

Young people, ‘flawed protestors’ and the commodification of resistance

ABSTRACT

In seeking to understand the nature of the struggle represented by the UK riots of 2011 (in which half of all crimes during the disorder were against commercial premises) this paper critically considers Bauman’s (2011) contention that these were the riots of defective and disqualified consumers. It reflects on how far youth resistance is, and arguably always has been, constituted around the ability or otherwise to consume. The concern here is with the degree to which consumption can genuinely contribute to the integrative and communicative rationality of society (Canclini, 2001) and how young people’s relationship to that rationality may inform an understanding of the social relevance of resistance. The paper challenges the assumption that the riots demonstrate a consensus of contestation amongst young people, arguing that these events counter-intuitively constitute a ‘culture of acceptance’ in which young people struggle to imagine themselves beyond the parameters that orthodox consumerism provides. This paper is concerned not with the role of resistance as anti-capitalist militancy, but as a pragmatic means by which young people seek to frame themselves ‘outside’ (or indeed inside) the parameters of consumerism. It calls for a more sophisticated examination of the relationship between resistance and consumption and suggests that in resisting consumer capitalism, young people are in danger of tying themselves more closely to the very ideology against which they rebel.

Key words: young people, resistance, protest, consumption.

Steven Miles professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology, Manchester Metropolitan University, s.miles@mmu.ac.uk

The UK riots of 2011 were described by Zygmunt Bauman (2011) as “riots of defective and disqualified consumers”. Arguing that the sense of humiliation and wrath that comes with not having objects of desire reflect a point in history in which non-shopping has become the “jarring and festering stigma of a life un-fulfilled”, Bauman argues that the looting that characterised these riots gratified an analogous longing to take what you can and to destroy what you can’t. This paper will consider the London Riots as a demonstration of ‘resistance’ in the context of the dominant social and cultural orthodoxy of global consumerism. In doing so the paper will argue the need for an approach to young people’s demonstrations of resistance as more than simply a reaction to a defined set of problems but rather as a more complex form of cultural normalcy which traverses human, social, cultural, political, and territorial boundaries through the prism that consumerism provides. In doing so it will consider the perhaps uncomfortable suggestion that any such resistance and the spectacle it entails inevitably serves to reinforce the very ideology it is designed to resist. Arguing that although the London riots represent a particular kind of protest that on the surface appears to be less than explicitly political, the suggestion is that the riots allow us to understand the role of consumption in the broader construction of youth resistance worldwide.

Understanding the riots

The UK riots took place over a four-day period in August 2011. The images of the riots that were circulated worldwide at the time were of violence, looting and arson. The reasons for such actions are undoubtedly diverse and complex. The original trigger for such events was apparently the fatal shooting of Mark Duggan by a serving police officer on 4th August after which a peaceful protest sparked a riot in the Tottenham area of London. But what is

particularly interesting about these riots is that they crossed boundaries of place and space. They appeared to become a focal point for a broader sense of civil unrest, protest and resistance. Over the next four days the riots spread to other districts of London, as well as Bristol, the Midlands and the North West of England causing an estimated total of over £200 million in property damage.

In seeking to account for the riots Sarah Birch and Nicholas Allen (2012) categorise explanations into three kinds: i) normative, ii) political and iii) socio-economic. *Normative or values-based accounts* most notably perhaps in the words of the British Prime Minister David Cameron explained the riots as the product of ‘sick communities’: the result of a breakdown in family structure and a subsequent lack of moral guidance. *Political accounts* meanwhile, referred to a reaction against the poor conduct of state elites such as politicians, but also a distrust for the police force and the perception that police systematically harass and victimise young black men (Birch and Allen 2012). Another target of resentment in this regard was undoubtedly the banking profession who were pilloried in the British Press during the post-riot analysis as the enemies of the working classes. Meanwhile, *socio-economic accounts* focus on social unrest as a demonstration of a discrepancy between social expectations and reality (Gurr 1971). From this point of view the serious discontent that was engendered by the riots was allegedly provoked by a sense of relative deprivation. In other words, the riots were underpinned by social inequality. For the purposes of this article the latter explanation is most pertinent insofar as any deficiencies in consumption effectively constitutes a visual manifestation of deprivation. The key question here then centres on how such deprivation is manifested and what the riots might tell us about the broader social condition of a consumer society and young people’s relationship to that society.

