

██████████ & Clifford Stott on behalf of the security sub-Group.

**Neighbourhood-level release:** While this proposal has merit in theory and may have worked well in the Chinese context, we believe that are several reasons why it would not be suitable for implementation in the UK and that it could a) undermine the consensus that has been built on the need for restrictive measures and b) lead to significant issue of disorder.

1. It is now becoming clear that there is far more public disquiet in China than has been commonly reported. Recent riots on the border with Hubei show the grievances of residents of that province at what they regard as discriminatory treatment. Reports in the South Korean press (scarcely known in the UK) point to widespread distrust of government in China, fear of future lockdowns and consequent concealment of cases.
2. There are significant differences in the political cultures of the UK and the PRC. In the PRC there is an automatic presumption that the state has authority over the individual. In the UK rights are inherent within individual liberty. This means that the power of the state to restrict individual citizens in the UK must rest on the assumption of consent (as with policing). The measures as proposed would entail the use of state power in an unprecedented way that could be perceived as discriminatory.
3. As the paper points out, several Chinese cities have been planned and evolved historically in such a way as to make the urban layout sympathetic to imposing localised quarantine measures. Large towns and cities in the UK have evolved piecemeal and, in most cases, cannot be subdivided, or easily policed, into containable geographical units.
4. A consensus has evolved in the UK over the last weeks concerning the need for restrictive measures which suggests that support for restrictive measures is contingent upon a sense of equality of sacrifice (i.e. we are all in together). The proposed scheme undermines this core proposition.
5. Geographical division of a large urban area in the UK will inevitably intersect with ethnic and socio-economic boundaries. Those in lower socio-economic positions are more susceptible to the virus and therefore 'lockdown' will be more likely in areas of poverty relative to wealth. Even if an area cuts across ethnic residential and economic divides, this could lead to perceptions of inequality and stigmatisation of particular ethnic groups.
6. Selective locking off or release from areas within urban centres may not only fragment public support for government measures but could lead to significant public disorder. Policing boundaries would rely upon technology that does not yet exist, and the enforcing of imposed measures would be highly resource intensive.
7. Anger arising from communities who perceive they have been locked down unfairly would be directed at police in the majority of cases. This is particularly problematic in areas of lower socio-economic status whose populations traditionally have more difficult historical relations with police and could easily lead to escalations.
8. Restrictions imposed in the UK during the epidemic have not led to conflict thus far because they have been perceived as fair (for the most part). Any sense of inequality arising from the imposition of selective measures would likely lead to civil disorder and feed the propaganda of extremist groups and hostile states. Households within local areas may also fear retaliation if cases within a neighbourhood prevent release and may conceal cases as a result.