Dr. Andy Williams

Paedophiles, Panics and Public Notification
Aims for Today

• Contextualizing Public Protection:
  – Provide an ethnographic overview of the Paulsgrove demonstrations
  – Discusses the media framing of child sex offenders and the history of public notification in the UK
  – Considers the community situated implications for vulnerable individuals (potential victims)
  – Public notification and austere Britain
There ain’t no Peds in Paulsgrove

Four Phases:
(i) Antecedents
(ii) The Demonstrations
(iii) The Investigation
(iv) The Riot Trials
If you are a parent, you must read this.

.Named Shamed

News of the World

Plus your Sunday Magazine

Price 60p

July 23, 2000
Naming Victor

- Victor Burnett **Named and Shamed**
- In 1996 he boasts he “could have any child within ten minutes” (Sunday Mirror, 25.08.96)
- Lots of residents made friends and integrated with Vic
- Allowed kids to spend time with him
- Friendship = ulterior connotations
The Riot

- After 5 days of trying to get information from police and council the residents decided to demonstrate (August 3\textsuperscript{rd} 2000)

- Residents involved in demonstration outside Burnett’s flat:
  - Burnett’s presence, police inaction, council inaction

- 6 incidents of violence (Williams, 2004:274-289):
  - Diverting attention, trashing the flat, the ‘Lada’ incident, police injury, yobbo bravado, council retribution
Rampage as vigilantes hunt ‘named’ pervert

150-strong mob sets car ablaze and hurls rocks at paedophile’s home

STREETS OF FIRE

Naming of paedophile leads to city riot

Innocents suffer when law of the lynch mob takes hold

Council to rehouse paedophiles after nights of violence on city streets

Mob rules
SAY IT LOUD
SAY IT CLEAR
WE DON'T WANT PROTESTERS HERE
Deconstructing Myths

Increase Vigilante Attacks

Innocents Targeted

Force Paedophiles Underground
Lessons of Paulsgrove

- Paulsgrove **NOT** result of *NoW naming and shaming* [Williams, 2004 & 2006; Williams & Thompson, 2004a & 2004b; Thompson & Greek, 2010]:
  - Failure to respond to official complaints and early MAPPP
  - Silence is dangerous
  - Education reduces intolerance and fear
  - Rethinking sex offender orders
  - Stigmatizing and attack local communities creates policing vacuums
Towards a Typology of Grooming

- Ten years ‘mini-ethnographic’ project – identifying community concerns and fears over CSO's
- Useful as it provides data on MO and the crime triangle
- Perception that nothing has changed in 12 years
- Public notification could aid in ILP - intelligence
• Sarah's Law I think is in place - if you live near a sex offender then you have a right to disclosure - what people do with this information is down to them,(knowledge is power as it gives you choices) the only thing that can be done is to educate children - if children knowingly go to these 'people' then that seriously needs addressing - if the kids aren't attending school then that needs sorting out - normally when a kid plays up at school then there are problems at home, sad but true :(
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Victim’ Characteristics</th>
<th>Approach or Location</th>
<th>MO Grooming Elements</th>
<th>‘Offender’ Characteristics</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post-pubescent teenage boys under 15; some family dysfunction</td>
<td>12-18 month approach; contact through family; coffee morning and cabbages; CB and mobile phones</td>
<td>CB radio; friends with family; coffee mornings and allotment; computer games; cigarettes; alcohol; adult porn; sweets; mobile phones</td>
<td>Male; previous convictions gang who molested over 140 boys;</td>
<td>Police and council complaints (no response); poor communication; demonstration with some violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several teenage females under 14; family dysfunction; lack of parental control</td>
<td>Word-of-mouth; ‘friendly’ place; ‘offenders’ flat;</td>
<td>Computer games; cigarettes; alcohol; place to ‘hang out’; provides missing attention; comfort</td>
<td>Males (offender and transient housemates); differing ages; victim criteria = girls (boys not allowed in house)</td>
<td>Beaten-up by uncle; Police officer overheard talking to paramedic – ‘cat 1’ offender; no communication with wider community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-pubescent males under 11; Teenage male (13 year-old)</td>
<td>SO’s house; word of mouth; free goodies (drugs and tobacco) drugged victim;</td>
<td>Computer games; cigarettes; alcohol; sweets; drugs (weed); knock the door and have to run out the back; lots of kids been in the house</td>
<td>2 male registered sex-offenders living together</td>
<td>Unrest on estate; police notified; victim in safe-house; police guarding house; court case; Beaten-up; in-hiding; windows smashed and graffiti at property</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notification in Austere Times

• Cut price public protection?

• Effects on delivering public notification….and added burden?

• Public protection squeeze?

• Can intelligence from the public more adequately direct resources?
Questions/Discussion