NW's effectiveness in reducing crime, although a reviews have concluded that NW could be effective in reducing low level crimes and anti-social behaviour (Bennett et al 2008, Huck and Kosfeld, 2007). It seems that NW's main contribution is to increase the feelings of security and improve relations between the police and the public (Moley and Budd, 2008). Yet, as discussed later, much relies on who is defining anti-social behaviour and, consequently, who feels secure in environs defended by NW.

What is clear, however, is that NW reflects social difference. Numerous studies have acknowledged that NW schemes are more likely to be established in middle-class areas with low crime rates and good police relations rather than high-crime, often poorer, neighbourhoods with low levels of trust between residents and the police (Bennett et al., 2008; Moley and Budd, 2008; Yarwood, 2012). NW tends to reflect existing community norms, rather than creating new ones (Fyfe, 1995). McConville and Shepperd (1992: 114) suggest that 'crime is not a salient issue in most people's lives. It is not for the most part central enough to drive communities together.' Thus NW is more likely to form in areas where neighbours and police are trusted rather than places where they are seen as threats. Despite the rhetoric of Neighbourhood Watch, it remains in the most part fairly passive in nature, providing a sense of security for those that choose to engage actively with it. Further, the numbers of schemes are declining (Moley and Budd, 2008) and they do not play a significant role in reducing crime. By contrast, new territories of private policing have a more significant impact on landscapes of exclusion and social control (Yarwood and Paasche, 2015). Claims that NW represent new territories of citizenship may therefore be exaggerated. They are perhaps symbols rather than enforcers of middle-class territory.

Given the passive nature of many NW schemes, there have been numerous efforts to galvanise schemes and encourage residents to be (even more) active citizens. In some cases new territories such as farms, schools, marinas, shops and pubs have been the focus of 'watch' schemes, employing the same principles of citizen-surveillance within a prescribed territory. Private property remains the focus of the scheme and, while the scope of property covered in watch schemes has widened (sometimes to non-humans in the case of horse-watch), they have not moved into working class neighbourhoods or high-crime areas.

In other cases, NW resident patrols have been instigated by local people with police regarding patrolling as 'a right we support, not a responsibility we impose' (Pascoe and Kerslake, 2018: 3). Thus the police work with night patrols to avoid vigilantism and divisiveness, policing the patrollers rather than the patrolled (Middleton and Yarwood, 2015; Roe, 2010; Yarwood, 2011). Hubbard (1998), for example, recounts how a resident-led scheme aimed at reducing kerb-crawling in Birmingham, UK was

formalised by the police to prevent harassment of sex-workers and to ensure residents operated within the law.

Other programmes, such as Neighbourhood Support in New Zealand, have taken up a wider remit. While crime-prevention is still central, Neighbourhood Support Groups also prepare residents for civil-defence emergencies, such as earthquakes, and to liaise with other community groups to improve quality of life. In widening its scope territory is seen less not only as something to be defended but a means of nurturing and improving social relations.

A more radical change has occurred in the USA. Following the 9/11 attacks in 2001, NW was rebranded as 'USAonWatch' with the aim of 'expanding beyond their traditional crime prevention role to help neighborhoods focus on disaster preparedness, emergency response and terrorism awareness' (National Neighborhood Watch, 2018). Members of schemes were not only encouraged to look out for crime but to also respond to natural hazards such as earthquakes (mirroring Neighbourhood Support in New Zealand) but also to become active in homeland security:

'National Neighborhood Watch empowers citizens to become active in homeland security efforts through participation in Neighborhood Watch groups. Many neighborhoods already have established watch groups that are vibrant, effective, and can take on this expanded role with ease. For neighborhoods without thriving groups, the renewed emphasis on emergency preparedness and response may provide the right incentive for citizens to participate in Neighborhood Watch in their community.' (National Neighborhood Watch, 2005: 1)

While remaining focused on local territories, USAonWatch drew on patriotism to motivate citizens, which was reflected in its logo that featured a map of the United States and the national emblem of the Bald Eagle. As the quote above suggests, the campaign drew on a sense of national duty to recruit participants at the local level. In

a move that saw NW 'jumping scales', residents were not only defending local territories but national ones as well¹.

