

Word count: 9942

Ghost Criminology: a framework for the discipline's spectral turn

There are spectres haunting criminology. Yet, these are not the spirits familiar to us from supernatural fiction. Instead, these are forces that push both our experience and understanding of time 'out of joint'. These spectres reveal to us that the present is not so solid as we might think. Harms return and persist. Future injuries are felt in the now. Here, spectrality operates as a conceptual metaphor allowing us to examine these disruptive forces. Criminology's troubling past with colonizing practices, for example, continues to be experienced in the afterlives of slavery and other white supremacist practices. Similarly, climate weirding means that harms that are experienced and inflicted in the present see us visited by the ghosts of future catastrophe. This destabilizing of the conventional notion of causal, linear time brings into focus a sense of indebtedness. A debt is owed to the voices of the past (and passed). And debts are being incurred to those threatened within an uncertain future. So, to encounter the spectral is to sift through traces of past practice that impact the present, in addition to attending to pre-echoes of the future. Davis (2007: 2) puts it that '[t]he ghost's appearance is the sign of a disturbance.' When time is 'off its hinges', the past-present-future coalesce, and the spectre – simultaneously present and absent, visible and invisible – disrupts the epistemological order. And a productive opening of meaning occurs.

The aim of this piece is to divine a path through the vaporous definitions of spectrality to provide a framework for a ghost griminology. This would see the discipline engage with forces that are uncoupled from linear time and which hover between presence and absence, visibility and invisibility. It is a response to the 'spectral turn' occurring within the discipline and seeks to extend the work begun in the recent edited collection entitled 'Ghost Criminology' (Fiddler, Kindynis and Linnemann, 2022). We will first set out the theoretical underpinnings of this project by examining the social theory of haunting and the ghostly, as well as Jacques Derrida's (1994) notion of hauntology. We will unpack the spectral turns that have already occurred in adjacent disciplines, as well as map out the nascent turn occurring within criminology. In doing so, we can see how the language of spectrality has been employed to explore lived experience. We draw upon these elements

to set out three strands of a ghost criminology: the (in)visible; the (in)corporeal and dead or haunted spaces. Using these we can capture the criminological dimensions of disrupted linear time, weird spaces, and individuals and groups rendered ghostly. Clearly, then, this is a project that compliments other sub-disciplines that explore cultural, visual or gothic dimensions of criminology. A *ghost* criminology differentiates itself by placing a sense of disrupted time at its core. This is the innovation of its approach. Where Gothic criminology, for example, is an 'expression of dis-ease with the grand narratives of the Enlightenment,' ghost criminology is concerned with a dis-ease of temporality (Picart and Greek, 2007: 15). Where Gothic criminology questions the progress of Enlightenment, ghost criminology questions the linearity of that path. As we will demonstrate, taking this approach opens us to adopt innovative and unconventional, perhaps even subversive, methodological approaches (*inter alia*. Blanco and Peeren, 2003). In doing so we conjure ghosts as conceptual metaphors allowing us to *see* what we *feel* haunting us. Intimately bound up with this is the importance of recognising - and seeking to reckon with - the malignant inheritance that sits within the discipline's origins; it is one of past action and inaction, of silences and silencing. As Agozino (2004: 346) phrases it, a foundational text for criminology, Beccaria's (1764) *On Crimes and Punishments*, was written in part as a response to the wrongful execution in 1761 of a Frenchman whose son had died by suicide, but who was tried for his murder. And so, '[t]he execution of a single Frenchman counts more in the conventional history of the invention of criminology' than the Trans-Atlantic slave trade or the genocidal practices underpinning European colonialism. This is a haunting absence that has sat within the discipline since its inception, the contours of which continue to be felt. As we will come to note, these aspects of inheritance from and debt to a fluid past-present-future are central to our approach and distinguish it from other examinations of harm. They become the key means by which we can ensure that justice (in Jacques Derrida's understanding of it) can be achieved. The conception of ghost criminology that we map out here is intrinsically reflexive; it demands that we reckon with our own 'ghosting' practice. As Cameron (2008: 384), citing Haraway (1994), points out, when utilising tropes to explore the social world, we can choose to use 'less-deadly version(s) for moral discourse'. We must remain mindful of simply repeating the troubling practices of the discipline's past. Rather, we intend to set out examples of praxis: conjuring, exorcising and giving proper burial in order to achieve justice for the past and future. First, let us explore the ways in which the

language of the spectre and phantom have been used in philosophy, psychoanalysis and social theory. Doing so will allow us to set out the framework for our own ghost criminology.

Haunted Modernity

How the spectre intersects with the social realm shifts in line with the ontology of the times. Castle (1995), for example, details the shifting status of the ghost in European thinking from the sixteenth and seventeenth century onwards. This period saw a 'rationalist assault' upon spectrality with the publication of anti-witchcraft tracts and the 'skeptical theorizing' of Hobbes and Descartes (Castle, 1995: 171). The systems of surveillance and punishment that developed across the 1700s usurped the place of a spectre that would haunt the guilty or ensure that an inheritance was passed on correctly. The ghost simply lost its social relevance (Thomas, 1971). The nineteenth century would see the ghost (re-)emerge as a means of capturing a sense of alienation and 'disturbing forms of otherness (including that contained inside the self, the home, and the homeland)' (Blanco and Peeren, 2013: 3). The Enlightenment attempt to bury the irrational had – *inevitably* – set the stage for its revenant return. Attempts to disavow the spectre only drew it closer.

In Hutchings (2001: 6) potent phrasing, the figure of the spectre was 'rational modernity's uninvited guest' and he documents how this shadowed early criminological thinking. Of further note is Hutchings' reading of a prank played upon a young Jeremy Bentham wherein he was led to believe that a ghoulish figure was coming to punish him. As he puts it, the trick developed within Bentham a fear, if not a belief, in the supernatural. It is this that 'taught him the means to *haunt the social imagination*' that he would then come to employ in his later life and within the design of the Panopticon in particular (emphasis added, *ibid.*: 43; Fiddler, 2022b). Similarly, Rafter and Ystehede (2010) and Picart and Greek (2007) trace the later interweaving of nascent criminology and gothic literature. Just as Bram Stoker's (1897) *Dracula* references Lombroso, so the latter's writing was imbued with a sense of the gothic as the two emerged as twisted conjoined twins.

There is likewise a clear resonance here with the work of Karl Marx. The spectre, the undead and the vampire each make appearances in his writing. A spectre haunts Europe in *The Communist Manifesto*, the vampiric nature of capital is described in *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*, and there is an extended dissection of the phrase 'es spukt' ('it spooks') in a critique of Max Stirner in *The German Ideology*. Derrida would later see Marx as demonstrating an 'unremitting hostility to the ghost', but the desire to exorcise it produced 'the further proliferation of ghostly and spectral effects' in his writing (Fletcher, 1996: 31). The impersonal 'es spukt' similarly appears in Freud's writing. Rabaté (1996) notes a number of ways in which the ghost and haunting feature in Freudian psychoanalysis. The dead returning and (failed) mourning would find analogues in repression and a troubling return of the secret or 'buried'. The act of haunting and the figure of the spectre provided metaphors for the work of the psyche. In attempting to privilege the rational, the haunting presence of irrational forces were driven deep into the psyche. The mind became supernaturalized as thought itself was haunted.

