



Kent Academic Repository

Redmon, David (2018) *Video Methods, Green Cultural Criminology, and the Anthropocene: SANCTUARY as a Case Study*. *Deviant Behavior*, 39 (4). pp. 495-511. ISSN 0163-9625.

Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/60672/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2017.1407110>

This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

DOI for this version

Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

Additional information

Versions of research works

Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk. Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

Video Methods, Green Cultural Criminology, and the Anthropocene:

SANCTUARY as a Case Study

Documentary criminology is a burgeoning, open-ended methodological technique that crafts and depicts sensuous knowledge from the lived experiences of crime, transgression, and harm¹. This ‘video ethnography paper’ examines my 74 minute documentary, SANCTUARY, as a case study to demonstrate how documentary criminology draws upon green cultural criminology, video methods, and sensory studies to provide an experiential understanding of crime (in this case, against donkeys) and rehabilitation in the contested notion of an ‘anthropocene’ epoch. I trace how documentary criminology can evoke and enact the lived experiences of “donkey rehabilitation” as sensuous scholarship.²

Re-Wilding: A Convergence of Green Cultural Criminology and Documentary Criminology as a Feral Method

In this article, I advocate for the adoption of video methods, in the form of “documentary criminology,” to enhance and advance our understanding of crimes against species through the construction of ethnographic media as sensory scholarship. I argue that in order to confront and address the Anthropocene, criminology must develop new languages and sensibilities: textual, non-textual, sonic, and cinematic. A project of textual and audiovisual reconfiguration of

¹ I employ the term “harm” as a shorthand for these three concepts — crime, harm, and transgression — throughout the rest of this paper. Although “harm” is the central issue confronted in *Donkey*, documentary criminology may be used equally effectively to approach all three concepts.

² SANCTUARY can viewed at the following link: <https://vimeo.com/176517219> with the password: greenculture.

criminology will necessarily be epistemologically and methodologically open-ended and emerging whilst subject to change, adaptation, and transformation.

Documentary criminology is simply one form among several, offering an aesthetic approach to craft and depict knowledge that pushes the boundaries of sensuous scholarship. Where traditional representations of criminological knowledge embrace *writing* and *telling* as ways of knowing, documentary criminology extends this process to *showing*, *sensing*, and *hearing* — and in doing so, helps us *relate* to the experience of harm. By highlighting the haptic and sensory closeness of harm, documentary criminologists can emotively touch audiences, inspiring understanding and empathy.

Documentary criminology's methodological approach transfigures the form and content of what is recognizable as “knowledge” in criminology. It calls into question taken-for-granted notions of what “counts” as criminological scholarship, thereby expanding methodological and epistemological boundaries. No longer reliant on the spoken word or textual accounts, documentary criminology reconsiders the foundational assumptions of how criminological knowledge is produced as scholarship.

Rather than dismissing documentary criminology as an illegitimate video method that fails to conform to staple-of-the-discipline approaches to explore crime, criminologists should seek to expand their methodological sensibilities and enhance their understanding of harm as sensuous knowledge production. As academics, we are taught – and we teach students – to write, read, and deliver textual research: we produce PowerPoints, Word documents, journal articles and

books. Yet in doing so, we reduce the plenitude of lived experience, in all its complexity and sensuousness, to language and numbers—we hold ourselves back from plunging into the brute experiences of sound, smell, taste, perception, and color.

As a criminologist, I have steeped myself in video methods for the past fifteen years, producing (what I call) ethnographic documentaries with visual and aural sensibilities. In 2005, I premiered my first ethnographic documentary, *MARDI GRAS: MADE IN CHINA*, at the Sundance Film Festival. At that time, I jokingly called myself a “feral criminologist,” an acknowledgement that I had strayed away from formal criminology to make documentaries. I left behind an academic world of teaching, administrative duties, and departmental meetings to craft ethnographic films from lived experience – documentaries that didn’t “count” towards tenure in academia. My projects, it seemed, were too wild, too far outside the boundaries of academia to count as reliable and valid academic knowledge. I had “gone feral” (rather than “gone native”) in my constant experimentation with the intersections among audiovisual technologies, methodologies, and criminology, and I now existed professionally outside the confines of the academic discipline.

Although I was disappointed in criminology, as a discipline, for not valuing video methods and supporting the making of documentaries to produce and disseminate knowledge, I continued to accept some of criminology’s central goal: the production of sensuous knowledge. It was only the institutional means to achieve that goal I rejected. Instead of publishing in academic journals, I turned

to popular culture, film festivals, television, Netflix, iTunes, and film distribution companies to distribute my scholarly work. The relative dearth of institutional support for criminological documentary filmmaking made it impossible to work with students to encourage audiovisual ethnographic research. Without institutional support, neither the students nor I could attain the goals of tenure, or the completion of dissertations; these milestones necessitated conformation to accepted institutional methods. So I left academia to become a feral scholar.

Flash forward more than a decade later: today, thanks to a handful of imaginative criminologists working tirelessly at the margins to open up methodological possibilities, criminology has entered an academic, epistemological, and pedagogical climate of profound opportunities, complete with a newfound willingness to experiment with emerging technologies. Nowadays, the opportunities are present to allow criminologists to go beyond the static methods of positivism, rational choice, and quantitative and qualitative research to explore mobile methods that can evoke and depict the fleeting, sensuous, and embodied motions of daily life.

Les Back (2013) illustrates how today's academic environment increasingly encourages a broad imagination within the social sciences, including criminology. "The tools and devices for research craft are being extended by digital culture in a hyper-connected world, affording new possibilities to re-imagine observation and the generation of alternative forms of research data" (Back and Puwar 2013: 7). The experiential flux of what people, objects, and animals do can be depicted sensuously. Mobile methods of immersion can reside

within the ambiguity of fluid experiences (see Ferrell 2013; Ferrell 2016; Redmon 2015). The methodological techniques of documentary criminology allow researchers to depict elements of harm in ways that written text cannot deliver.

Whereas written knowledge primarily lends itself to linear processing, sensory knowledge engages the viewer through non-linear encounters and indeterminate contacts (MacDougall, 2006; Young, 2010; Campbell, 2012). The video techniques of documentary criminology enjoin sensory experience with harm to produce vibrant encounters (Campbell, 2012; 2013). These techniques craft a sensory documentary that plunges viewers directly into the fluctuating experiences of harm through pre-reflective attention and external expressivity.