Activism, Contested Territories and New Spaces of Citizenship

NW, as this chapter has asserted, is about the identification and defence of particular territories. Yet, as Elden (2010a) reminds us, territory itself is not predefined but, rather, reflects a set of social and political practices. Territory is a way of re-configuring social relations and, as such, is contested. While NW appears fairly passive, there is a danger that the process of identifying and protecting territory can lead to the exclusion of particular social groups. There is evidence, for example, that rural-based community crime prevention schemes in the UK focuses attention on 'other groups' such as travellers and young people (Yarwood, 2011; Mawby and Yarwood, 2010; Gilling, 2011). One rural policing scheme, for example, encouraged residents to work with the police to identify local problems and implement solutions to them (Owen et al 2002, Yarwood 2005). Young people were seen as the main instigators and a series of situational crime prevention measures were put in place to resolve them. While many of these solutions were fairly innocuous, such as competitions to pick up litter or hosing down public areas to make them more attractive, it represents a 'broken windows' (Kelling and Wilson, 1982) approach to controlling territory that relies on maintaining a hegemonic image of rurality through the exclusion of certain groups or activities.

Such actions reflect a broader trend of public space being treated as private space and subject to greater security measures. In urban areas, direct and indirect legislation has sought to remove homeless citizens from public space or to ban behaviour, such as drinking in public, skateboarding or distributing leaflets, seen as 'anti-social' in public urban space (Paasche et al 2014). Whereas in the past public space was used to create inclusionary forms of citizenship, for example through campaigns for civil rights, it is now a territory formed by exclusionary practices (Mitchell, 2005). In an effort to keep danger at bay, a complex geography of 'secure

¹ USAonWatch has subsequently been renamed as National Neighborhood Watch Program and appears to have refocused to a focus on local crime concerns.

spaces' is emerging that encompasses different "patchworks', 'quilts', 'bubbles', 'corridors', 'mosaics', 'webs', 'networks' and 'nodes" (Zedner, 2009: 61) that divide space into distinct territories where some are welcomed and some are not. Consumption rather than citizenship is perhaps the key driver of the way local territories are defined and controlled (Yarwood and Paasche, 2015). Shearing and Wood (2003: 406) argue that 'people now live within a world full of crisscrossing group memberships that simultaneously operate across and through multiple governmental domains'. Territory is used to not only define who is or is not welcome in a place but it also serves as a means of maintaining exclusionary practices.

On February 26, 2012 Trayvon Martin was shot and killed by George Zimmerman, in Sanford, Florida. According to one media report (McVeigh, 2012), Martin was walking home from a convenience store carrying sweets and a drink and talking on a hands-free mobile phone while wearing a hoodie. Zimmerman was patrolling a gated community in a vehicle in his capacity as a self-appointed neighbourhood watch leader² when he saw Martin. Zimmerman called the 911 emergency number and reported Martin's behaviour as suspicious. Despite advice to the contrary from the police operator, Zimmerman left his vehicle and, carrying a pistol, pursued Martyn. An unwitnessed altercation following during which Zimmerman fatally shot Martyn, who was unarmed (McVeigh, 2012).

Initially, Zimmerman was not arrested as he claimed self-defence under Florida's 2005 "stand your ground" law that permits a citizen to use deadly force against another person if they believe their safety or life is in danger. The law was introduced in Florida in 2005 and, at the time of writing, has also been adopted in 28 other USA

² The National Sheriff's Association (NSA), who administer Neighbourhood Watch in the USA, distance themselves from the incident saying that it had 'no information that indicates that the community where the incident occurred has ever registered with USAonWatch® - Neighborhood Watch program. Neighborhood Watch is based on the premise that the role of watch groups is only to serve as the eyes and ears of law enforcement. We encourage individual groups to work directly with their local law enforcement agencies to develop procedures for reporting suspicious activities. At no time, do we advocate any intervention actions by any watch group or individual.'

<http://www.nnw.org/usaonwatch>

states. It significantly alters the territories of self-defence (Kurtz, 2013). Prior to the legislation citizens had the right to use self-defence, including homicide, if they were attacked at home. The legislation carries the Castle Doctrine 'into other social spaces, such as the street, the sidewalk or the bar. Sanctioned by half the states in the USA, people can now carry their invisible castle along with them virtually anywhere they go, as long as they have a lawful right to be there' (Kurtz, 2013: 249). Public territories are now afforded the same rights as private ones. In states that support this legislation, citizens have been empowered with a right to stand their ground if they are engaged in lawful activities in a public space. This has granted citizens 'more leeway in the use of deadly force than is afforded to trained police officers' (Kurtz, 2013: 250).

