

**The Annual Review of
Interdisciplinary Justice Research
Volume 11, 2022**

**Edited by
Steven Kohm, Kevin Walby, Kelly Gorkoff,
Katharina Maier and Alex Tepperman
The University of Winnipeg
Centre for Interdisciplinary Justice Studies (CIJS)
ISSN 1925-2420 (Print)
ISSN 2816-4253 (Online)**

Introduction: Mobilizing Justice

Steven Kohm, Kevin Walby, Kelly Gorkoff,
Katharina Maier and Alex Tepperman
The University of Winnipeg

This volume of the *Annual Review of Interdisciplinary Justice Research (IJR, Volume 11)* critically examines how issues of crime, law, and justice intersect with mobilities and how justice itself is mobilized through individual and collective action within and beyond the academy. While a new “mobilities paradigm” has taken root through diverse works in geography, cultural studies, migration studies, tourism and transport studies, sociology, and more, interdisciplinary criminology and criminal justice studies have yet to fully embrace this “mobilities turn” (Hannam, Sheller, & Urry, 2006; Grieco & Urry, 2011). Mobilities implies a variety of processes, technologies, regulations, and social arrangements that can facilitate but at times also hinder the movement of people and information within, across, and between territories and virtual spaces.

The theme of “mobilizing justice” can refer to activism and collective action around justice issues, and the multiple ways justice is produced and experienced or subverted and denied. In addition, mobilizing justice can refer to a range of activities by individuals and collectives aimed at ameliorating the conditions that produce injustices as well as mobilizing knowledge related to these issues.

Mobility is a major focus of social science in the twenty-first century. More than a decade ago, Sheller and Urry (2006) identified a “new mobilities paradigm” taking shape within the social sciences. (Im)mobility is a defining feature of contemporary times, including movement — or attempts to move — by asylum seekers, migrants, holidaymakers, terrorists, diasporas, commuters, and military forces (Cresswell, 2006; Sheller, 2004a; Sheller, 2004b; Sheller & Urry, 2006, p. 207). Indeed, the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic has sparked new and pressing questions related to justice and mobility within local, national, and international contexts. The mobilities paradigm seeks to analyze the social, political, economic, legal, and

technological forces that facilitate mobility for some groups while constraining the movement of other groups: “These diverse yet intersecting mobilities have many consequences for different peoples and places that are located in the fast and slow lanes across the globe” (Sheller & Urry, 2006, p. 207).

New forms of networked digital and online technologies now promise multiplying opportunities for virtual movement and global connection. Digital forms of virtual movement have increasingly come to structure social, political, and economic life in uneven and sometimes unexpected ways. New information technologies allow “detailed auditing of new mobilities” and “new forms of rapid social coordination and collective mobility” (Grieco & Urry, 2011, p. 1). Virtual movement and social organization across digital networks have only recently come to the attention of scholars working in interdisciplinary criminology and criminal justice studies, but there is growing awareness that crime and justice play out across virtual spaces in ways that have important implications for criminal etiology and social control (Atkinson & Rodgers 2016; Rowlands, Ratnabalasuriar, & Noel, 2016; Schneider, 2015; Yar, 2012). As technology continues to evolve, its impact on mobility and justice are as yet unknown. However, Elliot (2019, p. 20) argues that the use of new technologies in military and security applications such as “artificial intelligence, advanced robotics and accelerating automation makes new conceptual and methodological demands on mobilities research.”

Mobility and immobility implicate all kinds of issues of social justice. Mimi Sheller (2018a, 2018b, 2011) argues for a model of “mobility justice” that moves beyond transportation and spatial justice and reconsiders static philosophical theories of justice. She argues for a conception of justice rooted in “a mobile ontology” that incorporates and reconfigures distributive, deliberative, procedural, restorative, and epistemic models of justice (Sheller, 2018a, p. 35). Other interdisciplinary scholars have examined intersections of disability (Goggin 2016), race (Nicholson, 2016), and urban poverty (Jaffe, Klaufus, & Colombjin, 2012) with mobility and social justice. Parent (2016) reflects on questions of method and methodology from the standpoint of a disabled researcher, arguing for “mobile

methodologies.”

Scholars of crime and criminal justice have also begun to take up the mobilities paradigm. Nearly two decades ago, Claire Valier (2003) called for a rethinking of traditional theories of crime and punishment in the face of increasingly complex global patterns of mobility. Cultural criminologist Jeff Ferrell (2018) has invoked the concept of “drift” to characterize illicit movements by marginalized and criminalized groups such as illegalized migrants, convicted sex offenders, and the homeless. However, illicit migrants may be able to leverage technology to actively resist and remake the spaces they transverse. Milivojevic (2019) analyzes the role of communications technology and social media as resistance by illegalized refugees attempting to move into Europe from the Middle East. Carceral geographers have also drawn on the mobilities paradigm by examining movement between and within prisons and carceral spaces (Moran, Piacentini, & Pallot, 2012) as well as “the nuanced range of mobilities — forwards, backwards, up and down” that characterize the lived experience of incarceration (Turner & Peters, 2017, p. 99). Criminologists have also invoked the concept of policy mobilities in seeking to understand the effects of exporting criminal justice policy into new international contexts (Newburn, Jones, & Blaustein, 2017; Beck & Jaffe, 2019), while other scholars examine knowledge mobilization, exchange, and transfer as potent tools for social justice and transformation (e.g., Allard & Ferris, 2015; Anderson & McLachlan, 2016; Di Renzo, 2018).