Documentary Criminology as Sensuous Scholarship

Documentary criminology's wider objective is invitational. Uninterested in grand theory, both criminologies embrace a perspective-oriented approach that seeks to develop methodologically open-ended and porous sensibilities which evolve and adapt over time. Unlike textual criminology, which relies primarily on written language as a technique to render analysis, documentary criminology crafts an aesthetically rich, empirical, *sensuous scholarship* that uses images, sounds, and textures to immerse audiences in lived experience. Documentary criminology attends to lyrical impressions and atmospheres of harm, crime, and pleasures. To paraphrase Jane Bennett (2009), documentary criminology's sensuous knowledge is *vibrant*; it provides an experiential way of knowing and transfigures the real through contact and encounter. When we engage with documentary criminology, we not only know the real intellectually: we also

encounter the real with our bodies pre-linguistically. We are sensual before we are verbal; we are pre-reflective and reflective. Documentary criminology's phenomenological framework "calls us to a series of systematic reflections within which we question and clarify that which we intimately live, but which has been lost to our reflective knowledge through habituation and/or institutionalization" (Sobchack 1990: 28). The unique window documentary criminology provides into lived experience broadens criminology's boundaries.

Green Cultural Criminology and the Age of the 'Anthropocene'

Academics have published poignant and divergent literature on the *Anthropocene* — the "age of the human" — a questionable new epoch defined by human devastation of ecological habitat through acts of destruction (Baskin 2015; Bonneuil and Fressoz 2015; Hamilton et al. 2015; Pattberg and Zelli 2016; Ruddiman 2003; Steffan et al. 2011). The growing interest in this subject is reflected in the popularity of books such as *Feral*, *Re-wilding*, *The Intimate Bond*, *Feral Cities*, and *Rewilding the World*. Academic conferences (e.g., "Animals in the Age of the Anthropocene") have considered the complicated relationships among the anthropocene, the wild, humans, and animals. Documentaries featuring harm to animals have heralded the birth of a new domain in film studies encompassing "ecocinema" and "popular green criminology" (Rust, Monani, and Cubitt 2013; Kohm and Greenhill 2013).

Both frameworks pursue a green cultural criminological exploration of how media represents harm against species, ecology, and humankind. For example, Kohm and Greenhill (2013: 376) observe that media's 'affective nuances' can

engage audiences and move “criminology forward by reaching audiences rarely exposed to mainstream academic discourses on crime and the environment...[Media] opens up spaces for affective engagement with (in)justice and simultaneously suggests a re-examination of taken-for-granted assumptions about offending and harm and their connection to broader contexts.” Indeed, such quintessentially mainstream companies as Netflix, National Geographic, CNN, BBC, ARTE, Amazon, and the Discovery Channel are currently developing and expanding programs on the problematic relationships between animals, humans, and the last remaining “wild” spaces on Earth. The majority of these “wild” documentaries uncritically appear in public platforms such as iTunes, television stations, open-access e-journals with video embeds, film festivals, galleries, and movie theaters.

“Wild” as a concept that is inseparable from nature and culture – and especially media depictions of both – has been a debate among academics. Cronon’s (1995) argument, for instance, is that the ‘wild’ is fundamentally a human creation seeped in value-laden Romanticism that elevates it to the status of the sacred and divorces human from the natural. Drawing upon the discourse poets and environmental activists, Cronon demonstrates the human construction of wild as supernatural, transcendental, classist, and often racist. Yet, according to Cronon, ‘wild’ is everywhere; it contains its own autonomy and reasons for being inside ecological relationships increasingly decimated as acts of harm (Cronon 1995). Media’s entangled relationship with the wild is contradictory, as will be explored in the concluding critiques of this article.

Merging documentary criminology with green cultural criminology seems natural from the outset, given the overlap in perspective between the two disciplines. As Ferrell, Hayward, and Young (2015: 80) indicate, “countless other forms of green cultural criminology can also be imagined, some undertaken, some waiting to be imagined.” Green cultural criminology resonates with documentary criminology in several ways: (1) both attend to the mediated dynamics of style, symbolism, and meaning of environmental or species harm; (2) both have a shared focus on resistance to species harm; (3) both advocate for the evocation of sensory experiences of species harm through the construction and dissemination of media.

The harm arising from the anthropocene calls upon us, as contemporary criminologists, to expand our understanding of crime, innovate our modes of analysis, and broaden our engagement with public audiences through the production and dissemination of media. Shearing (2015: 258) explores the conceptual consequences of the anthropocene on the shape and content of criminology: “The realization that we humans are powerful biophysical agents invites us, as criminologists, to ask what criminology might be, and should be, in the Anthropocene?” South’s (2015: 271) response is to focus “on the study of ‘harms’ as much as, if not more than, the study of crimes.”³ Brisman and South

³ A notable difference between green criminology and green cultural criminology is how the former focuses on a broad array of political, economic, ecological and corporate infrastructures that enact harm against the environment, food production and animals, whereas the latter explores the impact of cultural production and consumption, mediated dynamics, and symbolism of the social construction of harm.

(2014: 117) recommend that criminology broaden its understanding of “crime” to include harms to species and their habitats through interdisciplinary approaches. Citing several documentaries and fiction movies in their exploration of crimes against species, the authors suggest that researchers implement sensibilities of media production “in popular cultural forms” to transmit, disseminate, and bring empathetic concern to critically resist social harms (Brisman and South 2013: 117; Brisman et al. 2014).⁴

Acknowledging the prospects of a green cultural criminology, Ferrell (2013) also drifts into the discussion on the state of contemporary criminology in the age of the anthropocene. Similar to Brisman and South (2014), Ferrell offers suggestions for *methodological* linkages between cultural and green criminology with video methods in his exploration of crime:

“Even in this emergent stage, though, particular orientations can be identified – orientations that create some particularly fertile ground for the intertwined growth of green criminology and cultural criminology. By the nature of their subject matter, both green criminology and cultural criminology push against the conventional boundaries of criminology, and so tend to upset the definitional and epistemic order of the discipline...Among cultural criminology’s more useful innovation has been

⁴ Documentary criminology is a theoretical and methodological sensibility that actively enacts and produces media as sensuous scholarship, whereas visual criminology examines and interprets pre-existing visual representations of crime such as images and videos. Visual ethnography is understood as a research method emerging from the social sciences to gain a deeper understanding of social life through lived experience and its visual representation.

its emphasis on the visual, not only as an essential criminological subject matter in an increasingly mediated world but as a mode of criminological documentation and analysis. A visual criminology of this sort seems particularly appropriate for recording and communicating the little lost ecologies of everyday life” (Ferrell 2013: 349–360).

This call to re-examine and broaden criminology’s focus on the study of depicting harm also necessitates the invention of new methodological sensibilities to conduct research on and depict harm. Such a re-examination demonstrates there is no singular “criminology”; rather, several “criminologies” exist (Michalowski 2010). I consider documentary criminology to be an essential part of this plural and open-ended emerging project that invites new methods to craft sensuous knowledge about the consequences of harm in the age of the anthropocene. It is here that documentary criminology and green cultural criminology can forge an alliance, and I demonstrate such an alliance with the documentary SANCTUARY as a case study.

