Visualizing Justice
Kevin Walby, Richard Jochelson, Michelle Bertrand and
Steven Kohm
University of Winnipeg

Introduction

This issue of the *Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research* focuses on visibility, visuality and justice. From studies of propaganda (Shimko 1991; Wilke 1998) to examinations of visual culture and images more broadly (Howells 2003; Messaris 1994; Mirzoeff 1998), visuality and visibility are two of the most significant concepts of the last decade across the social sciences and humanities (Jay 1995; 2005; Urry 1992; Woodiwiss 2001). Our definitions of justice, visuality, and visibility are broad and inclusive, partly because we see them as contested concepts.

The rewarding, enjoyable aspect of academic inquiry is testing how far these analytical ideas can be pushed and explored. As part of our annual justice conference, we invited academic contributions as well as photographic and artistic exposures of the following approaches to justice and visibility including but not limited to: *social justice; ecological justice; indigenous justice; urban justice; human rights and justice; works on surveillance; the role of sight in criminal justice; media representations of law; order and justice more broadly; the use of visual methods in the justice disciplines; and the visuality of forensics*. As the reader will see in what follows, the contributors have been comprehensive and meticulous in their examination of these topics.

The articles in this issue of the *Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research* stem from an event held in May 2015 called Visualizing Justice: Critical Perspectives on Visibility, Law, and Order. We should note that our approach to inclusive inquiry mirrors the diversity of our department and indeed of the Centre for

Interdisciplinary Justice Studies (CIJS). The Criminal Justice program at University of Winnipeg began as an interdisciplinary major, but has over time developed into a theoretically-oriented program that still maintains contact with its applied roots. The CIJS, which publishes the *Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research*, is housed in the Criminal Justice Department at the University of Winnipeg, but its editorial board stems from coast to coast in Canada and is made up of scholars committed to the study of justice as an interdisciplinary endeavour. The research that occurs in the Criminal Justice department and at the CIJS crosses disciplines and paradigms of research. Visualizing Justice builds on the momentum established in 2009 when the CIJS hosted its inaugural Theorizing Justice workshop. This was followed by Practicing Justice in 2010, Questioning Justice in 2011, Securing Justice in 2012, and Educating Justice in 2014.

Visibility and visuality are worthwhile concepts for inter-disciplinary study because they draw scholarly scrutiny from philosophy, aesthetics, cultural studies and a variety of social sciences, from history and politics to geography and criminal justice. In its broadest sense, visuality is concerned with interrogating texts, pictures, space, signs and often connects the visual with the material, situating practices of living and being via its sensory representation including how daily matters are performed, recorded, reproduced, visualized, practiced, and experienced. The concepts invoke the notion of being seen, or not, and how this, in turn, influences social and justice outcomes. Visuality is also important to questions of social identity and quests for recognition (Ruggiero 2000), as well as ethics of practice including reimagining justice landscapes. Woodiwiss (2001) uses the term visuality instead of vision to argue that seeing – the way we see and focus on aspects of images – is socially organized. In his examination of public sex in Toronto, Maynard (1994) uses the term *dialectics of discovery* to refer to the relationship of police watching men in bathhouses and men watching out for police. Involvement in the production and interpretation of visual texts is what Corrigan (1988) calls *picturing*. For instance, in this volume, Katherine Bischoping, Selom Chapman-Nyaho, and Rebecca Raby examine different covers of Michel Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* published around the

world, exploring the denotations and connotations of these images and how these visuals connect to ideas in the text (or not as the case may be). As well, Rebecca Bromwich provides a reflection on her painting of Russian nesting dolls, or "matryoshkas," and how the layers of her personal and educational journeys are mirrored through her artwork. When picturing becomes a technique organizing what and whom is shown, it is an example of what Corrigan calls *picturesque power*. There is no shortage of rich conceptual language in the field of visibility studies.