Evidence suggests that stand your ground laws have had little effect on reducing overall crime rates but have led to an increase in homicides, especially against minority groups (Murphy, 2018; Humphreys et al., 2017; Cheng and Hoekstra, 2013). Light (2015: 292) argues that these laws not only reflect the state's retreat from the protection of its citizens but has empowered 'the armed citizen with justification for an immediate lethal response to black intrusions into spaces considered white' Equally, Bonds (2014) considers that

'It seems patently obvious ... these laws mark black bodies, particularly those that transgress privileged white spaces, as killable. These efforts criminalize black mobility by restricting black movement in public space and by establishing systems of surveillance that empower everyday citizens to act upon their unquestioned racism with violent impunity' (Bonds (2014) cited in Derickson, 2017: 231).

More widely, the 'stand your ground laws' reflect policies that fortify American public space. Bonds (2018: 5) argues that 'the overwhelming response to protest about systemic racism, policing, and joblessness ... has been to expand and fortify the city's security apparatus. Rather than emphasizing structural inequalities, deep racial and class segregation, and urban disinvestment, crime reduction has been positioned as essential to resilience and revitalization.'

In 2013, Zimmerman was charged and acquitted of murder and manslaughter after the jury accepted that he acted on self-defence (Walker 2013). In response, three black activists used social media and the hashtag #Blacklivesmatter to protest about the outcome of the trial and draw attention racial injustices. What began as a social media campaign, developed into a political movement that sought to highlight and address perceived racial injustices in the legal system and, in particular, the killing of unarmed people by police officers (Derickson, 2017; Black Lives Matter, 2018). In 2014, the killing of Mike Brown, who was unarmed and black, by a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri led to protests from the local community and galvanised the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement into physical protest. This took the form of a 'Black Lives Freedom Ride' that saw six hundred people travel to Ferguson to support local protesters and to 'search for justice for Mike Brown and all of those who have been torn apart by state-sanctioned violence and anti-Black racism' (Black Lives Matter, 2018).

BLM described Ferguson as 'an occupied territory'; one that could be won back through blocking streets and engaging in civil protest. This tactic of blocking major roads and preventing the circulation of people through public spaces has since been repeated in many cities and has been a staple of BLM protest (Derickson, 2017). In preventing access to public space, these kinds of actions draw attention to the exclusion of black people from public places and, in doing so, attempt to garner wider support. These protests are, therefore, territorial, wresting control of a significant, public territory in a spectacular fashion to draw attention to other social and political possibilities. Yet, unlike NW, there is a realisation that these territories are temporary and symbolic (Routledge, 2017) and are likely to be disrupted by internal contradictions or state policing (Halfacree, 1999; Routledge, 2003). In this instance, territory is temporary but symbolic.

BLM (and other social movements) gain power by moving beyond and between established territories. Thus, following the Ferguson protests, BLM established a series of chapters in different American cities that evolved into a global network of activists (Black Lives Matter, 2018). In common with other social movements (Della Porter and Diani, 1999), BLM has participants rather than members and seeks to operate in a non-hierarchical, inclusive fashion that is 'adaptive and decentralized,

with a set of guiding principles' (Black Lives Matter 2018). While striving to achieve political change, these principals are themselves political and point to more inclusive forms of citizenship. Although territory is periodically occupied to drive home these claims, it is perhaps significant that the models of citizenship espoused by BLM, as well as other social movements such as Occupy, gain strength from crossing and transgressing territory, rather than seeking to control or redefine territory. The assumption is that if territories are created through unequal power relations, then redefining social and political structures will render these obsolete.

Conclusions

Citizenship is territorial. Yet the way that citizenship is re-imagined and contested has huge implications for territory. This chapter has sought to examine how the territories of citizenship have been renegotiated. Certainly, to associate citizenship solely with the territory of the nation state is misleading. Instead, as this chapter has argued, local territories are defined, created and challenged through different practices of citizenship

Previous studies have distinguished between active and activist citizens (Parker, 1999; Painter and Jeffrey, 2009). The former largely conform to government exhortations to participate in their local communities using formal and legal channels to support particular citizen-based policies, such as NW. By contrast, activists seek to disrupt visibly existing power relations and use direct action to destabilise and replace existing power structures. Engin Isin (2008: 38) eloquently summarises these differences:

While activist citizens engage in writing scripts and creating the scene, active citizens follow scripts and participate in scenes that are already created. While activist citizens are creative, active citizens are not