SANCTUARY as a Case Study of Documentary Criminology

SANCTUARY arrives during a particularly crucial period of the anthropocene and green cultural criminology’s response to it, as capitalism fuels the growth of urbanization and consumerism encourages expansive development without regard for the impact on other species that share the planet. Today, fewer and fewer “wild” spaces remain in which donkeys and other animals can live without human intervention and harm. According to the World Wildlife Fund, the planet has seen a 50% reduction in the overall number of wild animals since

1975; carbon emissions, urban expansion, pollution, abuse, and trafficking are pushing the wilderness to the margins and sequestering species within urban habitats. Into the breach created by this global crisis, institutions have arisen to protect marginalized species and the environments they inhabit. SANCTUARY responds to the harms of the anthropocene by exploring the rehabilitation of one particular species as an analog for larger issues of animal rights and eco-justice.

Once highly valued as farming and transport animals, donkeys in the post-industrial world have been rendered superfluous. As their functional value in society has diminished, the hundreds of thousands of donkeys currently in existence have been re-commodified; rising criminal networks illegally abduct and traffic in equines – horses and donkeys – (Sollund 2012), selling them to corporate factory farms where they are slaughtered, processed, and falsely packaged as “beef” in France, Sweden, Canada, South Africa, Australia, U.S., the U.K, and other countries. State complicity in the abusive treatment of donkeys is rampant: the Parks and Wildlife Department and the Bureau of Land Management in the United States routinely round up and shoot donkeys; in Mexico and in Quebec, Canada, donkey hides are sold and carcasses are butchered as meat; Taliban and ISIS fighters plant bombs in donkeys, and soldiers kill donkeys suspected of transporting armed weapons for terrorists. Sollund (2013: 319) refers to animals that are abducted, trafficked, and killed in this commodity chain as victims of crimes. “Wildlife trade is the abduction, acquisition, collection, destruction, possession, or transportation of animals for the purposes of barter, exchange, export, import, or purchase” (Sollund 2013:

319). To date, over 100,000 donkeys have been rescued from harm, abuse and abandonment in the U.K., USA, France, Spain, Canada, and Ireland. This startling number of rescues makes us wonder: what happens after these animals are rescued? What are the sensory elements of the rehabilitative process that donkeys undergo inside donkey sanctuaries as they recover from abuse and abandonment?

SANCTUARY is set inside The Donkey Sanctuary located in Sidmouth, Devon, UK. The Donkey Sanctuary's (hereinafter "The Sanctuary") mission is to care for the welfare and rehabilitate abandoned and abused donkey. The Sanctuary is inseparably tied to and born of the anthropocene, but it also provides resistance to and refuge from this destructive epoch. The ambiguous process of donkey rehabilitation in the Sanctuary is evoked in almost every phase of action, from donkey rescue to donkey surgery and donkey dentistry. Aesthetic depictions of these processes capture the sight, sounds, and patterns of donkeys' everyday experiences as they expressively reside in a human-made total institution that rehabilitates them. The camera captures their movements — braying, walking, eating, embodying their habitat, perceiving their environment. The images and sounds of care work and rehabilitation are messy, unpleasant, and at times alarming: a needle in a donkey's neck for anesthetization; surgery to repair damage; farriers cut directly into the tissue and nerves of donkey hooves. SANCTUARY unsettles the body and troubles the conscience while also instilling in audiences the vitality necessary to affectively encounter the vulnerability of species.

SANCTUARY demonstrates how video methods can be implemented to explore the broad ramifications of the anthropocene through the microcosm of care-work, where the damage of human violence and cruelty against one particular species — donkeys — is healed through rehabilitation. Although the goal of care-work is to improve the health of damaged donkeys, the invasive measures required to achieve this goal inevitably inflict pain, even as care-takers work to alleviate the ravages of human cruelty in the greater interest of long-term improvement. The invasive procedures undertaken to rescue donkeys from cruelty and habitat loss render them dependent on their human caretakers. Donkeys cannot decide when, where, or what to eat; they are not free to leave; they are bound by the institution's spatial and temporal barriers, put in place to protect and heal them. The institution, to paraphrase Goffman (1961), is "total." Within this mandatory enclosure, many of the donkeys are cut off from the wider ecology forever. Together, these donkeys lead an enclosed, formally administered life (Goffman 1961:11), sutured between a cruel world of deliberate abuse and the inadvertent but inevitable pain of rehabilitation. How do donkeys inhabit, embody, and expressively experience this institutional space of care-work that subjects them to distress in order to provide rehabilitation, sanctuary and security?

SANCTUARY examines the broader conditions of harm and healing by foregrounding the film's subjects — the donkeys — and capturing the starkness of their brays, trots, and spatial negotiations inside the confines of the care facility. Through experiential images and sounds, the audience comes to

understand how donkeys' livelihoods are shaped, orchestrated, and managed inside the Sanctuary's total institution. Cinematically, the film brings the audience *inside* the contact zones of social control and victimology. Indeed, green cultural provides a compelling approach to forging relationships between its theoretical framework and video methodologies enacted as documentary criminology. In examining how these connections are forged, I now turn to discuss how documentary criminology embeds itself within green cultural criminology to craft sensuous scholarship in the form of ethnographic documentaries.

Methodological Sensibilities: Four Approaches to Evoking Aspects of the Anthropocene

SANCTUARY took three months to prepare and five years to make. In my filmmaking, I acted initially as a trained ethnographer. I relied on the attuned skills of patience, participation, and immersive participatory-observation while taking detailed notes. I remained stationary in various parts of the Sanctuary for several days – at times, I slept there for up to seven nights; when not overnighing at the Sanctuary, I slept in an adjacent bungalow for up to a month at a time, off and on for five years. My goal in undergoing this immersion was to understand the rhythms and sounds of rehabilitation, the redundant movements through which humans and donkeys encounter each other during care work procedures, and the haptic interactions of touch as a rehabilitative process. I gave particular attention to the rhythms and patterns of caretakers and their choreographic gestures, how they delivered and isolated the donkeys to provide rehabilitation from abuse. I incorporated my observations into the techniques I

used to move and place my camera and sound recorder in relation to the rehabilitation process.

From my initial immersive activities, I decided to focus on and implement four methodological techniques: (1) learning to attend; (2) continuous long take; (3) sensory reliance; and (4) sonic communication. I believe each of these techniques can be fruitfully incorporated into green cultural criminology. In the next pages, I will use SANCTUARY as a case study to explore ways to extend green cultural criminology into a practice-based methodology of audiovisual sensory scholarship that crafts media out of ethnographic encounters. The four methodological techniques I identify can evoke sensuous scholarship through ethnographic immersion. By providing sensory substance via these four video methods, criminologists can advance a novel understanding of how rehabilitation occurs to animals that have been abused by humans, enhancing our study of deviance and crime.