Abraham and Torok (1994) would later iterate upon this notion by positing a 'phantom' that could be formed within the psyche following a trauma. To summarise, they proposed that the traumatic loss of a 'love object' – and this can be person, item, idea or place – can lead to a process that they refer to as incorporation. This sees the phantom entombed in a crypt within the psyche and endlessly repeating the traumatic event. The phantom can then be passed between individuals and groups. This describes the phenomenon of transgenerational haunting as descendants of those that experienced a traumatic event report symptoms associated with a trauma despite not directly suffering it themselves. These phantoms are secrets left within us by the dead. They are 'words buried alive', revealing themselves through linguistic tics or somatic symptoms, as the analyst sifts for their traces (Derrida, 1986: xxxv).

Jacques Derrida (1986) would write the foreword – the punningly titled *Fors* – to Abraham and Torok's (1986) *The Wolf Man*. In that, Derrida (original emphasis, 1986, xv-xvi) observes that the crypt 'itself is *built* by violence' and that it contains and maintains 'in a state of repetition the mortal conflict it is impotent to resolve.' Derrida (1994) would later formulate a spectre that is somewhat different to Abraham and Torok's phantom. Simply

put, phantoms 'lie about the past whilst spectres gesture towards a still unformulated future' (Davis, 2005: 379). It is this thought that takes us to Derrida and the concept of hauntology.

Derrida and hauntology

We can trace the spectral tendrils of *Fors* in Derrida's (1994) later text *Specters of Marx*. This book was similarly shadowed by Fukuyama's (1989) article entitled *The End of History?* Fukuyama (1989: 4) (in)famously saw liberal democracy's victory over communism in the latter part of the twentieth century as marking the 'end of history'; it was the 'end point of mankind's ideological evolution and universalisation of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government'. Yet, an end anticipates a return. So, Fukuyama's nail in the coffin should not be seen as an end point, but rather an indication of failed mourning. As Maddern and Adey (2008: 291) note, where commentators proclaimed that the end of the twentieth century saw 'all moments in time [as] neatly ordered and 'in their rightful place', the twenty first century has so far been haunted by 'irregular, unexpected and (un)anticipated events that appear to be 'beyond the real'.' This is where we see Derrida employ the punning name of hauntology in relation to ontology. Where ontology is concerned with being and presence, hauntology looks to those spectral traces that are neither/nor being or present. They hover between, disrupting both. Fisher (2014: 19) succinctly distilled the hauntological into these two strands:

The first refers to that which is (in actuality is) *no longer*, but which *remains* effective as a virtuality (the traumatic 'compulsion to repeat', a fatal pattern). The second sense of hauntology refers to that which (in actuality) has *not yet* happened, but which is *already* effective in the virtual (an attractor, an anticipation shaping current behaviour).

In *Specters of Marx*, Derrida (1994) reflects on the opening lines of the *Communist Manifesto* – that the reader will have noted we echo in the beginning of this article – '[a] specter is haunting Europe – the specter of communism.' He goes on to discuss the ghost of

Hamlet's father. A clue as to the nature of the first can be found in the second. As Buse and Stott (1999: 14) remark, 'Old Hamlet arrives from the past in order to make a demand on his son's future actions.' This, in turn, takes us to Brown's (2001: 149-150) concise reading of the spectre:

The specter begins by coming back, by repeating itself, by recurring in the present...We inherit not 'what really happened' to the dead but what lives on from that happening [And that] inspirit[s] our imaginations and visions for the future.

These lines are instructive. We await this return. We are indebted to what has come before. Things of the past make demands on the future. Further, what 'lives on' suggests a sense of persistence. The living on, the indebtedness and the inheritance, casts time out of joint. So, let us return to Fisher's distillation of hauntology to the two strands of the no longer or not yet. Derrida's use of the spectre within the Communist Manifesto speaks to both strands. The spectre within the Communist Manifesto that returns within *Specters of Marx* is a marker of structural openness. Marx repeatedly used the phrase 'let the dead bury the dead': the present must be stripped of the weight of the past for change to occur. This would then allow the realization of the future. For Marx, the spectre was not yet, but it was already effective. For Derrida, Europe – if not the world – had been 'haunted by events that had not actually happened, futures that failed to materialize and remained spectral' (Fisher, 2014: 107). The spectre was now of the no longer and not yet, both inspiriting imagination.

A spectral appearance brings our attention to a certain anachrony: 'the non-contemporaneity of the present time with itself' (Derrida, 1994: 29). The spectre means that the past is still unresolved and the future acts as a force upon the present. These, 'porous, permeable pasts and presents' bring with them ethical implications (Freccero, 2006: 69). They 'enable us to mourn and also to hope' (Freccero, 2006: 69). This fluid temporality rests at the core of Derrida's sense of justice. These encounters with the past/passed, anticipations of the future (and a sense of ourselves as future ghosts) pulls us into these relationships of debt and inheritance. Any consideration of justice must, therefore, take into account these fluid periods, these relationships cutting across past-present-future. As we

will come to unpack, it is within this framework that we, as (ghost) criminologists, make our interventions by revealing, examining and responding to harms experienced within a context of temporal disturbance. These are the moments of rupture that reveal how the trauma of past inter-personal or structural violence can return. We can see that this is particularly resonant when applied to police violence. Eric Garner's cry as he was suffocated – 'I can't breathe' - became atemporal. It echoed in the audio of the murder of George Floyd and then resounded as 'we can't breathe' in the global demonstrations that followed. It similarly exists, in Sharpe's (2016) phrasing, 'in the wake'; it is within slavery's 'as yet unresolved unfolding' (ibid.: 14). Achieving justice here would see us engage with the sorts of emancipatory practices that Brown (2022: 105) describes; creating spaces where the living and dead might 'co-exist in productive struggle'. Our thoughts must now turn to the creation of these sorts of spaces. How do we engage with these ethical implications that the ghosts of past and future bring with them? How to ensure a process of mourning can occur successfully or a space for hope to germinate across and within this fluid temporality. In our methods and analyses, how can we conjure, exorcise or give a proper burial?