Consumption and the riots

Authors such as Katja Isaksen and Stuart Roper (2012) have described a process in which self-esteem has effectively been commodified. They argue that at a time of ‘crisis and confusion’ in which young people experience high levels of insecurity and self-doubt they may well seek comfort through the ability to fit in with their peers through the opportunities that consumption provides. This assertion takes debates that occurred in the sociology of consumption from the 1990s around the role of consumption as a communicator of personality, class, wealth and status one step further insofar as brands now appear to imply some kind of global citizenship (see Strizhakova *et al.* 2008) or communal solidarity. Whereas previously the self was always subordinated to the collectivity (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2001), thinking for oneself whilst living for others is no longer a contradiction, but a principle underpinning everyday existence (Beck, 2001: 28). The decline of social connectedness and the utter dominance of a consumer society are far from unrelated phenomena: at least in part, social and civic disconnectedness is a product of the consumer society (Miles, 2010). In this context, Neil Brenner and Nik Theodore (2005) call for a reworking of the notion of citizenship and how the individual relates to his or her community in this context. Meanwhile, Elizabeth Hirschman (2010) goes as far as to suggest that brands provide a means by which humans can focus an evolutionary need to belong to communal groups to the extent that they can be actively used to combat a sense of social powerlessness. In considering the role of materialism in motivating the riots it is indeed worth considering the suggestion that the inability to afford branded products may result in feelings of inadequacy and social exclusion. Katja Isaksen and Stuart Roper argue (2008) that this may have more severe implications for low-income young people than it does those from middle or high-income households.

The role of consumption or at least the aspiration to consume has been hotly debated in the aftermath of the London riots. The Riots, Communities and Victims Panel (RCVP) (2012) pointed out that 50 per cent of recorded offences in the riots were acquisitive in nature. More broadly the panel suggested that the riots spoke of a lack of hope and dreams for the future on the part of young people: a picture in which young people leave school early unprepared for the challenges ahead. In this context we can reflect on discussions of critical pedagogy which posit that schools can only struggle to fulfil their 'democratic mission' when they are shaped by a social order underpinned by severe inequalities in wealth and power. The concern here then is that education is an instrument of commodification, designed in such a way to limit students' participation in a wider democratic culture that is instrumental in nature and which ties the individual to a democracy defined by consumerism (see Giroux 2010). From this perspective a revolutionary pedagogy would give voice to those who refuse to do the dirty work that props up global capitalism's consumerist agenda (McLaren and Farahmandpur 2005). Such a call to arms reflects a situation in which unemployment for young people aged 16 – 24 in the UK stood at 1.04 million (22.5%) in December 2011 and in which capitalism has become dependant upon an economy bereft of social value. In this context the RVCP Panel refer to Ed Miliband, the British Government's Opposition Leader's call for the Prime Minister to tackle the 'surcharge culture' in which consumers are fleeced by multinational companies and brands: a situation in which the market has got out of control, a market that is free yet unfair and one in which some get to share in the economic successes more easily than others.

In order to adequately contextualise the role consumption or the lack of as a marker of social deprivation it is very important to understand the broader cultural context in which

consumption operates and the sorts of social pressures that impinge on how consumers consume. At one level, Howard Slater (2011) points out that the reception of the riots as a disturbance of civil peace represents an affront to the role of surplus and exchange value. This article is concerned with how far such an affront can make serious inroads. Yes, the act of rioting from this point of view constitutes an impulsive and fundamental disrespect for the role of the commodity, but in doing so can it do anything more than offer symbolic solutions to individualised problems?