Methodologically, the four techniques I will outline assist in evoking an “order of things,” (Bennett 2009) a structure of an experience (Sniadecki 2014), and atmospheric drama in the mundane experiences of situational care work (Vannini 2015). **Learning to attend** requires a sensibility of openness, which in turn allows one to construct sensuousness through cinematic immersion in flux (Ferrell 2013: 265). **Continuous long take**, or extended duration, helps the videographer evoke a continuation of experience that can make the familiar unfamiliar, and the unfamiliar familiar – a fundamental goal in sociological criminology. **Sensory reliance** “proceeds neither through the reductionism of

abstract language nor the subordination of image and sound to argument, but instead through the expansive potential of aesthetic experience and experiential knowledge” (Sniadecki 2014: 26). Finally, ***sonic communication*** is based on the understanding that meaning “does not emerge only from language; it engages with the ways in which our sensory experience is pre- or non-linguistic, and part of our bodily being in the world” (Karel 2013: 2). In the rest of this article, I discuss the implementation of these four video methods to amplify and evoke empirical atmospheres of harm and rehabilitation in the context of SANCTUARY.

1. Learning to Attend: Rehabilitation through Touch

A central tenet in documentary criminology is that one must learn to attend to the activity of engagement by placing one’s body in proximity to it. In practice, learning to attend requires continual interaction with the activities you are investigating (in this case, harm and rehabilitation). In SANCTUARY, touch is the first type of interaction used to rehabilitate abused and abandoned donkeys. Attending to activities such as rehabilitation-through-touch often entails ongoing adjustments to one’s positioning of the camera in response to the movements underway. Foregrounding sensory encounters of touch through the skilled practice of ethnographic attentiveness helps the videographer to evoke the lived experience of rehabilitation and retains its animated features. The donkeys’ movements (feet shuffling, ears flapping, heads bowed eating) and their varied brays are mundane, but when given full cinematic attention they together produce a symphony of movement, sound, and emotion.

In SANCTUARY, each cinematic shot of rehabilitation is precise in how it attends to the minutia of care work. The durations and situations involved in the rehabilitation effort are carefully captured. Human hands move across the body of an abused donkey; a woman calmly speaks to donkeys while stroking them; dentists use machines to repair donkeys' neglected teeth; a veterinarian places a sedative in a donkey's neck immediately prior to performing surgery. Each specific situation of care work and rehabilitation occurs inside tightly contained spaces intended to create safety for the donkeys. Rather than creating a series of juxtapositions that condense the shots into fragments, the video method of *learning to attend* allows the rehabilitative experience to play out in an unusually lengthy manner. Each shot of attentiveness enhances the rehabilitative process and gives attention to touch, contact: the interactive texture of hands, brays, hooves, and machines.

Laura Marks discusses touch and contact as haptic interactions particular to the surface of the body. To touch is to trace a memory onto the body and activate the skin by moving through an immediate environment of material contact (Marks 2000: xii). "Haptic criticism is mimetic: it presses up to the object and takes its shape. Mimesis is a form of representation based on getting close enough to the other thing to become it" (Marks 2000: xiii). Contact through touch also engages a material association with hearing: these are haptic sounds. A bray, for instance, is a touch of sensuousness for some people, a stirring in the chest that offers a new way to experience sensations inside our bodies. In haptic visuality, by contrast, the eyes touch but do not attempt to produce identification;

they encourage an embodied relationship between viewer and image (Marks 2000: 3). Fingers and hands touch donkeys to explore their hair, head, nostrils, legs, and tails.

Learning to attend to haptic encounters as a methodological sensibility requires intuitive, embodied movement based on the experience of contact. The cinematic approach is to move with lived experience; the movement of the body, camera, and sound recorder occurs intuitively during the rehabilitative process. The criminologist-as-filmmaker responds to the experiential activity while remaining immersed in it, thereby co-constructing involvement as a *relationship*. Collaborative dynamics emerge among the criminologist-as-filmmaker, the caretaker, and the donkeys – all of whom share the experiential dynamics of the situation. These dynamics converge to produce a singularity of unique experience for each human and donkey, or what Manning and Massumi (2014: 92) call a “catalyzing moment” that helps the situation develop a “creative participation which would be encouraged to take on their shape, direction, and momentum in the course of the event” (Manning and Massumi, 2014: 92).

Manning and Massumi (2014) refer to the methodological approach of learning to attend as a “techniques of relation.” Techniques of relation always occur within “enabling constraints” and are therefore devices for catalyzing and modulating interaction; they comprise a domain of *practices* (Manning and Massumi 2014: 91). The collaboration here is between the filmmakers, the donkeys, and the caretakers, all of whom share overlapping experience through encounters inside enabling constraints. The learning-to-attend approach

connects various experiential practices, arranges unexpected filmic explorations, and allows more exploratory movement with the camera and sound recorder. “This means that what is key is less what ends are pre-envisioned – or any kind of subjective intentional structure – than how the initial conditions for unfolding are set” (Manning and Massumi 2014: 89).

Learning to attend is a skilled practice and a re-*wilding* technique that relies on open-ended physicality, embodied skills, and cinematic immersion. Learning to attend brings the critical faculties of intuitive practice, mobility, and flexibility to documentary criminology as a feral technique that ruptures and undoes “proper,” pre-conceived, and rigid methodologies. The wildness joins the already existing experiences to allow unforeseen possibilities, unexpected practices, and new types of movements to emerge. In this sense, each film that emerges from documentary criminology takes its own shape, form and momentum to arrive at an unknown outcome, rather than abiding by pre-conceived rules, a “vision,” or procedures – all of which are in line with green cultural criminology’s approach of attunement through affective encounters.

2. Long Take: Duration of an Experience

SANCTUARY experiments with long, unbroken shots designed to inflect the continuity of lived experience and to more fully explore the expressivity of donkey rehabilitation within the sanctuary habitat. The drama of duration produces shots that are mundane yet highly charged, attuned to everyday moments of texture and the sounds of machines used to rehabilitate donkeys. Slow movements and extended scenes offer audiences the opportunity to

thoughtfully reflect on their relationships with time, the space in which rehabilitation occurs, and nonlinguistic soundscapes. The use of long takes in SANCTUARY invites viewers into the active process of rehabilitating donkeys and helps them bear witness to the external response to that rehabilitation (subjectively, of course, we will never know the donkeys' internal experience of it). SANCTUARY opens up a rare moment in the lives of viewers, allowing them to be actively present during the rehabilitation of donkeys and exposing them to the tension inherent in this process.