Visibility is a core theme in criminal justice studies and especially in policing and security literature (Cook and Whowell 2011; Lippert and Walby 2014). The idea of visibility is often invoked in debates about police accountability and police patrols (see Fiske 1998; Jackson 1986). Recent work includes attention to the "new visibility" (Goldsmith 2010) stemming from increased use of mobile phone camera use and the capacity to seamlessly transfer camera images of police conduct and the low visibility of the "high end" of the private security industry such as forensic accounting operatives (Williams 2005a; 2005b). Thompson (2005) likewise examines the new visibility stemming from cell phone and other technology. Visibility is inseparable from notions of the "symbolic power" of the criminal justice agents (see White 2010) and enters debates about "broken windows" and "reassurance" policing where there is an "ever-present, insatiable desire for a visible police presence" (Barker and Crawford 2013: 12). Goldsmith (2010) refers to policing's new visibility as that which is enabled by use of technologies such as mobile phone cameras. He calls new technologically-mediated visibility *secondary visibility*, which is his major focus and which he links to scandal when public shootings caught on camera go viral, for instance. Police's primary visibility for Goldsmith is their uniformed presence in public, and his suggestion is that police's primary visibility such as being recognizable during patrols is mostly positive, while secondary visibility such as being filmed engaging in brutality is negative. Thompson (2005) likewise examines new risks for officials and politicians created by the new visibility. In these ways, visibility always involves a paradox in that it enables recognition/discovery and regulation. This is why Brighenti (2007) argues that visibility "is a double edged sword: it

can be empowering as well as dis-empowering" (335). Several of our contributors examine issues of policing, security, and visibility.

More broadly, visibility and visuality are key in how professional and expert texts are created and communicated. Goodwin (1994) has shown how videos are involved in producing visions of past events in courtrooms, and how these texts become courtroom evidence (also see Goodwin and Goodwin 1997). Social studies of science (Barry 1995; Corrigan 1988; Curtis 2006; Law and Whitaker 1988) likewise show how reporting and visualizing go hand in hand in producing depictions of events.

Though much existing literature has tended to focus on visibility in relation to police, visibility is an issue of significance to criminal justice practitioners more broadly. Visual representations of crime and justice are staples of the contemporary mass media and in popular culture too. A growing number of media scholars, cultural criminologists, and sociologists working at the nexus of crime, media, and culture are focusing their analytical attention on aspects of visuality, representation, and the spectacle of crime, punishment, and justice (see for example Ferrell, Hayward and Young 2008; Presdee 2000; Rafter 2006; Valverde 2006). Media representation is a key part of the social construction of crime and justice (Maneri and ter Wal 2005; Marsh 2009; Mason 2006a; 2006b). And surveillance feeds into media representations in formative ways (Doyle 2003; Presdee 2000). For some of these scholars, popular cultural texts such as fictional film and television constitute a popular discourse about crime and justice that is parallel to, yet perhaps more culturally significant than, academic criminological discourses (Rafter 2007). Visual representations of crime connect with a broad audience on an emotional register that can at times open up rhetorical spaces for exploration of the neglected moral, philosophical and ethical dimensions of crime and justice (Kohm and Greenhill 2011). The visual and spectacular can intersect in media and popular culture at times even (re)constituting media as a conduit of popular and populist punishment for contemporary folk devils (Kohm 2009). Contributors in this issue engage in cross-disciplinary explorations at the nexus of crime, media and visual popular culture. Steven Kohm and James Gacek do so by analyzing

representations of justice in the films of Atom Egoyan. Diana Young does so by examining the plot and subtext of the popular television show *Breaking Bad*. Isabel Scheuneman Scott and Jennifer Kilty provide a similar analysis by exploring stereotypes communicated in the televised infotainment series *Deadly Women*. Garrett Lecoq juxtaposes Joss Whedon's *Firefly* with western genre films to make visible critiques of settlement on the frontier, demonstrating the ability of science fiction to engage in powerful political critique of our conceptions of law and justice. Courtney Waid-Lindberg, Daryl Kosiak, and Kristi Brownfield provide a content analysis of four films released between 1930 and 1947, exploring whether such early film representations of prison life may have may have altered real-life prison subculture, and therefore may have played a role in the development of Clemmer's and Syke's prison subculture models. Yet non-fictive media analyses also provide profound critiques and usages of visual methods. For example, Amar Khoday analyzes the use of documentary as media that brings enhanced visibility to problems of justice – in this case he problematizes Mr. Big stings as viewed through the lens of *Mr. Big: A Documentary* (2007). One can also apply these methods in assessing accountability methods being deployed through video sharing sites such as You Tube or government hosted television or web-based channels of various court and government proceedings. Les Moran examines the audio-visual recordings of UK Supreme Court summary judgements to examine the way the depictions reflect understandings of courts and transparency, and the use of visual methods in unpacking these observations.