The flawed consumer

Bauman provides a useful starting point in comprehending the relationship between consumption and young people's sense of who and what they are. His argument is that in order to secure its customers those customers must be ready and willing to be seduced by the market, "The market might have already picked them up and groomed them as consumers, and so deprived them of their freedom to ignore its temptations, but on every successive visit to a market place consumers have every reason to feel in command... The roads to self-identity, to a place in society, to life lived in a form recognizable as that of meaningful living, all require daily visits to the marketplace." (Bauman 1998: 26) In a consumer society being 'normal' is defined by the ability to consume. The experience of poverty brings with it a particular relationship to the opportunities that consumerism provides. Bauman argues that the work ethic has gradually been demoted from its position as a supreme regulatory principle. Meanwhile, 'poverty' means being excluded from whatever passes as 'normal' life and not being able to partake in a 'happy life',

“This results in resentment and aggravation, which spill out in the form of violent acts, self-depreciation or both... In a society of consumers, it is above all the inadequacy of the person as a consumer that leads to social degradation and ‘internal exile’. It is this inadequacy, this inability to acquit oneself of the consumer’s duties, that turns into bitterness at being left behind, disinherited or degraded, shut off from the social feast to which others gained entry” (Bauman, 1998: 38)

The poor members of a consumer society are defined first and foremost as ‘flawed consumers’. It is indeed Bauman’s concept of the flawed consumer that perhaps best offers us a way in to understanding the meaning of the UK riots from a consumption perspective. For him the experience of being unemployed and hence of being a flawed consumer, is characterised above all by a sense of boredom, a complaint for which the world of the consumer has no patience. Perhaps the young people who were involved in the London looting did so through a pervading sense of boredom and through the fact they saw a readymade opportunity to graduate, at least in a partial fashion, to the world of a fully-fledged consumer.

In the above context the London riots constitute an effort to achieve consumer normalcy or in other words, to simply be normal (Hamilton 2012). Consumption can be understood as providing a means by which such normalcy can be achieved. In presenting this analysis Hamilton points out that poverty is more than purely a material condition, it is also both psychological and social. Crucially in this regard, those consumption practices that provoke stigma are the very same practices that are strongly coveted by low-income consumers, “In a cruel irony, the consumption choices that are driven by a desire to mask poverty instead only serve to further stigmatize.” (p. 85) In a context in which poverty is a social construction

consumption can thus be seen to provide a coping strategy but one can only ever be partially successful. Indeed, “the informants in [Hamilton’s]... study do not reject societal values... by attempting to contest and resist the stigmatizing regime, low-income consumers seek consumer normalcy through their marketplace transactions”. (p. 87) Self-esteem has arguably itself been commodified.

The UK riots may provide well have provided Bauman’s flawed consumers with a sense of protest, of rebellion and yet simultaneously provided a means of vindicating the status quo and their place in it. This, as Steve Hall *et al.* (2008), put it is a culture of ornamental consumerism. In their analysis of the relationship between crime and consumerism Hall *et al.* argue that symbols of social distinction play an absolutely key role not in articulating some kind of opposition to a sense of social exclusion, but in reflecting “their fantasised identities back to themselves” (191) This constitutes what Hall et al describe as a culture of narcissism that was most clearly expressed in the desire to use forms of conspicuous consumption to rise up the ‘mainstream ladder’. In analysing their data Hall *et al.* conclude that social justice or a sense that an unfair social system might be to blame barely registered amongst their respondents, “Echoing times past, the slaves seemed to be turning on themselves rather than the master and the master’s system’ (pp. 192 – 193) From this point of view relative deprivation cannot in itself explain the criminal act. The criminals Hall et al interview do not see themselves as deprived. Rather they belong to a narcissistic world where belonging is always just around the corner. To belong you don’t protest against deprivation, you just do all you can to demonstrate (via the symbolic value that consumption provides) that you aren’t deprived. It could indeed be argued that the apparently aimless forms of transgression that characterised the riots, may have looked like protest on the surface but actually provide more concerted evidence of consumerist conformity.

