

UCL Migration Research Unit

This paper may be downloaded for personal research purposes. However any additional reproduction for other purposes, in hard copy or electronically, requires the consent of the author(s). If cited or quoted, reference should be made to the full name of the author(s), the title, the working paper series, the year and the UCL Migration Research Unit as publisher.

This paper was originally submitted as a dissertation in completion of the requirements for the degree Masters in Global Migration. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of UCL's Migration Research Unit.

© 2014 Bhupinder Kaur Mann

UCL Migration Research Unit
UCL Department of Geography
University College London
26 Bedford Way
London WC1H 0AP

www.geog.ucl.ac.uk/mru

UCL Migration Research Unit Working Papers

No. 2015/3

Reflections on the Carceral Geographies of Detention Centres:

A Visitor's Perspective

Bhupinder Kaur Mann



**Reflections on the Carceral Geographies of Detention Centres:
A Visitor's Perspective**

Bhupinder Kaur Mann

Supervisor: Claire Dwyer

This research dissertation is submitted for the MSc in Global Migration at
University College London

2014

Abstract

Visitors can provide an enriching insight into administrative detention and the wider immigration context in the UK. Owing to the difficulties in accessing detainees in detention for research purposes, it is important to open avenues wherever possible. For this reason, the following dissertation aims to ‘incorporate the experiences and motivations of detention centre visitors into the wider theories of carceral geographies’. For the purpose of this dissertation, carceral geographies provided a theoretical framework to capture the experiences of volunteers who visit an institutional environment. Documenting the experiences of visitors will facilitate academic discussion regarding how scholars can conceptualise spaces of detention through thinking *emotionally*. To assess the emotional geographies invested in visiting, the following dissertation is based on empirical data gathered from sixteen semi-structured interviews and an auto-ethnography.

What is analysed below is the ‘emotionality of visitation’. Visitors vividly described intense emotions including feelings of surrender and powerlessness upon entering detention. This was largely the result of the prison-like environment of detention centres and the strategies of control performed by security staff. These strategies were also implicit in the experiences of the visiting room. Nonetheless, the visiting room was a liminal space, which presented opportunities of transformation for detainees who were able to regain some autonomy to their carceral experience. It was found that the entire visiting experience was a voluntary practice, which produced an intense emotional relationship between a detainee and visitor.

Visiting was an opportunity to perform one’s ordinary ethics. Participants were aware of wider historical and geographical relationships, which they felt conferred a degree of responsibility towards strangers. For visitors, this awareness questioned the legitimacy of administrative detention and this, in turn, provided the justification to extend their motivations of care towards detainees. Participants described feeling informed as a result of the visiting experience and in a position to raise awareness of administrative detention among the general public. Thus, I argue that visiting is an act of political resistance against government detention policy, which represents the power of ordinary ethics coupled with the capacity to care for unfamiliar others.

Word number: 14,998

Acknowledgments

I would like to take the opportunity to thank all the wonderful visitors who contributed to this research project. I would like to thank them further for trusting me with their stories and their words and emotions. I hope I have done justice to them. Each one of you does an amazing service and it was inspiring to hear your accounts of volunteering. I would like to say a big thank you to Claire Dwyer for her encouragement with both my Plan A and Plan B research projects. Claire's patience and encouragement, while I asked my many questions throughout this research journey, was always appreciated. I would also like to thank Nicola who took the time to read through my dissertation and provide feedback. Finally, I wish to thank my family and friends, particularly my mum and Paula for their unrelenting support, encouragement and laughs every morning on the way to the train station.

List of Contents

Abbreviations	5
Chapter 1: Introduction	6
Chapter 2: Literature Review	9
2.1 Carceral Geographies	9
2.2 Emotional Geographies	11
2.3 The Emotionality of Visitation	14
2.4 Geographies of Responsibility	16
Chapter 3: Methodology	21
3.1 Interviews	21
3.2 Ethics & Positionality	23
3.3 Auto-Ethnography	25
3.4 Analysis	26
Chapter 4: The Emotionality of Visitation	27
4.1 Going to Visit	27
4.2 The Visiting Room	30
4.3 Beyond the Detention Centre	40
4.4 Conclusion	43
Chapter 5: Geographies of Responsibility	45
5.1 Motivations	45
5.2 Thinking through Responsibility	48
5.3 Political Outlook	52
5.4 Conclusion	56
Chapter 6: Conclusion	58
References	61
Appendix 1: Interview Schedule	70