To address these questions, it is helpful to examine the 'spectral turns' that occurred in literacy criticism in the 1990s and that then followed in other disciplines since they provide an insight into the application of spectrality. Of particular note were the publication of Avery Gordon's (1997/2008) *Ghostly Matters: haunting and the sociological imagination* and Colin Davis' (2005) article 'État Présent: hauntology, spectres and phantoms' in *French Studies*. Comprehensive edited collections were overseen by Buse and Stott (1999) and Blanco and Peeren (2013), in addition to special editions such as *cultural geographies* in 2008 that offered a focus on 'spectro-geographies'. These mapped the change in the spectre from being a cultural entity to a conceptual metaphor with which to examine the social realm. They followed what Martin Jay (1998) referred to as the 'uncanny nineties' with its focus upon trauma and a renewed interest in the return of the repressed. Similarly, Huyssen (2003) made a list of the 'master-signifiers of the 1990s' and their influence upon 'traumatology'. These included the uncanny and abject, 'repression, specters and a present repetitively haunted by the past' (Huyssen, 2003: 8). Blanco (2012) notes Huyssen's dissatisfaction with these terms since they afforded no way out of these cyclical traumatic patterns. This takes us to Luckhurst's (2002: 532) forthright critique of spectral turns that

see haunting everywhere. Any text, any concept, contains within it a spectre. Perhaps more troublingly, Luckhurst (2003: 535) archly notes that these spectral turns lack the impetus to seek resolution: 'work that might actually seek to lay a ghost of rest would be the height of bad manners'. Further, there is an inherent vapourishness to the concepts surrounding hauntology. An answer to this generalized notion of spectrality that can be encountered any and everywhere would be to focus upon the specific and the local. Such an approach would involve particular focus upon the specific symptomology of a given spectre in a specific locale. Murray (2012: 67) acknowledges that a critical strength could come from a renewed focus upon 'historical and contextual specificity'. Similarly, in the editorial to their 2008 special edition, Maddern and Adey note the imprecision with which spectrality and haunting had been applied. They point to the case studies appearing in their collection as providing a way forward to the application of 'haunting' to geography.

A ghost criminology

This brings us to the precepts of spectrality and the hauntological that underpin a ghost criminology. We would echo Luckhurst's concerns about a generalized sense of the spectral that sees the ghostly everywhere and is uninterested in resolution. We argue that there must be a focus upon the specific: of symptomology and the local. We must seek means to conjure and – where appropriate – help to exorcise. As Brown (2001: 151) phrases it, ghosts can be 'made to live in the present or leave the present in a manner that shapes both possibilities for and constraints on the future'. This act of conjuration should be one of 'pure hope' (Brown, 2001: 151). In short, ghost criminology is an attempt to achieve justice within an understanding of time being 'out of joint' and of forces that are present/absent and (in)visible.

The methods applicable to such a project are varied and diverse. Aside from the psychoanalytically-informed approach outlined earlier, we can point to 'spectral ethnography' (Armstrong, 2010) and ghost-watching: 'a vigilant perception of the landscapes depicted within [texts] as they may reveal a different, and haunted, dimension' (Blanco, 2012: 1). McClanahan and Linnemann (2018) similarly note the utility of spirit

photography as a means of contending with the visible and invisible. As a means of opening up the 'optical unconscious' and capturing what is unseen, an approach that echoes the techniques of spirit photography could provide fresh analytical insight. Likewise, Ayres and Kerrigan (2020) adapt the notion of spirit recording in their innovative piece that explores hauntology and trauma in a prison soundscape. These are means for us to access the 'things behind the things' (Radway, 2008: ix). In keeping with the theme, we would be remiss if we did not make clear our substantial debt to Avery Gordon's (2008) *Ghostly Matters*. It is a text that reflects upon sociology's historical and on-going failure to 'tell the true history of the losses occasioned by the slavery and racism that have been so enabling for capitalism' (Radway, 2008: ix). To make amends necessitates a process of 'calling up and calling out' (Gordon, 2008: 22). This requires an act of conjuring that 'merges the analytical, the procedural, the imaginative and the effervescent' (Gordon, 2008: 22).

In establishing the framework of a 'ghost' criminology there is much, then, to take from Gordon's (1997/2008) work. Yet, we should also note where this project diverges from it. Ours is a more narrowly focused set of ideas, whilst opening up the available methods. Simply put, our focus is upon those that are ghosted, as well as the practices that ghost. We explicitly engage with the language of hauntology. In particular, we place a greater emphasis on a forward-looking orientation. In other words, how the trauma and harm of the 'not yet' inspires imagination and acts as a force upon the present. We see the importance of looking to 'ghosts of the future'. These have gone somewhat under-examined within hauntologically-informed analyses. There is, perhaps, a reticence at engaging with the imaginative when it could be dismissed as spurious. However, weighing the debts to the future and their impact in the present can be hugely impactful for criminological study. Consider the debts and anticipated harms of a planned carceral expansion that in years to come will incarcerate individuals who – in the *now* – have not yet left grade school.

This is to reiterate Derrida's understanding of justice being inherently temporal. Debts are incurred in the past or accumulated for the future. In adapting this approach we must be mindful of Luckhurst's critique of approaches that see haunting as ubiquitous. Gordon's focus upon narrowly focused case studies is one possible answer. Yet, in order to access the 'secret of kept secrets' it is important to be open to the methods of disciplines

that have experienced their own spectral turns: psychoanalytic techniques; close textual analysis to reveal the phantom and crypt within beneath the text; ghost ethnographies to locate sedimentary traces of the past *and* future.

Three spectral strands of ghost criminology

To give shape to a project, the ectoplasmic tendrils of which could become unwieldy, we have narrowed our focus to three strands that attempt to engage with the spectral and hauntological within the criminological. Firstly, there are *apparitions and the (in)visible*. This is a means to capture the spectre that is at once visible and invisible. It is concerned with hidden history and the discipline's relationship with optical regimes that have rendered subjects ghostly and unseen, and/or forcibly pulled them from the shadows into an unwanted visibility. Secondly, we look to the *necrotic and (in)corporeal*. This examines phenomena hovering between presence and absence; they are returned, but changed. These are examples of failed mourning. Finally, we look to *dead and haunted spaces*. These are spatial analyses where time is experienced as 'out of joint', and where the lived experience of trauma collapses the rigidity of linear, causal time. Our goal with each strand is to use them to locate or conjure the spectre. Conjuring is not the end-point. 'Raising up', 'exorcising' or providing a 'proper burial' should be seen as means of achieving a Derridean sense of 'justice' – providing a requiem for the departed or yet to come. And recall that this is future oriented. We would echo Radway (2008: xiii): 'we must seek to revivify our collective capacity to imagine a future radically other to the one ideologically charted out already by the militarized, patriarchal capitalism that has thrived heretofore on the practice of social erasure'.

We should make clear here that there are evident overlaps between each of the three strands, as well as clear points of divergence. The ideas we present here should be imagined as being akin to looking through a kaleidoscope; there are thematic similarities, but they shift and move around in relation to one another. As we rotate the kaleidoscope, certain elements come more to the fore whilst others recede. With the apparition and (in)visible, the elements relating to the visual take prominence, but retain a hauntological

focus upon temporality. As we rotate the kaleidoscope, the core elements of ghost criminology are given greater or lesser prominence; be they the weirding of time, space and vision, presence and absence. Let us turn first to those forces, practices and acts associated with the (in)visible.