In considering the riots, David Moxon (2011) argues that the riots demonstrate how prominent the ideal of the consumer has become to the extent that the dominant values of our society derive from the process of global consumption. For Moxon products are identity-inducing. Thus the deprivation people feel is no longer simply about the material products itself, but the sense of identity that products have come to bestow on the individual. Echoing Hall *et al.* (2008), Moxon (2011) notes that many of the looted items were what could be described as 'positional goods': trainers, clothing, flat screen TVs and suchlike that offer a sense of distinction while protecting them from the humiliation of being part of the non-consumerist poor. It is in this sense that the looting of consumer goods represents far from an inversion of the dominant values of society. Far from protesting against the status quo such actions can be said to represent an effort on the part of 'flawed consumers' to reassert their place in the symbolic order. From this point of view the participants in these riots had no underlying message to deliver. Young people can be said to be disfavoured, the spectre of unemployment being a more and more present reality. But their anger, at least as far as the London riots were concerned, is not with consumer capitalism, but with the fact that they are excluded from the opportunities that consumer capitalism provides.

Youth protest and resistance

In one sense when you consider the broader profile of resistance the London riots could be said to constitute an extreme demonstration of the dominance of a consumer ethic. Other protests in Genoa and Davos for example, cannot be so easily explained through the lens that consumption provides. However, the suggestion here is that consumption is an omnipresent influence on the everyday expression of youth protest and in this sense any sense of a stable

definition of protest is fundamentally flawed. In considering this issue it's worth reflecting at this point on the role of consumption in classic sociological analyses of youth sub-cultures and how they negotiate their relationship with social change. For example, Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson's (1976) *Resistance Through Rituals* was underpinned by the contention that the 1970s were seeing the opening new kinds of opportunities for the construction of identity and meaning through new forms of small-scale collectivity that could be expressed through the reworking of the symbolism associated with consumerism. The problem with the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies' approach, however, as Simon Winlow and Steve Hall (2007) have suggested, is that it tends to imply that youth cultures are somehow free from the seductions implied by a consumer culture and are thus capable of rising above such seductions in order to create their resistant identities and meanings. Perhaps such work over-estimates the extent to which young people were (and indeed still are) capable of re-working the meanings attached to the world of consumerism. Winlow and Hall question the degree to which resistance is implied in this process particularly when you consider the contemporary context in which consumerism operates,

“Can genuinely oppositional counter-values constantly recreate themselves among marginal groups in an industrialized West whose channels of communication are dominated by consumer values that now permeate every nook and cranny of everyday life? Are young people really subverting the metaphors of capitalism and stamping their own identity on their world because they appear ‘creative’ when reworking and ritualizing the symbolism of corporate goods?” (p. 395)

It could therefore be argued that what is in essence a romantic illusion of identity construction serves to perpetuate the market's need to perpetuate desire. Even marginalized social groups

such as the young working classes are tuned into a world in which everybody seems to think only they themselves or their immediate social group are immune from the homogenising tendencies of consumer culture. A similar point could well be made about youth (broadly defined as anti-globalization) protest which on the surface appears to position itself as existing outside conventional power structures. It is indeed in this sense that I want to consider the proposition that youth resistance as currently constituted amounts to a form of 'flawed protest' insofar as it is inevitably bound up with the very society against which it protests, undermining its ultimate effectiveness in the process.