Acronyms

FNPs	Foreign National Prisoners
GDWG	Gatwick Detainee Welfare Group
IRCs	Immigration Removal Centres
MHDVG	Morton Hall Detainee Visitor Group
MHM	Morton Hall Management
MASGs	Migrant and Asylum Support Groups

Chapter 1: Introduction

A detention centre visitor is often the only reliable source of emotional and practical support for a detainee. As a non-official figure, independent from the immigration system, the visitor stands in lieu of a detainee's family and friends (McGinley 2011). I am a detention centre visitor with Morton Hall Detainee Visitor Group (MHDVG). Morton Hall, a newly established Immigration Removal Centre (IRC), opened in 2011 after decades of use as a women's prison. The relationship between MHDVG and Morton Hall management (MHM) can be described, at best, as strained. It is my experience as a volunteer, as well as my relationship with MHM that has made me ask what it means to be a visitor at a time when the institution of administrative detention has become an unquestioned part of the immigration landscape in the UK.

Morton Hall IRC is part of an expanding detention estate within the UK and an integral component of a wider context of deportation. 'Crimmigration' or the criminalisation of immigration law (Stumpf 2006) was largely enforced under the reign of the Labour government (1997-2010) (Aliverti 2012). The Labour government set a precedent, stating that the administrative detention of foreign nationals is a practice 'ancillary to immigration control' (Wilsher 2004:897). Successive UK governments have since argued that detention is 'an essential, everyday facet of immigration control' and a 'regrettable but necessary' measure (Silverman 2012:1132).

Administrative detention is defined formally as a non-punitive and a non-criminal measure of control (Leerkes & Broeders 2010). Silverman & Hajela (2012:3) state the UK has the largest detention estate in the Europe with 11 dedicated long-term immigration-holding facilities and a detention capacity of 3,500 places. For the year 2013, the Home Office (2014) documented 30,036 people had entered the detention estate under Immigration Act regulations (excluding Foreign National Prisoners). This is a 5 percent increase from the previous year. Tyler et al (2014) argue that private companies, which are contracted by the government to manage detention centres, make the administrative detention of foreign nationals a lucrative business. Detention centres can only maximise their profits when operating at full capacity.

To be detained in a UK detention centre is to be incarcerated within a ‘secure prison-like [facility] with [...] radically curtailed freedoms of communications with the outside world’ (Tyler et al 2014:8). Furthermore, UK Immigration Acts have authorised the indefinite administrative detention of foreign nationals. This has had serious repercussions for the lives of detainees (see London Detainee Support Group 2009; Gatwick Detainees Welfare Group 2012). Among the difficulties in accessing detainees inside detention for research purposes are barriers to gaining permission from appropriate bodies (Hasselberg 2013). The little research that has been conducted documents the ‘corrosive’ and detrimental impacts to mental health and physical wellbeing of detainees (Silverman & Massa 2012:677; see also Robjant et al 2009; Bosworth & Kellezi 2012). Accordingly, the role of the detention centre visitor fundamentally takes shape at a time when the detainee is trapped within the complexity of immigration bureaucracy and the seemingly endless experiences of waiting, isolation and loneliness (Griffiths 2013a).

As all participants who contributed to the dissertation are aware, I had initially planned to examine the everyday experiences of detainees. However, after following the appropriate channels to gain permission from MHM, I was not given authorisation to interview detainees¹. Having not acquired access, I needed to rethink how I could still concentrate on detention centres without compromising the relationship between myself, as a member of MHDVG, and MHM. Thus, I decided to utilise my position as a visitor to highlight the experiences of detention centres, not from the perspective of detainees but rather from that of someone who voluntarily enters detention centres and witnesses first-hand the detrimental effect of incarceration.