Strand 1: the (in)visible

If we can argue that the spectre is unmoored from time, we can also describe it as unmoored from sight. It hovers between visibility and invisibility. We encounter this aspect of spectrality in the social. There are individuals, groups or specific harms that may be 'ghosted' and removed from optical hierarchies and regimes. Or, they may elect to remove themselves from sight/site in order to preserve and protect themselves. There are hidden histories and redacted texts. There are spectral figures that look and whose gaze cannot be returned (what Derrida refers to as the 'visor effect'). As Schroer notes (2013: 219), by way of Deleuze, 'every strategy of visualization will inevitably also produce new ones of invisibility'. And spectres hover at the edges of these optical strategies. These differing levels of the (in)visible - of sight obscured or granted - prompt a sense of doubt. We are not sure what we see is there. Optical hierarchies that privilege the vision of some and diminish that of others can prompt a sense of failure: a failure to see or bear witness. Yet, these can be re-envisioned as 'political and ethical potentialities of seeing and appearing *differently*' (original emphasis, Hochberg, 2015: 163-4). Encounters with the spectre can generate new models or modes of seeing and visualization. This prompts the question - who has the power to see? As Haraway (1988, cited in Hochberg, 2015: 1) puts it, there is a 'violence implicit in our visualizing practices. *With whose blood were my eyes crafted?*' How then to see the (in)visible? What methods can be employed to trace phenomena that exist at the edge of sight/site and/or that are disappeared?

Criminologists have employed a range of methods to capture a spectre that hovers between visibility and invisibility. Biber's (2017; 2018) work, for example, has examined the black mark of redaction and the cultural afterlives of evidence. This has involved analyses of the haunting impact of evidence from trial of Lindy Chamberlain, as well as artistic acts of

destruction in exploring the work of Jason File, an artist and war crimes prosecutor. Bureaucratic acts of destruction can inadvertently give shape to what was to be concealed. Rév (2005: 1) describes the work of the historian in the archives of repressive states as a process of sifting through either outright fabrications or ‘trivializations of dramatic events’. The interventions of the secret services apply a distorting lens to the reporting or witnessing of events. Yet, this ‘subterranean perspective sheds light on the surface’ (ibid.: 3).

The work of visual artist Edmund Clark (2017) could be seen as an attempt to see carceral systems anew and engaging with the spectre within systems of representation. Some of the images that make up the piece titled *My Shadow’s Reflection* – created whilst Clark was artist-in-residence at HMP Grendon in the UK – were produced by providing both incarcerated men and staff pinhole cameras to capture self portraits. These blurry, monochromatic images provide a visual echo of Sir Francis Galton’s optical apparitions. Galton was Charles Darwin’s cousin and, in a prolific career, is perhaps now mostly associated with the eugenics movement. In the late nineteenth century, Galton utilized photographic composite portraiture to capture an image of the ‘criminal type’. The act of compositing mimicked the techniques of spirit photography to conjure an image to haunt the imagination. In Sekula’s (1986: 19) phrasing, this was a ‘purely optical apparition’. In addition, we might draw upon Sekula’s (1986: 16) understanding of the uses of photography in nineteenth century policing and the camera’s position with a ‘bureaucratic-clerical-statistical system of ‘intelligence’’. This places less importance on the photographic plate rather than upon the filing system into which it is assigned. As is also discussed by Rév (2005) and Biber (2018), this opens us to the concealing, obscuring and redacting processes of the archive. Galton’s composite portraiture, conjuring the optical apparition of the ‘criminal type’, was then a visible artefact of a shadow archive that delineated social hierarchy. The reductive ‘repressive logic’ of the photographic erased the individual, capturing a portrait that was then reduced to a social type and then further erased by the act of compositing (Smith and Sliwinski, 2017: 2).

Yet, where Galton’s images effaced the individuals within the composite, the self portraits in Clark’s (2017) work were used as prompts for self-reflection. If we think of the capacity for ghost criminology to effect a practical outcome or intervention, then we can see

how these responses fit into the categories of conjuring, exorcising and giving proper burial. The first response conjures a sense of self for the participant. The second exorcises that which is not them. The third gives proper burial by describing a process of transition.

There is nothing in this photograph to identify me as a prisoner. I'd like them to see the essence, the spirit, the warm energy inside me.

A faceless deviant offender who is part of people's nightmares. I'm devalued to the point where I don't deserve to be human. It makes me feel really angry looking at it.

It looks like a spirit waiting to cross over. It's old me fading away as the new me emerges here.

(Clark, 2017: 46)

As we saw earlier, McClanahan and Linnemann (2018), likewise, evoke spirit photography as a mean to capture what hovers between presence and absence. Similarly, Schept (2014, 203) puts forward an example of counter-visual ethnographic practice to capture 'what is not 'there''. This can illuminate ghost-like carceral sites: those that have been formed at the edge of visibility. So, for Schept a counter-visual ethnography seeks to examine what has been 'cropped out'. This prompts a series of questions that are hauntological in nature: '[w]hat came *before* it? What is it built on top of? [...] What comes *after* prisons?' (emphasis added, Schept, 2014, 211). An approach such as this that adapted spirit photography could explore a site 'out of joint'. It could reveal the past acting on and through the present, as well as offering a prompt to future structures or imagined alternatives.

A related means by which to creatively make visible the invisible and conjure the spectral can be seen in the work of the Forensic Architecture team at Goldsmiths, University of London. They seek to compile 'evidence assemblages' (Weizman, 2017: 58). Their diverse case studies have included: land dispossession in Nueva Colonia in Columbia from the 1960s

to the present; gold mining and violence in the Amazon rainforest from 2019; the enforced disappearance of the Ayotzinapa students in Iguala, Mexico in 2014. Echoing the technique of dialectic montage developed by Sergei Eisenstein and Walter Benjamin's dialectical image, the team construct an architectural image complex consisting of 'digital photographs, material ruins [and] human testimony' (Weizman, 2017: 58). The timelines of events, the juxtaposition of 'befores' and 'afters' reveal that meaning 'lies not in the images, but in the tension or discord between them' (Weizman, 2017: 98). Of note here is that this has the potential to crack open linear causal time, as well as offering the opportunity to 'see' the (in)visible effects of environmental harms and acts of slow violence, where injuries are inflicted outside the spectacular. This leads us to the (in)corporeal in ghost criminology.