The film's long-take shots explore how donkeys circulate within the Sanctuary, moving from arrival to isolation, grooming (haircut, bathing, hooves pared) to membership in the herd. Implementing the long-take technique provides documentary criminologists the chance to help audiences sensuously understand the harmful implications of animal abuse, but also the broader context of the length of time it takes to heal invisible and visible wounds. Experiential long takes provide audiences an opportunity to connect (or to use green cultural criminology's term, "cathect") with donkeys during the rehabilitative process.

Cathexis is "the process of charging an object, activity, or place with emotional energy, which is in turn related to memory creation" (Pretty 2013: 493). Documentary criminology's advantage in this case is its ability to evoke highly charged atmospheres and appeal to the affective nature of the senses. Brisman and South (2014: 57) suggest that cathexis facilitates "attachment to objects, activities, and places, and this matures over time as a part, and as a reflection, of

biography and experience.” Although Brisman and South use the term “cathexis” to critically engage the limitations of consumerism, it also affirms an empathetic and sensuous interaction between viewers and abused donkeys, catalyzed during highly charged circumstances. Cathexis suggests that viewers may construct an attachment to animals, so that eventually the affective charge becomes part of their own biographical identity. Documentary criminology is inherently an experiential and sensuous medium, and for this reason, the technique of the long take has the potential to connect, or cathect, donkeys with viewers.

The long take intentionally eschews expository narrative and avoids constructing tension through the juxtaposition of shots in cinema verité style or with the use of words. Instead, the long take closely resembles Scott MacDonald’s (2013) phenomenological pragmatism: it evokes brute lived experience shaped into a narrative of everyday encounters, where the tension resides *within* the shot rather than *between* the juxtapose shots. The long takes presented in SANCTUARY shift the presentation of lived experience away from a dramatic, edited narrative to an attuned phenomenological inquiry of presence.

Long takes can elucidate the structure of an experience and reveal drama in mundane situational moments. The long take, as a technique of documentary criminology, offers a compelling means to inflect the fluctuating richness of complex motions and encounters that occur at the intersection of human, animal, and object rehabilitation. Methodologically, understanding rehabilitation entails paying close attention to atmosphere: how donkeys position themselves to eat,

where they stand, and how they move in synchronistical rhythms toward and within barriers of spatial limitations and freedoms. The camera is positioned to glance at donkeys within metal walls, but donkeys look back with intention. Their gaze holds the audience. It is clear that donkeys are not only objects to be looked at; they are subjects who look back.

3. Sensory Reliance

The mechanical sounds of a lorry's movement mingle with a donkey's muffled snorts. *Where is the donkey going and why?* An introductory long-take shot sets the cinematic tone of SANCTUARY as a single donkey enters an institution and guides the audience to the herd. We see that there are more donkeys — thousands more, in fact. From within the herd, the story unfolds patiently and attentively, in a spirit of curious exploration, with gentle sounds, harrowing brays, distressed movements, grinding machines, and embodied gestures. Documentary criminology's methodological approach highlights and foregrounds these sensory textures and kinetic inflections within the cinematic context of sensory criminology, a cinematic aesthetic that seeks to craft and implement media to situate audiences inside immersive phenomena of deep personal presence rather than didactic exposition or textual representation. Without the aid of voiceover or expert interviews, the audience is left to sensuously engage directly with donkey rehabilitation.

What remains when human language is stripped from documentary analysis? When the verbal, expository language is omitted, requiring viewers to rely on their own interpretive skills to experience the documentary? Experiential

immersion into the sensory aesthetics of the donkey's ecological space requires audiences to rely on sensibilities of orientation rather than a narrator's voice, an expert's interview, or an academic's explanation – here, *the documentary itself is the analysis*. Documentary criminology's methodological technique of “sensory reliance” is open and expansive. It relies on the audience to add to the movie through their sensory engagement; it cultivates attentiveness and patience. Relying on senses places bodies in contact with each other as a way of knowing.

Flashes of donkey experience enrich the criminological imagination. Instead of subordinating lived experiences as instrumental fodder for linguistic explanation, SANCTUARY prioritizes the richness of unspoken sensory experiences of green cultural criminology – *the criminological imagination* – to reach beyond verbal, numerical or textual criminology. SANCTUARY embraces sensory criminology and the inflections of video ethnography by deliberately enhancing the relationship between sight, sound, and movement: tactile sensations transmitted to the viewer's body. By relying on sensory engagement, the film immerses audiences in the donkeys' institutional habitat, enveloping them in haptic contact through tactile and aural engagement with the rehabilitative process. In SANCTUARY, each rehabilitative scene is open-ended “as seen, felt, and heard—they speak to the body...” (Redmon 2015: 435). The aesthetics of species harm – here, the damage to donkeys' habitats and bodies – is offered as a puzzle to be teased out (Brisman and South 2012: 125).

Documentary criminology, when combined with a green cultural criminology ethos, is infused with vitality: it brings audiences into a sensory,

embodied relationship with donkey rehabilitation and its enlivened surroundings – it demonstrates damage but also resistance to harm. The documentary connects with audiences in a physical, internal way while also encouraging audiences to touch and be touched; to transform and be transformed; to act and be acted upon by the physical and animal world. John Dewey (1934: 224) quotes a poet who maintains that “poetry seemed ‘more physical than intellectual,’ and goes on to say that he recognizes poetry by physical symptoms such as bristling of the skin, shivers in the spine, constriction of the throat, and a feeling in the pit of the stomach like Keats’ ‘spear going through me.’” This physical, sensory response is what is evoked with SANCTUARY: the eeriness of the dark barn, the closeness of the fur, the varied loud sounds of the bray, and the confrontation of the donkey’s gaze — all generate tension felt on and within the body. These aural and tactile experiences are kinetic, intended to activate audiences’ bodies, senses, and minds – thereby providing a “thick” understanding of what abused donkeys go through during the process of rehabilitation.

Documentary criminology approaches the human/non-human barrier not as a problem to be rationally solved, but as an opportunity to be recognized and embraced — an opportunity to acknowledge relational sentience embedded in profound difference. A larger objective of documentary criminology is to sensuously inflect and infuse these human/non-human differences with vitality so they flourish rather than diminish. Documentary criminology, in this instance, is open and expansive. When we empathetically immerse audiences in habitats

replete with sounds and visuals—when we envelop them in haptic contact—we astonish by way of pre-reflective contact.