The experiences with MHM led me to ask whether other visitors also felt an estranged relationship with detention centre management. I have been fortunate to talk with many other detention centre visitors and informally hear their experiences of detention centres. It soon became apparent that these experiences of visiting have yet to be empirically investigated. As a result, my dissertation aims ‘to incorporate the experiences and motivations of detention

¹ Author’s diary entry (21/02/2014). This extract details the meeting I attended with MHM, along with another visitor (discussed further in Chapter 5). I described my frustration towards the Governor who refused to listen to my project and who said, “all projects had to, as of last week, be submitted straight to the Home Office”. After several email exchanges with the Governor, no final decision was made in regards to the project.

centre visitors into the wider theories of carceral geographies'². To meet this aim, I have set three objectives:

1. Document the nature and experience of detention centre visitors,
2. Examine the emotional geographies invested in detention centres and;
3. Explore how geographies of responsibility encapsulate the voluntary practice of visiting.

To focus the project I have established several research questions, which theoretically engage with current scholarship surrounding carceral and emotional geographies. The purpose of the research questions is to provide an innovative approach to capture visitors' experiences within detention centres, whilst allowing an analytical reflection on theoretical literature. The research questions are:

1. What is the experience of visiting within detention centres and to what extent can the theory of 'liminality' reflect this experience?
2. What are the motivations behind visiting and how does the experience of visiting inform a volunteer's political outlook?
3. How might the experience of visiting change and broaden our thinking about detention centres and carceral spaces?

Owing to the relatively little research on detention centres that has been conducted in academic and non-academic circles, it is important to open avenues of research wherever it is possible. Documenting the experiences of visitors will facilitate academic discussion regarding how scholars can conceptualise spaces of detention through thinking *emotionally*. This project will highlight the vital but under-researched role that visitors have in shaping the experiences of detainees. Including this introduction, the dissertation is organised into six chapters. The next chapter explores relevant literature, which will provide a theoretical framework to structure the research. Chapter 3 discusses the methodologies chosen, including reflections on my positionality throughout the research journey. The analysis is split into two chapters to appropriately convey the experiences of visitors. Chapter 4 draws upon the emotions invested in visiting within detention centres and Chapter 5 questions to what extent this emotionality is informed by, and continually defines, our geographies of responsibility. Finally, Chapter 6 will conclude by drawing together key themes from empirical data, the limitations of fieldwork and explores opportunities for future research.

² The term 'carceral' and 'carceral geographies' will be further explained in Chapter 2.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The literature review briefly covers four main themes. Firstly, the theory of carceral geography is outlined and it is argued that this expanding scholarship should incorporate the use of detention centres, which is an increasing scar on the UK carceral landscape. Secondly, the theory of emotional geographies will be outlined in order to provide a framework which questions the underlying assumptions of emotionality within carceral spaces. This leads neatly towards the research surrounding visitors to incarcerated individuals, which has primarily focused on the transformative potential of visiting for the reduction of recidivism. The final section questions at what point strangers become responsible for each other and whether this can lead to political activism among volunteers. This will be conceptualised using the theory of geographies of responsibility.

2.1 Carceral Geographies

Gregory et al (2009:64) state that ‘spaces in which individuals are confined, subjected to surveillance or otherwise deprived of essential freedoms can be termed as ‘carceral’’. Carceral spaces are purposefully ‘set aside for ‘securing’ – detaining, locking up/away – problematic populations of one kind or another’ (Philo 2012:4). Moran (2013a:5) has argued carceral geography provides an innovative academic space to appreciate how incarceration can be conceptualised and critiqued on various scales; from the embodied nature and experience of confinement, to the punitive state and wider society.

Essentially current research on carceral geographies (see Moran 2013a; 2014; Crewe et al 2013) critiques Goffman’s (1961:1) interpretation of the ‘total institution’, which he uses to define the prison:

A place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life.

Fundamentally, Goffman reduces the prison space to an ‘isolated world’ (Baer & Ravneberg 2008:205). According to Goffman, incarceration ‘depersonalizes’ the prisoner, erasing their

relations with the outside world (Farrington 1992:14). Farrington (1992:13) however, identified a multiplicity of relations between penal spaces and wider society and suggests Goffman provides an inaccurate interpretation. Prisons, he argues, have ‘points of interpenetration’ (7) with the immediate host community and thus carceral spaces, he asserts, are rather ‘not-so-total’ institutions (7). Baer & Ravneberg (2008) are similarly critical of Goffman’s binary distinction between the inside and outside of penal spaces and suggest the boundaries that constitute confinement are porous. Confinement, they argue is ‘a captured state of betweenness’ (207) and no space can be subject to absolute impermeability. Prison walls are permeable to the exchanges between ‘material things’, such as people and belongings, and non-material or ‘intangible things’, for example emotional attachments and ideas (Moran 2014:37).