Strand 2: The (in)corporeal

Raymond (2016: 75) makes the observation that there is a spectral dimension to geometry. That is, geometry 'describes in three-dimensional form what is not there but is projected'. Exploring spectrality in terms of the (in)visible allows us to also see how the forces that hover between presence and absence act as a force and project their influence. The next facet of ghost criminology, the necrotic and (in)corporeal, shifts our position in relation to this projection from an absent form: we see the figure of the undead come into focus. The undead is an (in)corporeal form that carries with it traces of the past/passed and future. There is something of a model for this in Mbembe's (2003) notion of necropolitics. If we take Foucault's (1976) conception of sovereign power as being centrally concerned with the right to kill, Mbembe extends this to consider a power to 'let die'. Using the slave plantation and Nazi concentration camps as illustrative examples, necropolitics considers the modalities of power that allow injury to occur to the subjugated body. To think of the slave within this formulation, Mbembe (2003) describes a triple loss of home, of rights over one's body, and of political status. This places the colonized body into a state of liminality between subjecthood and objecthood. It is not that individuals are to be put to death – although, of course, that continues to be an ever-present threat – rather, they are 'kept alive but in a state of injury' (Mbembe, 2003: 21). This creates 'death-worlds, new and unique forms of social existence in which vast populations are subjected to conditions of life

conferring upon them the status of the living dead' (original emphasis, Mbembe, 2003: 40). This conception of the undead – alive, but in a state of bare existence – is certainly adjacent to some of the discussions of spectrality outlined here. One avenue in which to explore the hauntological dimension of Mbembe's necropolitics would be to consider the notion of 'let die' within a framework of the temporally weird. For this, it is helpful to turn to the work of Gan et al (2017) and their understanding of 'ghosts of the Anthropocene'. The anthropocene is that period of geological time where humans can be said to have had a measurable ecological impact. The ecological harms associated with this period can transcend the typical human lifespan and extend beyond national borders. We might also consider how futures haunt the present. Nixon (2011: 96), for example, notes how some First Nations people in Australia would refer to white colonial settlers as 'future eaters': 'hollowing out time' by over consumption with no consideration for the consequences. In phrasing that echoes Brown's reading of future spectrality acting as a force on the present, and of utopias un-lived, Gan et al (2017: G2) argue that '[w]e are willing to turn things into rubble, destroy atmospheres, sell out companion species in exchange for dreamworlds of progress.' These are the anticipatory harms of death-worlds, of an ecology 'let die'. This is what Rose (2004, cited in Gan et al, 2017: G7) refers to as the 'double death'. Extinction in the present presages a death of the future. And so we come to be haunted by these ghosts of the Anthropocene.

We can also see the necrotic and haunting practice take shape in Robins' (2022) work on criminal 'necrowaste'. This explores the symbolic meaning attached to the bodies of the deceased and the ways in which the criminal body can remain 'toxic' in death. This criminal 'necrowaste' is a material embodiment of the past remaining active as a force in the present. Mourning is interrupted or fails because the label of criminal lives on. We can apply this lens to the burial at sea of Osama bin Laden in 2011 as an effort to diffuse the toxicity of the corporeal. By burying bin Laden at sea, the US state controlled and effectively eradicated a potentially problematic space and future, rendering bin Laden ungrievable, as Judith Butler might describe. There is, however, another dimension above and beyond grievability. Here it is useful to revisit Slavoj Žižek's resurrection of Jacques Lacan's two deaths. Clearly the military mission to kill bin Laden was meant to remove him from the world of the living—the Lacanian Real—and thus eradicate a biopolitical threat. Yet by

refusing to release the photos of his dead body and by denying him a publicly viewed burial and memorial gravesite, the US government effectively produced a second, symbolic death, working towards the goal of erasing bin Laden from the cultural register and symbolic order. We can say then, that the US state engaged in an exorcism of sorts, attempting to rid cultural and political space of a certain kind of ghost. This is particularly the case if we understand exorcism as extending from its original Greek, *ex* or “out of” and *horkizein* “cause to swear an oath”—then exorcism is first directed toward the symbolic, striking or “swearing” out, a particular understanding from the cultural record. Along with bin Laden’s physical and symbolic remains are exorcised the complicated histories of US empire, questions of blowback and the bloody circumstance of an endless worldwide war on terror. What lingers, where bin Laden is concerned, is a spectral bogeyman, a mediated villain to stand in by name or in effigy in films and television

Strand 3: Dead and haunted spaces

The disposal of bin Laden’s body at sea emphasises the importance of place when we consider the dead. This brings us to our third facet of ghost criminology: dead and haunted spaces. This is where time is experienced as ‘out of joint’. It traces how harms might ‘linger’ in place. Trauma can collapse or elongate time, pushing it ‘off its hinges’. This has been a central feature of work that we identify as being part of the discipline’s ‘spectral turn’.

A key early text within Criminology’s spectral turn, Linnemann’s (2015) article *Capote’s Ghosts* explored the ways in which violence lingers and sits in place. Focusing upon the Clutter family murders in 1959 that were subsequently captured in Truman Capote’s *In Cold Blood*, Linnemann examines their resonance across the Kansas landscape. As Linnemann (2015: 517) phrases it, ‘[t]o speak of ghosts then is to speak of the phenomenology of place.’ To access this is to convene with presences that are now absent and interrogate those forces that haunt the social imagination. There is something fundamentally uncanny about haunting. As Hetherington (2001: 25) concisely notes, ‘[t]o haunt is to remain where one does not belong’. Or, perhaps, to arrive before one is due. As

with the other strands outlined here, this piece poses the question of how to analyze the social in the absence of *living* people? How do we see who is not or no longer there (Ferrell, 2015)?

In response, Ferrell (2015; 2016a; 2021), whose work has been of foundational importance to the current writers and this project in particular, has described using a 'ghost method'. This is a 'serendipitous methodology attuned to aftermath and absence' (Ferrell, 2021: 60). It is a means of engaging with the traces and residues of the absent, as well as the affect within and of locations. It requires engagement with the material traces left behind in place before looking for the missing 'authors' of those locations. Kindynis (2019: 30) notes that to engage in a 'ghost ethnography' is to assume a 'sensibility over and above [...] any prescribed set of methodological practices'. Accessing these 'material traces and affective residues' necessitates an 'exploratory, situated, immersive, reflective, impressionistic and imaginative approach to the study of space and place' (ibid.).

Kindynis's (2019) own excavation of graffiti ghosts serves as a model of this approach as he embraced Ferrell's call for criminological *verstehen*, and of being open to the fluidity of both situation and method. This was achieved by entering transport tunnels beneath London and examining the traces of past lives and cultures by both looking at the old graffiti tags in those spaces, as well speaking with past artists. Within the discipline's spectral turn, we can identify other researchers who have explored either affective residues and/or material traces. Young (2019; 2021), for example, has examined affective atmospheres of city spaces. Atmospheres, Young (2019) suggests, reveal themselves when we move from one to another (from the street to the reception area of a commercial building) or when the atmosphere is punctured by an unexplored shift (when a fire alarm goes off, for example). Anderson (2009, cited in Young, 2019: 2) describes atmospheres as producing 'multiple, expressive and overlapping spatialities'. This might remind us of Blanco's understanding of haunting relating to a 'crisis of perception': 'what is there that I cannot see, but nevertheless sense is there' (Blanco, 2012: 25). As Blanco puts it, the act of haunting prompts a sense of doubt as the spectre disrupts a sense of reality. Perception itself becomes haunted. A focus upon atmospheres – utilizing a 'detailed and flexibly adaptive ethnography' - could allow us

to tune in to these absences and thereby capture a phenomenology of haunted space (Young, 2019: 768).