This chapter has added to this knowledge by arguing that territory is crucial to understanding these different forms of citizenship. The way that territory is used defines forms of citizenship. While active citizenship attempts to create secure, defined and compliant spaces, this is frequently at a social cost. Black Lives Matter

emerged as a direct result of this territorial form of control. Instead, BLM, like other activist groups, use territory tactically and finitely, recognising it has powerful symbolic value as a form of protest but, equally, that it has little long-term value. Instead, new forms of citizenship are emerging that cross boundaries and have the potential to link different people in different places to strive for social change (Closs Stephens and Squire, 2012b; Khagram et al., 2002). In contrast to active citizenship, power is gained by rejecting rather than enforcing territory. It seems that as territorial boundaries are crossed, further forms extra-territorial citizenship are created.

- Bellamy R. (2008), *A Very Short Introduction to Citizenship*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett T. (1990), *Evaluating Neighbourhood Watch*, Aldershot: Gower.
- Bennett T, Holloway K and Farrington D. (2008) *The Effectiveness of Neighbourhood Watch*. Oslo: The Campbell Collaboration.
- Black Lives. (2018), *Herstory*, accessed 9 September 2019 at <https://blacklivesmatter.com/about/herstory/>.
- Bonds A. (2018), Refusing resilience: the racialization of risk and resilience. *Urban Geography*: 1-7.
- Brannan T, John P and Stoker G. (2006), 'Active citizenship and effective public services and programmes: How can we know what really works?', *Urban Studies* **43**: 993-1008.
- Cheng C and Hoekstra M. (2013) 'Does strengthening self-defense law deter crime or escalate violence? evidence from expansions to castle doctrine', *Journal of Human Resources*, **48**: 821-853.
- Cheshire L and Woods M. (2009), 'Citizenship and governmentality, rural', in R Kitchenand N Thrift (eds), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography* London: Elsevier, pp. 113-118.
- Clarke N, C Barnett, P Cloke, A Malpass, (2007), 'Globalising the consumer: doing politics in an ethical register', *Political Geography* **26**: 231-249.
- Closs Stephens A and V Squire (2012a), 'Citizenship without community?', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **30**: 434-436.
- Closs Stephens A and V Squire (2012b), 'Politics through a web: citizenship and community unbound', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **30**: 551-567.
- Cresswell T (2009), 'The prosthetic citizen: new geographies of citizenship', *Political Power and Social Theory* **20**: 259-273.
- Della Porter D and M Diani (1999) *Social Movements*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Derickson K. (2017), 'Urban geography II: urban geography in the age of Ferguson'. *Progress in Human Geography* **41**: 230-244.
- Desforges L. (2004), 'The formation of global citizenship: international non-governmental organisations in Britain', *Political Geography* **23**: 549-569.
- Desforges L, R, Jones and M Woods (2005), 'New Geographies of Citizenship', *Citizenship Studies* **9**: 439 - 451.
- Elden S. (2010a), 'Land, terrain, territory', *Progress in Human Geography* **34**: 799-817.
- Elden S. (2010b), 'Thinking territory politically', *Political Geography* **29**: 238-241.
- Faulks K. (2000), *Citizenship*, London: Routledge.