A state’s ‘carceral architecture’ is designed to spatially and temporally govern different flows of mobility (Michalon 2013:42). Pallot et al (2009:701) argue that prisons are not

...simply institutions which (cor)respond to crime, rather they are reflective of and mediate social, political, and cultural values, both at the level of the carceral state, and at the level of the individual prison.

Pallot et al’s typology, I argue, should incorporate the production of detention centres, which are also highly reflective of social and political values, albeit within an immigration context. Gill et al (2013:1) recognise carceral geography is based on a crude separation between the incarceration of ‘criminals for custodial sentences’ and administrative detention. Administrative detention is *formally* a ‘non-punitive’ measure, as it does not require a criminal conviction (Leerkes & Broeders 2010:831). However, for the purpose of this dissertation, I agree with Martin & Mitchelson (2009:459) who assert, the intention of incarceration is to ‘hold human beings without consent by other human beings’. Thus detention, like mainstream imprisonment, is the purposeful restriction of ‘space and time so that individual mobility is highly constrained’ (460).

Gill et al (2013) argue that the boundaries, which demarcate mainstream prisons from migrant detention have become increasingly blurred; subject to similar regimes of surveillance and the processes of privatisation, in addition to the experiences of the incarcerated being inherently alike. However, a stark difference remains between such carceral spaces. It is argued that the

purpose of mainstream imprisonment is rehabilitation and discipline in order to create an “ideal” citizen upon release (Foucault 1991). While detention centres may have similar carceral functions, the purpose of administrative detention is solely to facilitate removal from the UK (Bosworth 2011).

For the purpose of this research, carceral geography will provide a conceptual framework to recognise the experiences within detention centres, which I argue are inevitably part of a wider carceral landscape. A conceptual strength of carceral geography is the flexibility to incorporate wider theoretical concepts (Moran 2013a). Appreciating that carceral spaces are intrinsically permeable to material and non-material interrelations, I plan to incorporate emotional geographies in order to reflect the nature and experience of social actors who undoubtedly define, and are defined by, carceral spaces.

2.2 Emotional Geographies

Davidson et al (2005:1) pointedly argue ‘emotions matter’. Geographically, emotions are an important articulation of ‘events that ‘take-place-in’ [...] the real world’ (Smith et al 2009:2). Emotional geographies conceptualise the spatiality and temporality of ‘emotional life’ (Thien 2011:309) and question to what extent emotions constitute our lived experiences. Damasio (1999:35) describes the importance of emotion as:

Without exception men and women of all ages [...] are mindful of the emotions of others, cultivate pastimes that manipulate their emotions, and govern their lives in no small part by the pursuit of one’s emotions...

To argue that humans are mindful of others, Damasio identifies the investment of emotions within social relations (also see Thien 2005). Anderson & Smith (2001:7) identify the ‘power of emotional relations’ whereby relations ‘flow’ between people. Consequently, this relational exchange determines one’s own emotions (Bondi 2005:443; Bennett 2009). According to Massey (1993:66), place represents an ‘articulated moment [within] networks of social relations’. Accordingly place, as a ‘thrown-togetherness’ (Massey 2002:294) of material and non-material relations, is recognised as, ‘spaces people have made meaningful’ (Cresswell 2004:7). Therefore social relations, which are imperative to place-making practices represent a myriad of meanings and, I argue, emotions. Damasio’s (1999) extract also acknowledges

time or pastime, as constitutive of emotion. Like place, emotions are not ‘neutral’, but are rather embedded within a historicity of relations (Crang & Thrift 2000). Emotions are dependent upon the negotiations of one’s ‘past geographies’ and memories (Jones 2005:6) and thus, emotions come to be subjective accounts of ‘being in the world’ (Hubbard 2005:121).