Campbell's work, similarly, provides us with a model of examining the material traces of a particular location that engages with 'what is now gone or never was' (Ferrell, 2016b: 227). An encounter with the past 'is always-already relational, and mobilized through imaginative practices of reconstruction' (Campbell, 2022: 167). Focusing upon 10 Rillington Place – a location in London and the site of multiple murders in the 1940s and 1950s – Campbell (2022: 167) describes how the act of dwelling that occurred there can be traced through: 'the material-cultural bricolage of library and archival records; true crime novels and biographies; newspaper coverage and trial transcripts; stage plays, film and television drama; personal correspondences and memoirs; court and museum exhibits; and photographic collections and repositories.' Drawing upon the work of Karen Barad (2007), Campbell provides a diffractive reading of these materials of 10 Rillington Place. Where we might ordinarily compare and contrast the items, 'where one serves as a fixed frame of reference', a diffractive approach involves reading these *through* one another (Barad, 2007, cited in Campbell, 2022, 167). This produces a 'discontinuous, relational space of encounter with practices of dwelling' (Campbell, 2022: 167). This is a means to more fully capture an encounter with a location that is out of joint and we see the traces of past violence in a manner more closely reflecting the hauntological approach set out in this article. The past, present *and* future traces of the location can be read diffracting through one another. By this we mean that the location is unfinished. The forces of the past and future can be read as operating upon the present. So, reading these texts through one another allow an understanding of the space of dwelling.

Where Campbell's work has resonances with the Derridean spectre, Fiddler's (2019) work is more attuned to Abraham and Torok's phantom. Utilising a psychoanalytically-informed approach, this sees the techniques of literary criticism – and the idea of 'texts in distress' – transposed to a location and the idea of a 'space in distress'. Here, Fiddler (2019) explored a site specific artwork in London's East End and unpacked it as a 'crypt' containing within it the incorporated phantom following the traumas that have occurred in and around that location over the preceding century. More recently, Fiddler (2022b) has applied an

hauntological lens to sift the spectral traces of Samuel Bentham – Jeremy’s brother – within the design of the panopticon. This positions the unbuilt prison as an example of a ‘phantom architecture’ that haunts the criminological imagination.

Each of these encounters with dead and haunted spaces offer examples of what Fisher (2014: 18) referred to as ‘broken time’. In that context, the analyses outlined here provide a framework for ‘the (re)connection of the past, through the present, with ‘lost futures’ (Kindynis, 2019: 39). They offer differing means of conjuring the spectre through imaginative, fluid, reflective method. Further, we might imagine drawing upon a combination of the approaches set out in the three strands here to provide a sense of resolution to a ‘space-in-distress’. A participatory research design could be used to draw upon local knowledge and, in collaboration with stakeholders, ‘call up and call out’ the residues and atmospheres that linger following violence in its varied forms. Such an approach could use the adapted spirit recordings or counter visual techniques we have outlined here to allow those collaborators in the research to ‘see’ what they feel is haunting them and their environment. To borrow Ferrell’s phrasing, such ‘street-side séances’ are an opportunity to heal spaces. By capturing and giving voice to the absent and silenced, they can give recognition and, in doing so, proper burial to a traumatic past that keeps returning. Further, dialectical images and montages can be used as prompts for participants to consider not only the constellation of connections between past and present, but they can open up a space of possible futures, Fisher’s ‘not yet’, the force of which may be felt in the present (Fiddler, 2022a).

The ‘haunting’ of ghost criminology

As we noted earlier, having established the three strands of ghost criminology, we must be mindful that this approach does not itself ‘ghost’ individuals, groups or concepts. Of note here is Saleh-Hanna’s (2008) unpacking of Derrida’s own troubling ghosting of colonialism and colonial practice. In this respect, we should note that our focus here has largely been of knowledges produced in the global North and of a conception of the spectre that is shaped in Western philosophy and critical thought. However, we have an opportunity

to embrace the decolonizing practices occurring within criminology. Our next task must be to reach out to authors of the global South to take on a hauntology that speaks to non-Western traditions of haunting. This is not to replicate colonising or appropriating practices (of the sort noted by Saleh-Hanna), but to provide space for such voices to be heard in the closed academic networks of the global North (*inter alia*. Carrington, Hogg and Sozzo, 2016). To give shape to this, it is helpful to turn to Lincoln and Lincoln's (2015) approach to a 'critical hauntology'. They provide a critique of Avery Gordon's work in *Ghostly Matters* that, in many respects, can be applied to our thinking as well. Their reading is that Gordon diminishes the importance of *the ghost* within the ghostly. You will recall that we dismiss the actual presence – as it were – of the ghost in the opening lines of this article. Rather, we have focused our analytical attention upon 'ghostly' signals, matters, and traces' (Lincoln and Lincoln, 2015: 195). This is to ignore '[g]hosts *qua* ghosts' (ibid.: 195). By doing so we fail to attend to 'individuals or social groups who experience haunting as something consistent with, and rooted in, their cosmology, ontology, and psychology...' (ibid.: 195). To recognize the 'ontological status' of the ghost is to respond to the lived experiences of those that encounter them. Lincoln and Lincoln (2015) argue for a separation between primary and secondary haunting. Primary haunting refers to the traumatic and traumatising encounter of a small number of individuals with such a ghost. This would lead to the living paying their debt to the dead by taking on and sharing the pain that has caused the dead to return. A secondary haunting is, in part, more akin to the analysis of the spectral outlined here. This attends to traumas at a broader scale. Within Lincoln and Lincoln's (2015: 210) framing, this is 'not with the hope of putting anyone to rest, but to mobilize a moral community to prevent such atrocities in the future.' We would argue that the project outlined here offers a more nuanced approach to dealing with the harms of the past, as well as considerations of the future's role in the present. That said, attending to 'the ghost' as an active social force could lead this project into challenging new avenues of inquiry.

Kwon (2008), similarly, focuses upon the role of the ghost *as* ghost in Vietnam and provides us with an example of a 'primary' haunting. These are ghostly encounters that flow through quotidian experience. The ghost is an 'ontological refugee'. They are truly *unheimlich*, being without home, at the wrong location and at the wrong time. As Kwon (2008: 35) details, one of the Vietnamese terms for body – *xac* – refers 'to [an] amalgam of

the body past and the body present'. The live body carries within it a spirit of the past. The living body presents those physical symptoms suffered by the dead that now possesses them. The passed walk within the living. To borrow an expression from Mark Fisher once more, this captures the 'time-wound' of death. To deal with spectrality is to acknowledge that our relationship with the past is unfinished. We need to reflect on this in our analysis; is ours a self-referential engagement with the past that continues to occlude the powerless and simply perpetuates colonial power structures? Does it dwell upon the 'time wound' without considering restorative processes that can be actioned in the present?