- Foucault M. (1991), *Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison*, London: Penguin.
- Fyfe N. (1995), 'Law and order policy and the spaces of citizenship in contemporary Britain', *Political Geography* **14**: 177-189.
- Fyfe N and C Milligan (2003a), 'Out of the shadows: exploring contemporary geographies of voluntarism', *Progress in Human Geography* **27**: 397-413.
- Fyfe N and C Milligan C (2003b), 'Space, citizenship, and voluntarism: critical reflections on the voluntary welfare sector in Glasgow', *Environment and Planning A* **35**: 2069-2086.
- Gilling D. (2011) 'Governing crime in the UK: risk and representation', in: R Mawby and R Yarwood (eds) *Rural Policing and Policing the Rural: a constable countryside?* Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 69-80.
- Halfacree K. (1999) 'Anarchy doesn't work unless you think about it: intellectual interpretation and DIY culture', *Area* **31**: 209-220.
- Ho E. (2008) 'Citizenship, migration and transnationalism: a review and critical interventions', *Geography Compass* **2**: 1286-1300.
- Hubbard P. (1998), 'Community action and the displacement of street prostitution: Evidence from British cities', *Geoforum* **29**: 269-286.
- Huck S and M Kosfeld (2007), 'The dynamics of neighbourhood watch and norm enforcement', *Economic Journal* **117**: 270-286.
- Humphreys D, A Gasparrini and D Wiebe. (2017), 'Evaluating the impact of Florida's "Stand Your Ground" self-defense law on homicide and suicide by firearm an interrupted time series study', *Jama Internal Medicine* **177**: 44-50.
- Isin E. (2008) 'Theorising acts of citizenship', in E Isin and G Nielson (eds) *Acts of Citizenship*. London: Zed Books, pp. 15-43.
- Isin E. (2012) 'Citizens without nations', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **30**: 450-467.
- Isin E and B Turner., (2007) 'Investigating citizenship: an agenda for citizenship studies', *Citizenship Studies* **11**: 5-17.
- Kearns A. (1995), 'Active citizenship and local governance: political and geographical dimensions', *Political Geography* **14**: 155-175.
- Kearns A. (1992), 'Active Citizenship and urban governance', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* **17**: 20-34.
- Kelling G and J Wilson(1982), 'Broken Windows: the police and neighborhood safety', *Atlantic Quarterly* **March**: 1-9.
- Khagram S, J. Riker J and K. Sikkink, (2002) 'From Santago to Seattle: transnational advocacy groups restructuring world politics', in S Khagram, J Riker and K Sikkink (eds) *Restructuring World Politics: transnational social movements, networks and norms*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 3-23.
- Kisby B. (2010) 'The Big Society: power to the people?' *The Political Quarterly* **81**: 484-491.
- Kurtz H. (2013), 'Trayvon Martin and the dystopian turn in us self-defense doctrine', *Antipode* **45**: 248-251.
- Light C. (2015), 'From a duty to retreat to stand your ground: the race and gender politics of do-it-yourself-defense', *Cultural Studies-Critical Methodologies* **15**: 292-298.
- Linklater A. (2002) 'Cosmopolitan citizenship', in: E Isin and B Turner (eds) *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 317-333.
- Lockie S, G. Lawrence and L. Cheshire (2006), 'Reconfiguring rural resource governance: the legacy of neo-liberalism in Australia', in P. Cloke T. Marsden and P. Mooney(eds) *Handbook of Rural Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 29-43.

- Marshall T. (1950 [1992]) 'Citizenship and social class'. in: T Marshall T and T Bottomore (eds) *Citizenship and Social Class*. London: Pluto, pp.3-54.
- Mawby R and R Yarwood (eds) (2010) *Rural policing and policing the rural : a constable countryside?*, Farnham: Ashgate.
- McConville M and D Shepperd (1992) *Watching Police, Watching Communities*, London: Routledge.
- McVeigh K. (2012) 'Trayvon Martin's death: the story so far', *The Guardian*, 20th March, accessed 9 September at <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2012/mar/20/trayvon-martin-death-story-so-far>
- Middleton J and R Yarwood (2015), 'Christians, out here?' Encountering Street-Pastors in the post-secular spaces of the UK's night-time economy', *Urban Studies* **52**: 501-516.
- Mitchell D. (2005), 'The SUV model of citizenship: floating bubbles, buffer zones, and the rise of the "purely atomic" individual', *Political Geography* **24**: 77-100.
- Mohan G. (2007), 'Participatory development: from epistemological reversals to active citizenship', *Geography Compass* **1**: 779-796.
- Moley S and S. Budd (2008) 'Neighbourhood watch membership', in S. Nicholas , J Flatley, (eds) *Circumstances of Crime, Neighbourhood Watch Membership and Perceptions of Policing: Supplementary Vol.3 to Crime in England and Wales 2006/07 Findings from the 2006/07 British Crime Survey*. London: HMSO, pp. 55–67.
- Murphy J. (2018), 'Are "Stand Your Ground" laws racist and sexist? a statistical analysis of cases in Florida, 2005–2013', *Social Science Quarterly* **99**: 439-452.
- Owen C, I. Small and C. Chidlow (2002), *Rural Safety Initiative*, accessed 9 September 2019, at: <https://popcenter.asu.edu/sites/default/files/library/awards/tilley/2002/02-64.pdf>
- National Neighborhood Watch (2005) *What is USAonWatch?*, Alexandria, VA: National Sheriffs' Association.
- National Neighborhood Watch (2018), '*Our history*', accessed 9 September 2019 at: <http://www.nnw.org/our-history>.
- Painter J. (2002), 'Multilevel citizenship, identity and regions in contemporary Europe', in J Anderson (ed) *Transnational Democracy: Political Spaces and Border Crossings*. London: Routledge, pp. 93-110.
- Painter J and A. Jeffrey (2009), *Political Geography*, London: Sage.
- Painter J and C Philo (1995), 'Spaces of citizenship: an introduction', *Political Geography* **14**: 107-120.
- Parker G. (1999), 'The role of the consumer-citizen in environmental protest in the 1990s', *Space and Polity* **3**: 67 - 83.
- Pascoe J and L. Kerslake (2018), '*Citizen Patrols*', accessed on 9 September 2019 at https://www.ourwatch.org.uk/uploads/pub_res/NPIA_Citizen_Patrols_Presentation_.pdf.
- Paasche T, R. Yarwood R and J. Sidaway(2014), 'Territorial tactics: the socio-spatial significance of private policing strategies in Cape Town', *Urban Studies*: **51**,1559-1575.
- Pickerill J and J. Krinsky (2012) 'Why does Occupy matter?', *Social Movement Studies* **11**, 279-287
- Roe M. (2010) *Volunteer Street Patrols - Briefing*, London: National Policing Improvement Agency.
- Routledge P. (2003) 'Convergence space: process geographies of grassroots globalization networks', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* **28**: 333-349.
- Routledge P. (2017) *Space Invaders: Radical Geographies of Protest*, London: Pluto.