Damasio (1999:36) distinguishes between emotion and feeling and argues that emotions are the public reflection of a private ‘feeling’. Feelings are reflexive of the human conscious and unconscious (Jones 2005) and thus, emotions reveal something embodied. Dyer (2011:348) describes ‘embodied life as [an] active process, constituted by and constitutive of social relations’. The body, and similarly emotions, are porous and constantly exposed to what is on the ‘outside’ (Davidson et al 2005:7). Essentially, I argue in this dissertation that emotions reflect the vulnerability of the body to the “relational”³. However, the body is not a passive recipient of outside forces, but rather a space which must continually negotiate between resistance and conformity (Dyer 2011). By examining this ‘(inter)corporeal exchange’ with the surrounding world (Hubbard 2005:121), emotional geography can question how emotions are ‘felt’ and formulated (Fenton et al 2012:41).

Pile (2010) offers a critical account of emotional geographies, warning of an ‘ever-expanding shopping list of expressed emotions’ (17). By privileging the ‘expressed emotional experience’ and assuming people are ‘honest and genuine’ (8), Pile argues emotional geography has failed. He questions to what extent emotional geographies can adequately reflect the complexity of “emotion”. Instead Pile explores affective geographies, which recognises the capacity of material and non-material relations to determine the ability of the body to act. Affect is the ‘transpersonal capacity which a body has to be affected (through an affection) and to affect (as a result of modifications)’ (Anderson 2006:735). Thus, the body holds an affective capacity, which is manipulated by relational encounters between other bodies. These encounters control the emotions experienced by one’s body. Therefore, affective geographies recognise humans are determined by transpersonal experiences arising as a result of (inter)relations. However, Thien (2005) suggests affective geographies threaten to marginalise “emotion” from research. Instead, Moran (2013a:19-20) argues emotional geographies offers several theoretical strengths; the recognition of the dynamics within social

³ Concerning both material and non-material relations.

relations; the extent to which social actors feel spaces of incarceration, and how social actors 'engage with each other [within carceral] spaces'.

Emotions have been examined within carceral spaces with the intention of exposing prisons as anything but a 'monolithic capsule of space and time' (McWatters 2013:127). Sykes (1958:63) and his depiction of the 'pains of imprisonment', underpins much of the scholarship surrounding the experience of prison (Crewe 2007, 2011; Moran 2013b). The pain of imprisonment includes the loss of liberty, which comprises of 'civil death' - a consequence of lost emotional relationships; the deprivation of goods, autonomy and security and finally the 'frustration of sexual desire' (Liebling & Maruna 2005:5). Crewe (2011:509) depicts the pain of imprisonment as the feelings of 'tightness' among inmates (522). He argues that the experience of incarceration produces a 'gripping' sensation in inmates (524), which represents their emotions of pain, uncertainty and insecurity. Jewkes (2005) describes the pains of imprisonment by utilising the concept of liminality⁴ to appreciate the experiences of inmates undergoing life sentences. Jewkes (2005:367) argues it is owing to the abundant temporality of 'indeterminate confinement' that life-sentences are not experienced as transitional, but rather a 'near-permanent liminal state'.

The depictions of the pains of imprisonment have also been studied within detention centres, predominantly referring to the prospect of indefinite detention (see Griffiths 2013a; 2013b). What is clear from current research on detention centres is the alignment with wider research on mainstream imprisonment, whereby the detainee, like the prisoner, is stripped of their agency. This is best exemplified in the work of Gill (2009) and the involuntary movements of detainees across the UK detention estate. Thus, the detention centre represents a space of State excesses and power. However, as I will demonstrate in the following section, the incorporation of emotional geographies into research on detention centres will critique this assumption of powerlessness among the incarcerated.

⁴ Liminal, which translated from Latin means limen or threshold, describes the spaces and experiences of 'betweenness' and 'indistinction' (Moran 2013a:15). Liminality is an important tool to analyse the spatialities and temporalities which are undergoing transition, and aims to incorporate the social actors engaged within such time-spaces.