The mobility turn also intersects with policy studies. McCann (2008) uses the term “urban policy mobilities” to refer to how policies transfer from city to city. McCann uses this term because the literature on policy transfer focuses too narrowly on the national scale of politics and government, on the roles played by government actors, and on official channels of policy learning. Urban policy mobilities refer to how cities become tied to other cities in terms of policy, although urban policy mobilities also connect to other scales of policy such as the regional and the national. McCann’s overall goal is to displace the centrality of government from the literature on policy transfer and focus instead on the local scale as well as a greater diversity of actors in policy processes.

Given all this, mobilities, movement, and mobilization can (and should) be a focus in criminal justice studies and criminology; hence this thematic issue of *IJR*. Looking at justice and mobilities, movement, and mobilization implicates a range of disciplines including philosophy, cultural studies, and a variety of social sciences, from geography and politics to psychology and sociology. Volume 11 brings together a range of interdisciplinary perspectives on these issues. We hope that readers will find these works to be insightful.

Summary of Contents

The paper by Mehmet Yavuz, Kelly Gorkoff, Nadine Bartlett, Rebeca Heringer, and Natassia D'Sena examines community mobilization programs in Manitoba, Canada that exist to help facilitate coordination and networking between different segments of society. In particular, the authors consider the role of community mobilization programs in mitigating transgression and promoting peacebuilding. The authors provide an examination of how mobilizing community resources may allow for communities to think differently about transgression and responses to it.

The paper by Marcella Siqueira Cassiano, Abbie Raza, and Rosemary Ricciardelli looks at how employers in the oil and gas sector in Alberta, Canada conduct various forms of surveillance of a highly mobile workforce. The authors show that these forms of surveillance infringe upon numerous rights of workers, although the surveillance and privacy consciousness of these workers tends to remain low.

The research note by Courtney A. Waid, Pamela Monaghan-Geernaert, Kristi Brownfield, and Christopher E. Near provides an exploratory account of the impacts of COVID-19 on the work of victim services professionals in a mainly rural, midwestern American state. Waid et al. find that the vast distances and sparse population of the state exacerbated problems of domestic violence, particularly during the first months of the COVID-19 pandemic. Waid et al. utilize open-ended interviews with victim services professionals to highlight the challenges and prospects of doing this essential work during periods of restricted mobility and increasing levels of danger for the most vulnerable.

David Moffette's contribution explores the problematic logics and consequences associated with what are officially presented as 'alternatives' to immigration detention, such as the use of electronic monitoring and voice-reporting requirements. Drawing on Access to Information and public records regarding the Canada Border Services Agency's "Alternatives to Detention" program, Moffette provides a critical analysis of the nature and use of such control measures. The author ultimately argues that 'alternatives' to detention bolster and expand regulatory control, while making the pain associated with immigration detention less visible in society. Moffette also explains how such 'alternative' measures can be used by government in an attempt to neutralize calls for the abolition of immigration detention.

The research note by Nadine Wathen examines challenges and lessons learned about mobilizing research knowledge generally and also specifically as it relates to her position as a Canada Research Chair for Mobilizing Knowledge on Gender-Based Violence. By noting how long traditional methods of knowledge mobilization take, her note examines integrated knowledge mobilization practices. These practices have knowledge makers (researchers) actively partner with knowledge users (policymakers/practitioners) to develop and implement new knowledges. The note then outlines strategies by explicating four lessons learned from over two decades of work across multiple partnered programs of gender-based-violence research.

Chartrand and Foshay's contribution draws on Indigenous feminisms to offer a historical contextualization of Indigenous dispossession and argues that Indigenous women are central to contemporary mobilizing against colonial, racialized, and gendered violence. Utilizing the Unearthing Justices research project that includes a resource collection of over five hundred Indigenous-based grassroots initiatives for MMIWG2S+ people, they narrow in on programs focused on Vancouver's Downtown Eastside. With a focus on Indigenous women-led initiatives, the authors show the centrality of Indigenous women's work in creating intentional relations, revitalizing and rebuilding communities, and dismantling colonial violence. They demonstrate how initiatives that highlight the centering of women move grassroots mobilizing against violence

from the racialized, patriarchal, and colonial tropes to a healing approach that builds communities to reach the goal of self-determination.