We would like to stress that this thematic exploration is not simply a conceptual affair. Visualizing Justice refers to method in justice studies as well. For example, literature on visual ethnography and visual methods (Harper 2003; Margolis 1998; Pink 2014; Schwartz 1989) draws our attention to the relationship between the visual and social science. Contributors in this issue offer some tricks of the trade in using visual methods to conduct research in criminal justice studies. For instance, Kevin Walby and Justin Piché interrogate the strengths and weaknesses of visual methods by reflecting on their work on Canadian prison museums. Using photography of objects at penal tourism sites, Piché and Walby, unpack the paradoxes of penal

tourism and reveal challenges in applying visual (and counter visual) criminological methods. Another contribution comes from Michael Weinrath, Camella Budzinski, and Tanis Melnyk, who analyzed videotape footage within Headingly Correctional Institution in Manitoba to study whether architectural differences within the prison units influenced interactions between correctional officers and prisoners.

Part of this focus on justice also involves examining what is not represented, not depicted or visualized, and the ramifications of such framing – Schept (2014) calls this counter-visual analysis. Mandi Gray and Karl Gardner explore these ideas in their unmapping of use of urban space in Winnipeg and the placement of the Canadian Museum for Human Rights. With this focus on visuality and visibility, we by no means wish to fetishize the visual. As with all core concepts, visuality, and visibility have their limits, some of which the contributors explore here as well.

Last but certainly not least, the theme visualizing justice refers to envisioning or imagining greater fairness in all aspects of life. The desire to envision a more just world cuts across all contributions to this special issue. Contributors explore the meanings of visualizing justice and the possibilities for social change. Many criminal justice practitioners and social justice advocates get involved in their work in order to create social change and to pursue their visions of justice. For example, Robert Diab examines federal and international security law and finds measures of threat reduction that render terrorism offenders invisible, without recognition of their humanity, by analyzing state techniques such as targeted killing, citizenship revocation, and life without parole. His analysis brings into question these state actions as well as claims about enhanced security. Through in-depth interviews, Ruby Dhand explored the experiences with the mental health tribunal of ethno-racial people with mental health disabilities. Dhand argues that this is a group whose voices are largely invisible within the mental health system and that the mental health system should implement the principles of therapeutic jurisprudence to help combat the inequalities within the system. Lastly, John Charlton and John Hansen examine the impact of the Saskatoon Community Youth Arts Programming (SCYAP) on their

clients via a series of interviews with urban Indigenous youth who had used the services. Thus, scholars and practitioners as well as advocates are interested in this notion of visualizing justice, broadening the appeal of this issue of the *Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research*.

References

Barker, A., & Crawford, A. (2013). Policing urban insecurities through visible patrols: Managing public expectations in times of fiscal restraint. In R. Lippert, & K. Walby (Eds.), *Policing cities: Urban securitization and regulation in a 21st century world* (pp. 11-28). London: Routledge.

Barry, A. (1995). Reporting and visualizing. In C. Jenks (Ed.), *Visual culture* (pp. 42-57). London: Routledge.

Brighenti, A. (2007). Visibility: A category for the social sciences. *Current Sociology, 55*(3), 323-342.

Burns, T. (Producer, Director). (2010). *Mr. Big: A documentary* [Motion picture]. Canada (no distributor).

Cook, I., & Whowell, M. (2011). Visibility and the policing of public space. *Geography Compass, 5*(8), 610-622.

Corrigan, P. (1988). "Innocent stupidities:" De-picturing human nature. On hopeful resistances and possible refusals: Celebrating difference(s) – again. *The Sociological Review: Special Issue* (Picturing power: Visual depiction and social relations), *35*(S1), 255-281.

Curtis, B. (2005). Textual economies and the presentation of statistical material: Charts, Tables and texts in 19th century public education. *Scientia Canadensis, 30*(1), 3-29.

Doyle, A. (2003). *Arresting images: Crime and policing in front of the television camera*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Ferrell, J., Hayward K., & Young J. (2008). *Cultural criminology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fiske, J. (1998). Surveilling the city: Whiteness, the black man and democratic totalitarianism. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *15*(2), 67-88.

Goldsmith, A. J. (2010). Policing's new visibility. *British Journal of Criminology, 50*(5), 914-934.

Goodwin, C. (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist, 96*(3), 606-633.

Goodwin, C., & Goodwin, M. H. (1997). Contested vision: The discursive constitution of Rodney King. In B. L. Gunnarsson, P. Linnel, & B. Nordberg (Eds.), *The construction of professional discourse* (pp. 292-316). London: Longman.