Requiem

In this piece we have explored the spectres inspiring criminology. They flow within the apparent 'spectral turn' that the discipline has taken. We have sought to narrow this nascent field from the somewhat nebulous use of a catch-all conceptual metaphor that finds haunting 'everywhere' and every when. In identifying three key strands of the (in)corporeal, (in)visible and haunted space, we aim to provide shape to its contours whilst remaining open to new ways of capturing phenomena that are experienced as 'out of joint'. In exploring collective memory, trauma, harms out of joint and out of place, we are taken towards the edges of the social sciences. We should look to incorporate 'non-western traditions yielding considerably different epistemological frameworks and critical possibilities' (Blanco and Peeren, 2003: 19).

Matless (2008) refers to the ways in which differing disciplines can 'graze' one another. This 'grazing' might provide moments of mutual nourishment or the contact might be abrasive and wound both parties. In short, we need to be mindful. One way is to heed Haraway's (1994) call to use the 'less-deadly versions' of tropes to understand the social world. Utilising the spectre as a conceptual metaphor can lead us down a path whereby we simply repeat the damaging practices of the past without effecting restitutive and rehabilitative change in the present. We need to be mindful of an 'endless 'dancing around a wound'' (Cameron, 2008: 389).

We envisage ghost criminology as being exploratory in its focus, with an emphasis placed upon imaginative engagement with the active presences of the past and future within the present. To be clear, this does not involve jettisoning rigor for oneiric flights of fancy. Rather, it is one that encourages us to 'graze' with and against spectrality in other disciplines and to explore alternative methodologies. As Vanolo and Pavoni (2022: 6) propose: '[o]bjective realism and linear historicism are dramatically unequipped to account for the fragmentation produced by the multiple spatialities and temporalities' experienced as the 'uncanny focus that past and future violence and desire exert over the here and now'. It provides a framework to examine the not yet, never was, might be and no longer.

We close, then, with a requiem. Why phrase it like that? It speaks, once more, to the importance of time and of remembering. A requiem seeks to ensure the repose of the dead. Having sought out ways to heed their voices, what steps are there to ensure a sense of peace for the departed? We can conjure, exorcise and ensure proper burial for the spectres haunting the discipline. And, in recognising that time is out of joint, begin to achieve justice.

References

- Abraham N. and Torok M. (1986), *The Wolf Man's Magic Word : A Cryptonymy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Abraham M., Torok M., and Rand N. T. (1994), *The Shell and the Kernel: Renewals of Psychoanalysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Agozino, B. (2004), 'Imperialism, crime and criminology: Towards the decolonisation of criminology', *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 41: 343–358.
- Armstrong, J. (2010), 'On the Possibility of Spectral Ethnography', *Cultural Studies* [Critical Methodologies](#), 10/3: 243--250.
- Ayres T. and Kerrigan D. (2020), 'The Gaols of Guyana: Hauntology and Trauma in the soundscape of Prison', *LIAS Working Paper Series*, 4. DOI: 10.29311/lwps.202143755
- Biber, K. (2018), 'Evidence in the Museum: Curating a Miscarriage of Justice', *Theoretical Criminology*, 22/4: 505--522.
- Biber K. (2019), *In Crime's Archive: The Cultural Afterlife of Evidence*. London: Routledge.
- Blanco, del Pilar M. (2012), *Ghost-Watching American Modernity: Haunting, Landscape, and the Hemispheric Imagination*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Blanco, M. del Pilar and Peeren, E. (2013), 'Introduction: Conceptualizing Spectralities', in M. del Pilar Blanco and E. Peeren, eds., *The Spectralities Reader: Ghosts and Haunting in Contemporary Cultural Theory*, pp.1--27, London: Bloomsbury.
- Blanco, M. del Pilar and Peeren, E. (2013), 'The Spectral Turn/Introduction', in M. del Pilar Blanco and E. Peeren, eds., *The Spectralities Reader: Ghosts and Haunting in Contemporary Cultural Theory*, pp.31--36, London: Bloomsbury.
- Brown, M. (2022), 'The Specter of White Supremacy: Fugitive Justice and the Dead Body of US Racialized Politics', in M. Fiddler, T. Kindynis, and T. Linnemann, eds. *Ghost Criminology*, pp.135--154, New York: New York University Press.
- Brown, W. (2001), *Politics Out of History*. Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Buse, P. and Stott, A. (1999), 'Introduction: A Future for Haunting', in P. Buse and A. Stott (eds) *Ghosts: Deconstruction, Psychoanalysis, History*, pp.1--20, Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Cameron, E. (2008), 'Indigenous Spectrality and the Politics of Postcolonial Ghost Stories', *cultural geographies*, 15: 383--393.

Campbell, E. (2022), 'Extreme Dwelling: Assembling Domus Horribilis', *Crime Media Culture*, 18/2: 163--182.

Carrington, K., Hogg, R., and Sozzo, M. (2016), 'Southern Criminology', *British Journal of Criminology*, 56/1: 1--20.

Castle, T. (1995), *The Female Thermometer: Eighteenth-century Culture and the Invention of the Uncanny. Ideologies of Desire*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Clark, E. (2017), *In Place of Hate*. Birmingham: Ikon Gallery.

Davis C. (2005), 'État Présent: Hauntology, Spectres and Phantoms', *French Studies*, LIX/3: 373--379.

Davis, C. (2007), *Haunted Subjects: Deconstruction, Psychoanalysis and the Return of the Dead*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Derrida, Jacques (1994), *Specters of Marx*. London: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1986), 'Foreword: Fors: The English words of Nicolas Abraham and Maria Torok,' translated by B. Johnson, in *The Wolf Man's Magic Word: A Cryptonymy*, pp. xi--xlvi, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ferrell, J. (2015), 'Looking for Unknown Others', The Other, International Cultural Criminology Conference, 25--26. June, Amsterdam, VU University Amsterdam.

Ferrell, J. (2016a), 'Ghost Ethnography: On Crimes against Reality and their Excavation', Public lecture, University of Hamburg.

Ferrell, J. (2016b), 'Postscript: Under the Slab', in M.H. Jacobsen and S. Walklate, eds., *Liquid Criminology: Doing Imaginative Criminological Research*, pp.221--229, London: Routledge,

Ferrell, J. (2021), 'Postcards from a Pandemic', *Crime Media Culture*, 17/1: 59--63.

Fiddler, M. (2019), 'Ghosts of other Stories: A Synthesis of Hauntology, Crime and Space,' *Crime Media Culture*, 15/3: 463--477.