It is our hope that this thematic issue of the *IJR* on mobilizing justice advances interdisciplinary scholarship on crime, law, justice, and mobilities in new and productive ways. The diverse contributions in this volume embody a range of perspectives and disciplinary positions that promise to open up new theoretical, methodological, and empirical insights into justice in a world characterized both by increasing and vastly restricted mobility of people, capital, and information on a global scale. In an age deeply riven by mobility *injustice*, it is hoped that this special issue provides a timely and critical record of these pressing issues, as well as the impetus for action.

References

- Allard, D., & Ferris, S. (2015). Antiviolence and marginalized communities: Knowledge creation, community mobilization, and social justice through a participatory archiving approach. *Library Trends*, 64(2), 360–383.
- Anderson, C. R., & McLachlan, S. M. (2016). Transformative research as knowledge mobilization: Transmedia, bridges, and layers. *Action Research*, 14(3), 295–317.
- Atkinson, R. & Rodgers, T. (2016). Pleasure zones and murder boxes: Online pornography and violent video games as cultural zones of exception. *British Journal of Criminology*, 56(6), 1291–1307.
- Beck, M. & Jaffe, R. (2019). Community policing goes south: Policy mobilities and new geographies of criminological theory. *British Journal of Criminology*, 59(4), 823–841.
- Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move: Mobility in the modern western world*. Routledge.
- Di Renzo, F. (2018). Mobilities, knowledge, and social justice. *Information, Communication & Society*, 21(12), 1813–1814.

- Elliott, A. (2019). Automated mobilities: From weaponized drones to killer bots. *Journal of Sociology*, 55(1), 20–36.
- Ferrell, J. (2018). *Drift: Illicit mobility and uncertain knowledge*. University of California Press.
- Goggin, G. (2016). Disability and mobilities: Evening up social features. *Mobilities*, 11(4), 533–541.
- Grieco, M. & Urry, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Mobilities: New perspectives on transport and society*. Routledge.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (2006). Editorial: Mobilities, immobilities and moorings. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 1–22.
- Jaffe, R., Klaufus, C., & Colombjin, F. (2012). Mobilities and mobilizations of the urban poor. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 36(4), 643–654.
- McCann, E. (2008). Expertise, truth, and urban policy mobilities: Global circuits of knowledge in the development of Vancouver, Canada's 'four pillar' drug strategy. *Environment and Planning A*, 40(8), 885–904.
- Milivojevic, S. (2019). 'Stealing the fire', 2.0 style? Technology, the pursuit of mobility, social memory and de-securitization of migration. *Theoretical Criminology*, 23(2), 211–227.
- Moran, D., Piacentini, L. & Pallot, J. (2012). Disciplined mobility and carceral geography: Prisoner transport in Russia. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(3), 446–460.
- Newburn, T., Jones, T. & Blaustein, J. (2017). Policy mobilities and comparative penalty. *Theoretical Criminology*, 22(4), 505–522.
- Nicholson, J. (2016). Don't shoot! Black mobilities in American gunscapes. *Mobilities*, 11(4), 553–563.
- Parent, L. (2016). The wheeling interview: Mobile methods and disability. *Mobilities*, 11(4), 521–532.
- Rowlands, T., Ratnabalasuriar, S., & Noel, K. (2016). Video gaming, crime, and popular culture. *Oxford Encyclopedia of Crime, Media*

and *Popular Culture*, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.013.51>

Schneider, C. (2015). *Policing and social media: Social control in an era of new media*. Lexington Books.

Sheller, M. (2018a). *Mobility justice: The politics of movement in an age of extremes*. Verso Books.

Sheller, M. (2018b). Theorising mobility justice. *Tempo Social: Revista Sociologica da USP*, 30(2), 17–34.

Sheller, M. (2011). Sustainable mobility and mobility justice: Towards a twin transition. In M. Griec, & J. Urry (Eds.), *Mobilities: New perspectives on transport and society* (pp. 289–304). Routledge.

Sheller, M. (2004a). Demobilising and remobilising the Caribbean. In M. Sheller & J. Urry (Eds.) *Tourism mobilities: Places to play, places in play* (pp. 13–21). Routledge.

Sheller, M. (2004b). Mobile publics: Beyond the network perspective. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 22(1), 39–52.

Sheller, M. & Urry, J. (Eds.). (2004). *Tourism mobilities: Places to play, places in play*. Routledge.

Turner, J. & Peters, K. (2017). Rethinking mobility in criminology: Beyond horizontal mobilities of prisoner transportation. *Punishment & Society*, 19(1), 96–114.

Valier, C. (2003). Foreigners, crime and changing mobilities. *British Journal of Criminology*, 43(1), 1–21.

Yar, M. (2012). Crime, media and the will-to-representation: Reconsidering relationships in the new media age. *Crime Media Culture*, 8(3), 245–260.