2.3 The Emotionality of Visitation

The experience of visiting within spaces of incarceration has been primarily researched in reference to visitation and the extent this reduces recidivism of post-sentence prisoners (Mears et al 2012; Moran 2013a). Visiting is inherently transformative in nature, encouraging the good behaviour of inmates. Berg & Hubner (2011) argue the maintenance of familial and social networks provides emotional support for prisoners in a space, which is otherwise depicted as emotionally vacant (Crewe 2011). This has led Moran (2013a; 2013b) to argue, visitation cultivates a liminal state for prisoners, blurring the binary between the inside and outside of carceral spaces. Incorporating liminality into the experience of visiting, particularly acknowledging material and non-material interrelations illustrates how the inmate is able to “connect” to the outside. In reference to visiting in administrative detention, there has been no academic research conducted into the experiences of detainees. For this reason, the dissertation has had to refer specifically to penal scholarship.

Penal scholarship has called for the nuanced appreciation to the ‘dynamics of visitation’ (Moran 2013a:11; Bales & Mears 2008). Jewkes (2005) argues the whole experience of visiting cultivates a state of liminality. She asserts:

Passage through the liminal environment signifies uncertainty, vulnerability, chaos and danger because customary rules are upturned and normal codes of activity or behaviour are suspended. (375)

This extract, I argue, exemplifies why the experiences of family members and social networks should also be included within carceral geographies. Although under-researched, the pain and experience associated with imprisonment are argued to extend beyond the experiences of the prisoner, to their social network (Light 1993; Murray 2005; Codd 2007). This has been described as ‘secondary prisonization’ (Comfort 2003:78) or the ‘secondary effects of imprisonment’ (Breen 2010:46). As a result, penal space is defined as a ‘domestic satellite’ (Comfort 2002:470), which regulates a prisoner’s social network according to penal ‘time, resources, behaviour and emotions’ (Breen 2010:50). Comfort (2003), when researching San Quentin prison, found the corridor leading into the visiting room was a transitional, liminal space where the visitor must negotiate their outside and “free” identity into a ‘carceral character’ (98), in order to meet the demands of the penal regime. Comfort labelled visitors

‘quasi-inmates’ (103) to reflect their transitional experience from outside to inside penal space.

Feminist scholarship has largely developed the theorisation of the embodiment of emotions. By questioning the dominant assumptions of time-space, feminist scholarship acknowledges how bodily inscriptions, such as gender, come to define one’s ‘emotional management’ and experience (Hubbard 2005:122). Ultimately feminist geography aims to expose repressed emotions and uncover what cultivates such emotions within certain spaces and between certain relations (Longhurst 2005a). While Longhurst (2005b:247) has argued feminist geography assumes a ‘mutually constitutive relationship’ between bodies and space, Comfort’s (2003) findings indicate the experience of visitors within penal space is not a mutual relationship. Inherently, Comfort’s participants experienced a ‘gendered effect’ of incarceration (Moran 2014:47). For example, often arbitrary dress-codes were enforced in order to regulate the ‘sexually provocative’ bodies of female visitors (Comfort 2003:96).

Investigating the visiting experience further, Moran (2013a) states the visiting room is an under-researched space, which offers invaluable insight into the experience of incarceration for both inmates and visitors. She argues:

The actual spaces of visiting are intensely significant both for the nature of contact and intimacy which can take place, and for the ways in which the spaces themselves are socially constructed and reconstructed by those who occupy them. (16)

Crewe et al (2013:14) describe the ‘emotional landscape of the visits room’, as a space where an inmate’s outside life enters prison. The visiting room was an appropriate space, where inmates were able to show feelings of compassion and affection. Muedeking (1992) describes how the inmate is able to perform an ‘inauthentic image of himself’, which transgresses from the ‘authentic’ image of the convict (230). Consequently, the visits were found to be ‘emotionally uplifting’ (231) for inmates and an opportunity to reclaim autonomy and transform some part of their carceral experience. This critiques the image of the incarcerated as a powerless subject in their experience of prison. For the visit to be “emotionally uplifting” represents the permeability of prison space to material and non-material relations, which in turn, determine the emotions experienced by inmates and their visitors. As a result, Moran

(2013a:15) argues both the physical space of the visiting room and the experience of visiting are liminal and hold the possibility of temporary transformation and transition.