Fiddler, M. (2022a), 'From Optograms to X-Rays: How to Conjure a Spectral Criminological Image', in M. Fiddler, T. Kindynis, and T. Linnemann, eds. *Ghost Criminology*, pp.110--131, New York: New York University Press.

Fiddler, M. (2022b), 'Phantom Architecture: Jeremy Bentham's Haunted and Haunting Panopticon. *Incarceration*, 3/2. <https://doi.org/10.1177/26326663221101571>.

Fiddler, M., Kindynis, T., and Linnemann, T. (eds) (2022), *Ghost Criminology*, New York: New York University Press.

- Fisher, M. (2014), *Ghosts of My Life: Writings on Depression, Hauntology and Lost Futures*. Winchester: Zero Books.
- Fletcher, J. (1996), 'Marx the uncanny? Ghosts and their relation to the mode of production: Spectres of Derrida Symposium', *Radical Philosophy* 075/Jan/Feb: 31--37.
- Foucault, M. (1991), *Discipline and Punish*. London: Penguin Books.
- Freccero, C. (2006), *Queer/Early/Modern*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Fukuyama, F. (1989), 'The End of History?' *National Interest*, 16/Summer: 3--18.
- Gan, E., Tsing, A., Swanson, H., and Bubandt, N. (2017), 'Introduction: Haunted Landscapes of the Anthropocene', in A. Tsing, H. Swanson, E. Gan and N. Bubandt, eds., *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet: Ghosts of the Anthropocene*, pp.G1--G14, London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gordon, A. F. (1997/2008), *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hetherington, K. (2001), Phantasmagoria/ Phantasm Agora: Materialities, Spatialities and Ghosts. *Space & Culture*, 11 & 12. Available on-line: <https://sites.ualberta.ca/~rshields/sc/11-12%20Spatial%20cd/24-41%20Hetherington.pdf>
- Hochberg, G. Z. (2015), *Visual Occupations: Violence and Visibility in a Conflict Zone*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hutchings, P. J. (2001), *The Criminal Specter in Law, Literature and Aesthetics: Incriminating Subjects*. London: Routledge.
- Huyssen, A. (2003), *Present Pasts: Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory*. Stanford University Press.
- Jay, M. (1998), *Cultural Semantics: Keywords of our Time*. University of Massachusetts Press.
- Kindynis, T. (2019), 'Excavating Ghosts: Urban Exploration as Graffiti Archaeology', *Crime Media Culture* 15/1: 25--45.
- Kwon, H. (2008), *Ghosts of War in Vietnam*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lincoln, M. and Lincoln, B. (2015), 'Toward a Critical Hauntology: Bare Afterlife and the Ghosts of Ba Chúc', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 57/1: 191--220.
- Linnemann, T. (2015), 'Capote's Ghosts: Violence, Media and the Spectre of Suspicion', *British Journal of Criminology*, 55: 514--533.

- Luckhurst, R. (1999), "Something Tremendous, Something Elemental': On the Ghostly Origins of Psychoanalysis', in P. Buse and A. Stott, eds., *Ghosts: Deconstruction, Psychoanalysis, History*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, pp.50--71.
- Luckhurst R. (2002), 'The Contemporary London Gothic and the Limits of the 'Spectral Turn'', *Textual Practice*, 16/3" 527--546.
- Maddern, J.F. and Adey, P. (2008), 'Editorial: Spectro-Geographies', *cultural geographies*, 15: 291--295.
- Marx, K. (1951), *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*. (trans. Daniel De Leon). New York: Labor News.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1848), *Communist Manifesto*. 1st ed. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Marx, K. and Engel, F. (1964), *The German Ideology*. Moscow: Progress.
- Mbembé, A. (2003), 'Necropolitics', *Public Culture*, 15/1: 11--40.
- McClanahan, B. and Linnemann, T. (2018), 'Darkness on the Edge of Town: Visual Criminology and the 'Black Sites' of the Rural', *Deviant Behavior*, 39/4: 512--524.
- Murray, A. (2012), "This Light was Pale and Ghostly': Stewart Home, Horror and the Gothic Destruction of 'London'', in L. Phillips and A. Witchard, eds., *London Gothic: Place, Space and the Gothic Imagination*, pp.65--79, London: Continuum.
- Nixon, R. (2011), *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Picart, C. and Greek, C. (2007), 'Introduction: Toward a Gothic Criminology', in C. Picart and C. Greek, eds., *Monsters in and Among Us: Toward a Gothic Criminology*, pp.11--43, Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Rabaté, J. (1996), *The Ghosts of Modernity*. Gainesville, University Press of Florida.
- Rafter, N. and Ystehede, P. (2010), 'Here Be Dragons: Lombroso and the Gothic, and Social Control', in M. Deflem, eds., *Popular Culture, Crime and Social Control*, pp.263--284. Bingley: Emerald Publishing.
- Rand, N. (1994), 'Secrets and Posterity: The Theory of the Transgenerational Phantom', in N. Abraham, and M. Torok, *The Shell and the Kernel*. N. Rand (trans.), pp.165-169, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Raymond, C. (2016), *Francesca Woodman's Dark Gaze: The Diazotypes and other Late Works*. London: Routledge.

- Rév, I. (2005), *Retroactive Justice: Prehistory of Post-Communism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Robins, D. (2022), '(Dis)posing of 'Toxic Necro-Waste': Managing Unwanted Ghosts', in M. Fiddler, T. Kindynis, and T. Linnemann, eds. *Ghost Criminology*, pp.135--154, New York: New York University Press.
- Saleh-Hanna, V. (2015), Black Feminist Hauntology: Rememory The Ghosts of Abolition, Penal Field, XII. <https://doi.org/10.4000/champpenal.9168>
- Schept, J. (2014), '(Un)seeing like a Prison: Counter-visual Ethnography of the Carceral State', *Theoretical Criminology*, 18/2: 198--223.
- Schroer, M. (2013), 'Visual Culture and the Fight for Visibility', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 44/2: 206--228
- Sekula, A. (1986), 'The Body and the Archive', *October*, 39: 3--64.
- Sharpe, C. (2016), *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Smith, S.M. and Sliwinski, S. (2017), 'Introduction' in S.M.Smith and S.Sliwinski, eds., *Photography and the Optical Unconscious*, 1--31. London, UK: Duke University Press.
- Thomas, K. (1971), *Religion and the Decline of Magic*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Vanolo, A. and Pavoni, A. (2022), 'Editorial,' *Lo Squaderno*, 62: 6--8.
- Weizman, E. (2017), *Forensic Architecture: Violence at the Threshold of Detectability*. New York: Zone Books.
- Young, A. (2019), 'Japanese Atmospheres of Criminal Justice', *British Journal of Criminology*, 59/4: 765--779.
- Young, A. (2021), 'The Limits of the City: Atmospheres of Lockdown', *British Journal of Criminology* 61: 985--1004.