4. Sonic Communication and Diegetic Sounds (or, how can we ignore the range of donkey brays?)

Sonic communication — the diegetic soundscape of criminological atmospheres — provokes embodied and ‘felt’ responses to audiences. Documentary criminology maximizes the technique of sonic communication in SANCTUARY through the aural textures of rehabilitation, whereas spoken human language is minimized. Approximately seven English sentences are spoken in SANCTUARY; overwhelmingly, the language of the soundscape is instead mechanical, animal, and environmental. Non-verbal communication emphasizes the status of the donkeys as victims of crimes – burning, torture, stabbing, and starvation.

Banging metal bars clash with donkey brays; the sounds of impatient donkeys scampering in a barn comingle with the echoes and refractions of their hooves running across the concrete floors as they prepare for medicine to be forcefully inserted into them. The sounds of donkeys jumping, resisting their medicine and licking their lips blend with the unseen donkey brays in the background. These atmospheric sounds of rehabilitation are the living substance of aural phenomenological experience that communicates to audiences. We are so acclimatized to the presence of an expository, disembodied voice directing viewers’ attention that the mere omission of this voice starkly foregrounds the

ambiguity of sonic language. Exposition that 'clarifies' closes off interpretative possibilities, whereas the non-expository, sonically vibrant atmosphere offered in SANCTUARY is open-ended.

Foregrounding sonic communication in documentary criminology has the methodological benefit of reinforcing the audience's connection to the sensory immediacy of rehabilitation as aesthetic knowledge. The depiction of sound as aesthetic knowledge aligns with Katz's quest to convey the sensory details of crime and the victims who experience it. Katz (1988: 3) writes: "Social science literature contains only scattered evidence of what it means, feels, sounds, tastes, or looks like to commit a particular crime. Readers of research on homicide and assault do not hear the slaps and curses, see the pushes and shoves, or feel the humiliation and rage that may build toward the attack ...".

Indeed, audiences do not hear (or see) *any* of the sensory elements addressed by Katz (1988) in *written* form. Yet documentary criminology as sensuous scholarship can communicate sonic textures from multiple perspectives. For example, the sounds of repairing donkey teeth; the grating of damages donkey hooves; the tactile softness of massaging a wound — all these sensory encounters permeate the Sanctuary and activate viewers' bodies in uncomfortable and pleasurable ways. The sound of the donkey dentist's machine grinding on the enamel of donkey teeth is part of disciplinary rehabilitation as well as the Sanctuary's sonic environment. These sounds agitate and vibrate, evoking memories and empathy. Rehabilitation is heard, but the violence against donkeys is absent: audiences hear the consequences of harm through routine care work.

The visceral sounds of rehabilitation communicate non-verbally through aesthetic experience. These diegetic and depicted sounds of documentary criminology fill in Katz's gap.

Sound acts with force; sound is felt internally and externally on the skin of the body. Sonic communication inflects immediacy and pre-reflective expressivity; the body naturally registers experiential sounds differently than written communication. Sonic communication develops rapport but also ruptures viewers' (listeners') engagement. The sonic components of rehabilitation in SANCTUARY come in a wide range of styles, embodying pre-linguistic sensory experiences through their duration and continuity. The soundscapes of criminology can immerse the body into an aural atmosphere — an overlooked frontier of lived experience in criminological research methods.

Criminologists almost never study the sounds of crime, transgression, harm — or, in this case, rehabilitation. It is only in documentary criminology that sound stands on an equal footing with visual and textual representation.⁵ Documentary criminology demonstrates how sound is directly connected to embodiment and sense of place. Sound may not be *seen*, but it is *perceptive* to the body. The “visual” in “visual criminology” is often privileged as a primary way of knowing experience, effectively eschewing the aural, the affective, the tactile, haptic, and ambient — yet all experiences necessary contain invisible, crucial textures of sound. Documentary criminology is interested in the invisible as much

⁵ An exception to where one encounters the “smells” of criminology is Chura, David. 2011. *I Don't Wish Nobody to Have a Life Like Mine*. Beacon Press. Boston.

as the visible (Davies et al. 2014), and it is in the invisible domain of the sonic that documentary perhaps gains its most powerful methodological and epistemological traction.

A sonic approach to criminology records and depicts sounds of harm in ways that *bring audiences into* the experience. Sound is felt through the body; bodies are *in* sound as much as sound works *through, on, and with* bodies. A benefit of foregrounding sonic criminology is that it evokes the sensory immediacy of sound as aesthetic knowledge. The environment of donkey rehabilitation becomes fuller when it is realized through sonic embodiment. Evoking the sensuous sounds of a particular place — whether those sounds evoke revulsion and horror, seduction and affirmation, silence or laughter — is crucial to the construction of criminological documentaries. Criminological sounds are active, affective experiences that provide audiences with a crucial interpretive key. Sonic criminology can be understood as the production of aural information as aesthetic knowledge in its own right rather than as supplementary material to aid visual and textual representation.

Conclusion

This article has used the documentary SANCTUARY as a case study to discuss four methodological techniques that aid the production of sensory scholarship in documentary criminology: (1) learning to attend; (2) continuous long take; (3) sensory reliance; and (4) sonic communication. I have explained and showed how SANCTUARY employs these techniques to position its

audience to sensuously understand the distressing rehabilitative process donkeys undergo while recovering from abuse.

The four techniques outlined in this article are in no way definitive and remain malleable and invitational to an open-ended exploration of lived experience. These methodological techniques allow criminologists to craft sensory experience that is dynamic, engaged, and attuned to the sensibilities emerging from direct encounters rather than pre-existing prescribed rules. The articulation and rendering of these methodological techniques establishes flexible expectations of what documentary criminology entails. The formation of a criminological documentary occurs through actual practice and ongoing encounters in the field. The researcher's approach is attuned to the rhythms, dynamics, and ambiguity of lived experience. This experiential nature of this approach sets documentary criminology fundamentally apart from other, more textually-based *criminologies*. As a sensory-based methodology, documentary criminology seeks to answer the question: how can we *know and relate to* harm?

This question relational and sensuous rather than textual or verbal; answering it necessitates an epistemological reconfiguration of the criminological imagination. Methodologically, documentary criminology answers this question by enhancing our understanding of sensory-based harm. In this article, we saw this approach played out particularly through video methods, used to advance our understanding of donkey rehabilitation as sensory scholarship in the anthropocene epoch.

This article has also borrowed extensively from green cultural criminology's open-ended practices to re-wild methodologies, inviting feral approaches to mobile encounters that allow researchers to move with the flux of sensory experience. The four techniques outlined in this article intersect with green cultural criminology's interest in ethnography and the crafting of media to engage popular audiences. By forging connections between green cultural criminology and video methods, documentary criminology can create sensory scholarship that re-imagines the relationship between popular audiences and academic researchers. Sensory documentaries are currently being disseminated on a range of popular platforms, including iTunes, Netflix, and movie theaters. And here is precisely where I'd like to highlight two critiques of documentary criminology (though of course more exist).