The flawed protestor

In the above context, Oliver Marchart (2004) suggests that the anti-globalization movement has in effect developed a 'subculture' of its own that is characterised by the linking up of diverse social actors who deliberate through new social fora which in turn produce an increasingly expansive form of political action that is not purely confined to violent street demonstrations. Similarly, Jenny Pickerell and Paul Chatterton (2006) talk about 'autonomous geographies' the everyday spaces in which people constitute non-capitalist, egalitarian and solidaristic forms of political, economic and social action through a commitment to the revolution of the everyday. However, Pickerell and Chatterton (2006) also concede that the sub-cultural characteristics of youth protest, for example as demonstrated by the 'hori-zone', a convergence space organised during the 2005 G8 summit in Gleneagles are vulnerable to the accusation that they constitute self-serving subcultural ghettos of activism. The fractured and transitory nature of such activities reflects the heterogeneity and creativity of the protest movement on the one hand, and the fact that such movements are partial in nature and can never be expected to secure the kind of wholesale social change to which they aspire.

The end-product of the above process is a form of protest founded upon counter-cultural carnality (see Higgins and Tadajewski 2002) that resolves issues at an essentially symbolic individual level. Such forms of resistance are in danger of becoming a user-friendly form of anti-consumer society protest: a form of resistance that seeks to expose the spectacle of the consumer society but which ends up reproducing that society, not least through the promotion of the anti-capitalist message in a multi-media environment. Anti-corporate protestors, have thus allegedly transformed protest into a series of celebratory events that deliberately simplify the grey areas between 'good' and 'evil' while inadvertently undermining their own ability to resolve any of the key issues with which they are concerned. Indeed,

“Anti-corporate protestors have utilised the methods of consumption without appreciating their own complicity in maintaining consumer sign value. The consequence of this is that they have failed to appreciate that anti-corporate protest does not occupy a privileged position outside of consumer society” (p. 368)

Anti-corporate protests run the risk of reproducing what is in effect a lifestyle choice within a consumer society: protest itself evolving as what is in effect another dimension of the experience economy (Pine and Gilmore 1999). Young protestors and indeed young people more broadly are in this sense locked with a spiral created for them by the society in which they are nonetheless critically engaged.

It is important to recognise that the above dilemma is not simply the product of a one-way power relationship. Any understanding of anti-global/corporate protest cannot be couched in notions of the consumer society existing at one end of the good versus evil continuum. As far

as the London riots are concerned, although they appear to be more obviously criminal in their effect than other forms of youth protest, youth protest (and in this case property crime) is itself a commodity that enables young people to enjoy the excitement and emotions of hate, rage and love that are implied,

“In its consumption, violence is simplified and reduced to a trivial act of instant enjoyment; it thereby becomes no different from, say, the eating of a chocolate biscuit or the drinking of a can of coke. There is no moral debate, no constant, no remorse, no meaning. This is disposable violence that need not concern us in our journey through the week. It is violence without responsibility” (Presdee 2000: 65)

Presdee claims that while on the one hand western governments have effectively criminalised everyday life, they have done so through the imposition of rationalised measures designed to curb young people’s freedoms to the extent that the government actively mitigates against the pursuit of pleasure. This, as Keith Hayward (2004) points out is in direct contrast to the dominant social form of the market that seeks to celebrate and commodify excitement and emotionality. You could argue that the London riots are a direct product of a paradox that leaves young people with nowhere to go.

Conclusions

So what to make of the young people engaged in the London riots in light of the above argument? Can such behaviour be construed as in any way political or resistant? Slater argues that the riots were political in the sense that they constitute a form of action in the streets that gets beyond the idea of a ‘neutrality’ of living. But in reflecting on Bauman’s 1998)

suggestion that consumers are alone even when they are together we might reflect the riots were themselves so tied up into notions of consumerism and the values that our consumerist society is founded upon that they simply constitute a celebration of an inert neutrality as defined by consumerism. The protests engendered by the riots were born of frustration. The irony is that such protest is not in any way other than in terms of the immediate effect on direct victims of property theft and affront to consumer society. Indeed, such actions actively feed that society insofar as images representing the riots lionise lawful consumers as protectors of a cultural orthodoxy, while shaming those consumers unable to stay within the clear boundaries of lawfulness that the consumer society provides.