Harper, D. (2003). Framing photographic ethnography: A case study. *Ethnography, 4*(2), 241-266.

Howells, R. (2003). *Visual culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jackson, P. (1986). Black visibility, city size, and social control. *Sociological Quarterly, 27*(2), 185-203.

Jay, M. (2005). Epilogue: Visual worlds, after 9/11. In J. R. Hall, B.

Stimson, & L. Tamris Becker (Eds.), *Visual worlds* (pp. 243-250). London: Routledge.

Jay, M. (1995). *Downcast eyes: The denigration of vision in twentieth-century french thought*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Kohm, S. (2009). Naming, shaming, and criminal justice: Mass-mediated humiliation as entertainment and punishment. *Crime Media Culture, 5*(2), 188-205.

Kohm, S., & Greenhill, P. (2011). Pedophile crime films as popular criminology: A problem of justice?. *Theoretical Criminology, 15*(2), 195-215.

Law, J., & Whittaker, J. (1988). On the art of representation: Notes on the politics of visualisation. *The Sociological Review: Special Issue* (Picturing power: Visual depiction and social relations), *35*(S1), 160-183.

Lippert, R., & Walby, K. (2014). Marketization, knowledge work, and "users pay" policing in Canada. *British Journal of Criminology, 54*(2), 260-280.

Maneri, M., & Wal, J. (2005). The criminalization of ethnic groups: An issue for media analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 6*(3), Art. 9.

Margolis, E. (1998). Picturing labor: A visual ethnography of the coal mine labor process. *Visual Sociology, 13*(2), 5-35.

Marsh, I. (2009). Representations of prisons in the British media, or are we being fair to holiday camps?. *Criminal Justice Studies, 22*(3), 367-374.

Mason, P. (2006a). Lies, distortion and what doesn't work: Monitoring prison stories in the British media. *Crime Media Culture, 2*(3), 251-267.

Mason, P. (2006b). Prison decayed: Cinematic penal discourse and populism, 1995-2005. *Social Semiotics, 16*(4), 607-626.

Maynard, S. (1994). Through a hole in the lavatory wall: Homosexual subcultures, police surveillance and the dialectics of discovery, Toronto, 1890-1930. *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, *5*(2), 207-242.

Messaris, P. (1994). *Visual Literacy: Image, mind & reality*. Oxford: Westview Press.

Mirzoeff, N. (1998). What is visual culture?. In N. Mirzoeff (Ed.), *The visual culture reader* (pp. 3-13). London: Routledge.

Pink, S. (2014). Digital-visual-sensory design anthropology: Ethnography, imagination and intervention. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education, 13*(4), 412-427.

Presdee, M. (2000). *Cultural criminology and the carnival of crime*. New York: Routledge.

Rafter, N. (2006). *Shots in the mirror: Crime films and society* (2nd Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Rafter, N. (2007). Crime, film and criminology: Recent sex-crime movies. *Theoretical Criminology, 11*(3), 403-20.

Ruggiero, V. (2000). The fight to reappear. *Social Justice, 27*(2), 45-60.

Schept, J. (2014). (Un)seeing like a prison: Counter-visual ethnography of the carceral state. *Theoretical Criminology, 18*(2), 198-223.

Schwartz, D. (1989). Visual ethnography: Using photography in qualitative research. *Qualitative Sociology, 12*(2), 119-154.

Shimko, K. (1991). *Images and arms control: Perceptions of the Soviet Union in the Reagan administration*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Thompson, J. (2005). The new visibility. *Theory, Culture & Society, 22*(6), 31-51.

Urry, J. (1992). The tourist gaze "revisited." *American Behavioral Scientist, 36*(2), 172-186.

Valverde, M. (2006) *Law and order: Images, meanings, myths*. New York: Routledge.

White, A. (2010). *The politics of private security: Regulation, reform, and re-legitimation.* London: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Wilke, J. (Ed.). (1998). *Propaganda in the 20th century: Contributions to its history*. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Williams, J. (2005a). Governability matters: The private policing of economic crime and the challenge of democratic governance. *Policing and Society, 15*(2), 187-211.

Williams, J. (2005b). Reflections on the private versus public policing of economic crime. *British Journal of Criminology, 45*(3), 316-339.

Woodiwiss, A. (2001). *The visual in social theory*. London: Athlone Press.