The first shortcoming of documentary criminology is its emphasis on longitudinal form. For example, not everyone can spend five years making an ethnographic documentary. How do academics overcome this limitation while also preserving the integrity of their research? Saunders (2012) cites the emergence of digital technology as a transformative 'practice' in disciplines among the landscapes of higher education. Practices, according to Saunders (2012: 232), are "routine behaviours derived from a personal or collective knowledge base." An ongoing conundrum is how to enact new practices from and within ongoing practices in criminology (see Ferrell 2011). In an increasingly reductive academic infrastructure that examines the 'bottom line' of research output in terms of numbers and text inside an audit culture, efficiency, and new

managerialism that overextends and degrades academics (Becher and Trowler 2001: 13; Daniels and Thistlethwaite 2016: 115) – and that leaves out whole swathes of curriculums and disciplines (Saunders 2012: 239) – where do researchers who practice documentary criminology fit into this neoliberal model?

Daniels and Thistlethwaite (2016: 132) suggest the future of researchers will be a bricolage of practices. “Digital media technologies make it easier to create hybrid projects across fields that are typically separate. The future of being a scholar will include more blending of academia, journalism, and documentary filmmaking ...” (Daniels and Thistlethwaite 2016: 133). It will shift to digital models of communication and modes of digital scholarship thereby presenting scholars with amazing “new opportunities to do their work in ways that matter to wider publics...Being a scholar in the digitally networked classroom means guiding students to new knowledge and helping them become lifelong learners” (Daniels and Thistlethwaite 2016: 138). Digital media technologies, *when implemented as a research sensibility*, allow scholars to depict, disseminate, and re-imagine knowledge as sensuous to enhance textual scholarship.

Ferrell (2009: 12) has come closest to defining this emerging digital media as ‘instant ethnography’. Instant ethnography “denotes an ethnography of moments and ephemeral meanings and in so doing confronts yet another conventional assumption underlying the sense of ethnographic method as a totalizing enterprise: the notion that durable social groups and situations are to be studied through enduring ethnographic research.” Sometimes documentaries

combine immediate situations with longitudinal media immersion, interpretively recording the immediacy of crime, harm, and transgression over the course of time. Participating in and intimately observing fluctuating activities allows researchers to explore and depict immediate experience as 'instant ethnography' while retaining inflections of dynamic experiences with audiovisual immediacy, mediated verstehen, and intimate attunement. Ferrell, Hayward, and Young (2015: 215-230) further elaborate on instant ethnography by drawing upon Cartier-Bresson's notion of 'decisive moment' as a technique to depict the expressive significance of an event. It offers researchers insight to "say something significant about the world the image encapsulates" (Ferrell, Hayward and Young 2015: 230). Documentary criminology and instant ethnography overlap in ways that invite further methodological explorations as open-ended practices that contribute to novel research techniques as a sensibility.

A second criticism of documentary criminology is from a commodified perspective of the 'knowledge industry'. How can an anti-consumerist/anti-capitalist green cultural criminological project be squared with the fact that research films will be sold on iTunes, Netflix, Amazon and other digital platforms and is thus a commodified product? Indeed, I have demonstrated how and why documentary criminology is compatible with the ethos and theoretical frameworks of green cultural criminology in spite of the dissemination techniques and distribution outlets chosen by documentary criminology. It is important to find possibilities as well as limitations. The tools of video ethnography and documentary filmmaking are technologies of the culture industries that help

produce and disseminate popular knowledge in civil society. We as criminologists and knowledge producers (in the culture and knowledge industries) occupy nuanced contradictory positions: we are consumers, we are consumed, and we make consumable goods. Let me be clear: *there is no space of non-commodification in academia*. Books, journal articles, and documentaries are all part of the culture and knowledge industries, and by extension the crime industry too. Media can be a way of translating complex ideas in everyday life in contradictory ways. Media production demonstrates Cronon's (1995) proposition of humans' construction of and presence in nature.

Vannini (2014: 397) has demonstrated how the growing popularity of popular documentaries distributed on Netflix, iTunes and so on can humble and teach researchers a lot about their role in the public sphere and how to reach different popular audiences beyond text. For example, textual based criminological articles, chapters and books are commodified products sold on Amazon, iTunes, and so forth – and so are movies. Articles and movies have distribution companies and so do academic publications. Movies and academic publications are branded, packaged and sold as a commodity; both are consumed by their recipients; and both generate income for the distributor and publisher – some more so than others. Documentary criminology can hold contradictory positions: it can be anti-consumerist while also functioning as a commodity to undo harm (see Redmon 2015). The question for my approach to documentary criminology is how to tap into existing modes of dissemination in order to further make research available – whether it's free on Youtube or

purchased on Netflix or iTunes. As Vannini (2014: 412) states, “more than ever before hybrid TV makes it possible—not easy, but at least possible—to reach a wide, diverse, documentary-savvy, and potentially socially conscious audience thirsty for entertaining and intelligent ethnographic content.”

It is my conclusion that a shared goal of green cultural criminology and documentary criminology is to bring video ethnography “out of the rigid disciplinary and methodological debate following its inception by outlining its potential to reach multiple publics and inspire dialogue among audiences beyond the academy” (Taggart and Vannini 2015: 227). Documentary criminology’s feral tendencies, methodological advantages, and unique practice-based sensibility offer a new and exciting way to advance this goal in spite of the above limitations but especially because of its possibilities.

Works Cited

Andrist, L. Chepp, V. Dean, P. Miller, M (2014) “Toward a Video Pedagogy: A Teaching Typology with Learning Goals,” *Teaching Sociology*, Vol. 42(3) 196-206.

Back, L (2013) ‘Live Sociology: Social Research and its Futures,’ in Back, Les and Puwar, Nirmal, eds. (2013), *Live Methods*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.

Back, L and Puwar, N (2012), A manifesto for live methods: provocations and capacities. *The Sociological Review*, 60: 6–17.

Baskin, J (2015) Paradigm Dressed as Epoch: The Ideology of the Anthropocene. *Environmental Values* 24(1) [February]: 9-29.