This leads us to reflect on the suggestion that consumption actually displaces the potential for genuine resistance amongst young people (Hall *et al.* 2008). The notion that consumption has potential as an arena for critical creativity and potentially of resistance (e.g. Willis 1990) is a misleading one. Hall *et al.* (2008) draw attention here to the liberal tendency to shy away from criticising consumers for fear that doing so would be tantamount to snobbery. As Hall *et al.* put it transgression and resistance are not the same thing. The process of consumption thus emerges as a complex product of hedonistic self-expression and market-driven calculability.

“Once the riots are seen in such a light, they begin to make sense as an extreme, but not pathological, manifestation of some of the underlying trends of contemporary society. The Janus-faced truth of the riots is that they represented a disruption to social order whilst simultaneously suggesting the strength and vitality of the consumer culture that is now such a central plank of social life in this country (Moxon, 2011).

Moxon's contestation may well reinforce Nestor Garcia Canclini's (2001) broader argument that the arena of consumption contributes to the integrative and communicative rationality of society. In an increasingly atomised world consumption comes more to the fore in determining what constitutes a shared identity. Public life is filtered through the market more so than it is through the state. There is thus potential for a reimagining of consumption as a site of cognitive value that can provide an arena for meaningful ways of thinking and doing (Canclini, 2001). In effect, there is a profound possibility that the consumer interest incorporates an infinite variety of socio-political concerns so that consumerism becomes equated with a particular form of citizenship. In other words, there are dangers inherent in assuming that this relationship is foisted upon the individual consumer. Paul Hopper (2003) argues that the consumer, unlike the citizen, has no sense of duty and obligation other than to themselves. His subsequent call for a more public-spirited culture is in this sense optimistic, as optimistic perhaps as calls for a critical revolutionary pedagogy in which educators refuse to go down the path that global capitalism has assigned to them (McLaren and Farahmandphur 2004).

It is easy to get carried away with the spectacle of youth protest as an emerging global phenomenon, not least given the high media profile of the Occupy movement and its ability to cross geographical borders. There is also evidence, of course, of increasing numbers of issue-specific protests worldwide, such as regular student protests demanding free education in South Africa, for instance. Such examples although significant in their own right, should not lead us to conclude that a new dawn lies around the corner for young people.

We can of course recognise the mobilisation of a significant movement of youth protest worldwide, but such a movement must be understood in the broader ideological context

within which it sits. As such, the admittedly pessimistic conclusion of this article is that, at least as explored through the prism of the London riots, the above movement is contained by the very ideologies it purports to undermine. In critically engaging with young people's role as protestors there is a particular need to engage with the experience of consumption. Our understanding of consumption cannot be founded on purely ideological grounds for to do so would be to underestimate its complexity. The ideology of consumerism is built upon the emotional pull of the consuming experience (Ilouz 2009). Protest is a form of experiential consumption. Clearly, young people have genuine cause to protest about their apparent lack of status in a rapidly changing world. But the parameters within which those changes are occurring are more multi-faceted than they may appear to be on the surface. The flawed protestor is only free to resist *within* the parameters laid down for them by a global consumer society.

References

Bauman, Z. 1998. *Work, Consumerism and the New Poor*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bauman, Z. 2011. <http://www.social-europe.eu/2011/08/the-london-riots-on-consumerism-coming-home-to-roost/> Accessed 20th June, 2012.

Beck, U. and Beck-Gernsheim, E. (Eds.) 2001. *Individualization*. London: Sage.

Birch, S. and Allen, N. 2011. *There will be burning and a-looting tonight: The social and*

political correlates of lawbreaking, [http://www.essex.ac.uk/government/](http://www.essex.ac.uk/government/ethicsandintegrity/Birch%20Allen%20There%20will%20be%20burning%20and%20looting%2018%20Aug.pdf)

[ethicsandintegrity/Birch%20Allen%20There%20will%20be%20burning%20and%20looting%2018%20Aug.pdf](http://www.essex.ac.uk/government/ethicsandintegrity/Birch%20Allen%20There%20will%20be%20burning%20and%20looting%2018%20Aug.pdf), accessed 20 June, 2012.