- Sack R. (1983) 'Human territoriality - a theory', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* **73**: 55-74.
- Sassen S. (2009), 'Incompleteness and the possibility of making: towards denationalized citizenship', *Political Power and Social Theory* **20**: 229-258.
- Scott M, D. Redmond and P. Russell P. (2012), 'Active Citizenship and Local Representational Politics in Twenty-First Century Ireland: The Role of Residents Groups within Dublin's Planning Arena', *European Planning Studies* **20**: 147-170.
- Shearing C and J Wood (2003), 'Nodal governance, democracy, and the new 'denizens'', *Journal of Law and Society* **30**: 400-419.
- Smith S. (2000), 'Citizenship', in R. Johnston, K. Gregory, G. Pratt, M. Watts, S. Whatmore (eds) *The Dictionary of Human Geography, 4th Edition*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 83-84.
- Staeheli L. (2005), 'Editorial: can American cities be sites of citizenship? What can we do about it?', *Urban Geography* **26**: 197-199.
- Staeheli L. (2011), 'Political geography: where's citizenship?', *Progress in Human Geography* **35**: 393-400.
- Storey D. (2012), *Territories: The Claiming of Space, second edition*, London: Routledge.
- Turner B. (2002), 'Religion and Politics: the elementary forms of citizenship', in B. Isin and B. Turner (eds) *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 259-276.
- Turner B. (1990) 'Outline of a theory of citizenship', *Sociology* **24**: 189-217.
- Walker, T (2013), 'George Zimmerman found not guilty of murdering unarmed black teenager Trayvon Martin', *Independent* 14th July, accessed 9 September 2019, at <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/george-zimmerman-found-not-guilty-of-murdering-unarmed-black-teenager-trayvon-martin-8707943.html>
- Wolch J. (2006), 'Beyond the Shadow State?', in C Milligan and D. Conradson (eds) *Landscapes of Voluntarism: new spaces of health, welfare and governance*. Bristol: Policy Press, pp. xii-xv.
- Yarwood, R (2005) 'Crime concern and policing the countryside: evidence from parish councillors in West Mercia Constabulary, England', *Policing and Society* **15**: 63-82
- Yarwood R. (2007), 'The geographies of policing', *Progress in Human Geography* **31**: 447-465.
- Yarwood R. (2011), 'Whose blue line is it anyway? Community policing and partnership working in rural areas', in R Mawby and R Yarwood (eds) *Rural Policing and Policing the Rural: a constable countryside?* Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 93-108.
- Yarwood R. (2012) 'Neighbourhood Watch', in S Smith (ed) *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home, Vol 5*. Oxford: Elsevier, 90-95.
- Yarwood R. (2015), *Citizenship* London: Routledge.
- Yarwood R and B Edwards (1995) 'Voluntary action in rural areas: The case of neighbourhood watch', *Journal of Rural Studies* **11**: 447-459.
- Yarwood R and T Paasche (2015), 'The relational geographies of policing and security', *Geography Compass* **9**: 362-370.
- Zedner L. (2009) *Security*, London: Routledge.