Becher, T and Trowler, P (2001) *Academic Tribes and Territories*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Bennett, J (2009) *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke Press.
- Bonneuil, C., and Jean-Baptiste Fressoz (2015) *The Shock of the Anthropocene: The Earth, History and Us*. London: Verso.
- Brisman, A and South, N (2013) 'A green-cultural criminology: An exploratory outline', *Crime, Media Culture*, 9(2): 115-135.
- Brisman A and South N (2014) *Green Cultural Criminology: Constructions of Environmental Harm, Consumerism, and Resistance to Ecocide*. London: Routledge.
- Brisman, A, Bill McClanahan, and Nigel South (2014) Toward a green-cultural criminology of "the rural." *Critical Criminology* 22(4): 479-94.
- Brisman A, South N and White R (eds) (2015) *Environmental Crime and Social Conflict: Contemporary and Emerging Issues*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Campbell, E (2012) 'Landscapes of performance: stalking as choreography,' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 30(3), 400-417.
- Campbell, E (2013) Transgression, 'Affect and Performance: Choreographing a Politics of Urban Space,' *British Journal of Criminology*, 53(1), 18-40.
- Chura, D (2011) *I Don't Wish Nobody to Have a Life Like Mine*. Beacon Press. Boston.
- Cronon, W (1995) "The Trouble with Wilderness; or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature" (1995), accessed November 2, 2016.
http://www.williamcronon.net/writing/Trouble_with_Wilderness_Main.html
- Daniels, J and Thistlethwaite, P (2016) *Being a Scholar in the Digital Era: Transforming Scholarly Practice for the Public Good*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Davies, Francis, P, Wyatt P (eds) (2014) *Invisible Crimes and Social Harms*. London: Palgrave.
- Dewey, J (1934) *Art as Experience*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Donovan, T (2015) *Feral Cities: Adventures with Animals in the Urban Jungle*. Chicago: Review Press.
- Fagan, B (2015) *The Intimate Bond, How Animals Shaped Human History*. Bloomsbury Press.

- Ferrell, J. 2009. Kill Method: A Provocation. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Criminology*, Vol 1 (1).
- Ferrell, J (2011) "Disciplinary and Drift," in Mary Bosworth and Carolyn Hoyle, editors, *What is Criminology?* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ferrell, J (2013) 'Cultural Criminology and the Politics of Meaning'. *Critical Criminology*, 21:257–271.
- Ferrell, J, Hayward, K, and Young, J (2015) *Cultural Criminology: An Invitation*. London: Sage Press.
- Ferrell, J (2016) 'We Never, Never Talked About Photography': Documentary Photography, Visual Criminology, and Method', forthcoming in *Routledge International Handbook of Visual Criminology*. London: Routledge.
- Fraser, C (2011) *Re-wilding the World: Dispatches from the Conservation Revolution*. Picador Press, New York.
- Goffman, E (1961) *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. New York: Anchor Press.
- Hamilton, C., Christophe Bonneuil and François Gemmene, (eds), (2015) *The Anthropocene and the Global Environmental Crisis: Rethinking modernity in a new epoch*. Routledge: NYC.
- Karel, E (2013) Interview with Ernst Karel, by mark peter wright / February 14, 2013: <https://earroom.wordpress.com/2013/02/14/ernst-karel/>
- Katz, J (1988) *Seductions of Crime*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kohm S and Greenhill P (2013) 'This is the north, where we do what we want': Popular green criminology and 'Little Red Riding Hood' films. In South N and Brisman A (eds) *Routledge International Handbook of Green Criminology*: 365-378. London and New York: Routledge.
- MacDonald, S (2013) *American Ethnographic Film and Personal Documentary: The Cambridge Turn*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- MacDougall, D (2006) *The Corporeal Image*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Manning, E and Massumi, B (2014) *Thought in the Act: Passages in the Ecology of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Marks, L (2000) *The Skin of the Film: Intercultural Cinema, Embodiment, and the Senses*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Michalowski, R (2010) "Keynote Address: Critical Criminology for a Global Age." *Western Criminology Review* 11(1):3-10.

Monbiot, G (2013) *Feral: Searching for Enchantment on the Frontiers of Rewilding*. Penguin Press, London.

Pattberg, P, and Fariborz Zelli, (eds), (2016) *Environmental Politics and Governance in the Anthropocene: Institutions and legitimacy in a complex world*. NYC: Routledge.

Pretty, J (2013) 'The Consumption of a Finite Planet: Well-Being, Convergence, Divergence and the Nascent Green Economy.' *Environmental and Resource Economics*, 55 (4). pp. 475-499.

Redmon, D (2005) *Mardi Gras Made in China, Carnavalesque Films*.

Redmon, D (2015) *Beads, Bodies, and Trash*. NYC: Routledge.

Ruddiman, W (2003) The Anthropogenic Greenhouse Era Began Thousands of Years Ago. *Climatic Change* 61(3): 261-93.

Rust, S, Monani, and Cubitt, (eds) (2013) *Ecocinema Theory and Practice*. Routledge, New York.

Saunders, M (2012) "Transformations from Without and Within the Disciplines" in *Tribes and Territories in the 21st Century: Rethinking the Significance of Disciplines in Higher Education*, edited by Paul Trowler, Murray Saunders and Veronica Bamber. London: Routledge.

Shearing, C (2015) 'Criminology and the Anthropocene'. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, Vol. 15(3) 255–269.

Sniadecki, J (2014) 'Chaiqian/Demolition: Reflections on Media Practice,' *Visual Anthropology Review*, 30: 23–37.

Sobchack, V (1990) *The Active Eye: A Phenomenology of Cinematic Vision*. *Quarterly Review of Film and Video*, 12(3):21–36.

Sollund, R (2013) 'The Victimization of Women, Children and Non-human Species through Trafficking and Trade' in South N and Brisman A (eds) *The Routledge International Handbook of Green Criminology*. London: Routledge.

South, N and Brisman A (eds) (2013) *The Routledge International Handbook of Green Criminology*. London: Routledge.

South, N (2015) 'Anticipating the Anthropocene and Greening Criminology'.

Criminology & Criminal Justice 2015, Vol. 15(3) 270–276.

Steffen, W, Jacques Grinevald, Paul Crutzen, and John McNeil (2011) The Anthropocene: Conceptual and historical perspectives *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* 369 [13 March]: 842-67.

Taggart, J and Vannini, P (2015) 'Life Off-Grid: Considerations for a Multi-Sited, Public Ethnographic Film', in *Video Methods*; Bates, C., Ed.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2014; pp. 230–240.

Vannini, P. 2015. "Ethnographic Film and Video on Hybrid Television: Learning from the Content, Style, and Distribution of Popular Ethnographic Documentaries," *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, Vol. 44(4) 391–416.

Vannini, P (2015) 'Video Methods beyond Representation: Experimenting with Multimodal, Sensuous, Affective Intensities in the 21st Century', in *Video Methods*; Bates, C., Ed.; Routledge: New York, NY, USA, 2014; pp. 230–240.

Young, A (2010) 'The Scene of the Crime: Is There Such a Thing as "Just Looking"?'', in Hayward, K and Presdee, M, eds, *Framing Crime: Cultural Criminology and the Image*. Oxford: Routledge.