- Brenner, N and Theodore, N. 2005. Neoliberalism and the urban condition. *City* 9, 1, 101 – 107.
- Garcia Canclini, N. 2001. *Consumers and Citizens: Globalization and Multicultural Conflicts*. Minneapolis, MI: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giroux, H. A. 2010 Dumbing down teachers: rethinking the crisis of public education and the demise of the social state, *Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*. 32 (4-5) 339 – 381.
- Gurr, T.R. 1971. *Why Men Rebel*. London: Princeton University Press.
- Hall, S. Winlow, S. and Ancrum, C. 2008. *Criminal Identities and Consumer Culture*. Cullompton: Wilan.
- Hall, S. and Jefferson. 1976. *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*. London: Harper Collins.
- Hamilton, K. 2012. Low-income Families and Coping through Brands: Inclusion or Stigma. *Sociology*. 46. 74-90.
- Hayward, K. J. (2004) *City Limits: Crime, Consumer Culture and the Urban Experience*, London: Routledge-Cavendish.
- Higgins, M. and Tadajewski, M. 2002. Anti-corporate protest as consumer spectacle, *Management Decision*, 40 (4), 363 – 371.
- Hirschman, E. C. 2010. Evolutionary Branding. *Psychology and Marketing*, 27 (6) pp. 568 – 583.
- Hopper, P. 2003. *Rebuilding Communities in an Age of Individualism*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Illouz, E. 2009. Emotions, imagination and consumption: A new research agenda. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 9,3. 377 – 413.
- Isaksen, K. J. and Roper, S. 2008. The impact of branding on low-income adolescents: A vicious cycle? *Psychology and Marketing*, 24 (11) 1063 – 1087.

- Isaksen, K. J. and Roper, S. 2012. The commodification of self-esteem: branding and British teenagers. *Psychology and Marketing*, 29, 3, 117 – 135.
- Marchart, O. 2004. New protest formations and radical democracy. *Peace Review*, 16, 4, 115 – 120.
- McLaren, P. and Farahmandpur, R. 2004. *Teaching Against Global Capitalism and the New Imperialism: A Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Miles, S. 2010. *Spaces for Consumption: Pleasure and Placelessness in the Post-Industrial City*. London: Sage.
- Moxon, D. 2011. Consumer Culture and the 2011 'Riots'. *Sociological Research Online*, 16 (4) 19, <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/16/4/19.html>. Accessed 20 June, 2011.
- Pickerill, J, and Chatterton, P. 2006. [Notes towards autonomous geographies: creation, resistance and self-management as survival tactics.](#) *Progress in Human Geography*, 30 (6), 730-746.
- Pine, J. and Gilmore. 1999. *The Experience Economy*. Chicago: Harvard Business School Press.
- Presdee, M. 2000. *Cultural Criminology and the Carnival of Crime*. London: Routledge.
- Riots, Communities and Victims Panel <http://riotspanel.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Riots-Panel-Final-Report1.pdf>
- Slater, H. 2011. FTH: The Savage and Beyond, *Mute*, 3, 2, 74 – 85.
- Strizhakova, Y, Coulter, R. A. and Price, L. L. 2008. Branded products as a passport to global citizenship: perspectives from developed and developing countries. *Journal of International Marketing*, 16, 4, 57 – 85.
- Willis, P. 1990. *Common Culture: Symbolic Work at Play in the Everyday Cultures of the Young*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Winlow, S. and Hall, S. 2007. Book Review: Resistance through Rituals (2nd edn) Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson (eds). *Crime Media Culture*. Vol. 3, No. 3, 394 – 397.