For the purpose of this dissertation, I argue there are limitations within penal scholarship surrounding visiting, which ought to be addressed. Visitation literature predominately refers to family visits and hence, the emotional experiences invested in visiting will undoubtedly differ from that of volunteers. The visiting room, although described as a barren space (Hall 2007), shares intimate emotions for many partners. Kotarba's (1979:90) ethnographic work describes the exchanges and performances between 'intimate visitors', for example wanting to share pictures, to talk intimately and desire to create a private sphere within a "public" space. For the intimate visitor, the visit represented an embodied and personal experience. This was contrasted against the 'casual' visitor who Kotarba (1979:97-98) describes as someone that

...utilise[s] the kinds of body language that would be normal for any two friends conversing. As a group, they require a minimum of personal space and often sit so far away [...] that they barely see the prisoner [...] They speak openly because they rarely deal with topics that require much intimacy.

Accordingly I suggest, when reflecting academically on the emotional experience of visiting, this will undoubtedly differ between volunteers and family members. For this reason, in the final section I refer to literature surrounding motivations to care and our geographies of responsibility towards "unfamiliar others". By referring to this literature, I want to correct the absence of the visiting volunteer in penal scholarship.

2.4 Geographies of Responsibility

Geographers have recognised that material and non-material (inter)relations produce responsibilities (specifically Massey 2004; Lawson 2007). Massey (2004) argues a world that is increasingly embedded within the 'relational' has a responsibility which extends beyond what is perceived as local or 'fully accountable' (Darling 2010:126). Darling (2010:126) defines responsibility as the 'negotiations that are sensitive to, and informed by, both the interconnections and the specificities of place'. These negotiations are on-going and part of a process of 'responsivity' (135) that asserts humans must recognise and respond to the consequences of social relations. This is exemplified by Young (2004:372) who argues:

I share responsibility with the many others who also contribute by their actions to the processes that connect us. Just because I cannot disentangle my particular actions from the complex process in which some people are made particularly vulnerable [...] I have a relation of responsibility to the process itself.

Young highlights how our relations may not specifically be seen, nor are they local in proximity, but are rather constitutive of a wider interconnectedness, which owing to uneven power relations has disadvantaged some people. For the purpose of this dissertation I suggest that recognising social relations and taking responsibility inevitably relates to the literature of geographies of care. Care, like emotion, is embedded within all social relations and encounter (Lawson 2007). Conradson (2003:508) defines care as the ‘movement towards another person in a way that has potential to facilitate or promote their well-being’. In this dissertation, the concept of care will adopt Smith’s (1998:16) interpretation, which focuses on ‘beneficence’ as the activity of ‘doing good or showing active kindness’.

Responsibility encourages an attentiveness and responsiveness ‘to our own location within circuits of power’ (Lawson 2007:6). This effectively implies that one’s boundaries of care-giving should negotiate notions of scale, for example the family unit and geographical proximity (Conradson 2011). Tronto (1993:101) calls for a rethink of our ‘moral boundaries’ of care, to extend beyond the remit of the familiar, such as what is “near”, and ultimately care for the stranger. Similarly Pogge (2006:135), although writing from the perspective of health equity, argues responsibility derives from ‘relational factors’, whereby the relationship between A and B must be non-exploitative and mutually constitutive. Thus, taking responsibility accounts for and challenges adverse relations.

Thinking critically on the provision of care has led Lawson (2007:1) to question to what extent ‘our ethical responsibilities to care’ exist and inform one’s understanding of the world. Lawson (2007:1) encourages the concept of “care ethics”, which adopted from Tronto (1993:127), comprises four values of ‘attentiveness, responsibility, competence, and responsiveness’. To practice care ethics would establish relational networks of ‘interdependence and mutuality’ (Lawson 2007:1). Care ethics aim to tackle inequalities, which have resulted as a consequence of ‘historical and institutional relationships’ (3) and consequently, meet the demand for care. By utilising Massey’s (2004) *Geographies of Responsibility*, Lawson identifies the necessity to establish a “care ethics” framework, which

ought to be expanded towards unfamiliar or ‘distant others’ (2007:6), rather than simply mediated through the “familiar”, for example the community unit.

Tronto (1993:126) argues care is morally appealing as both a societal and personal responsibility and, in a similar vein, Smith (1998) suggests the engagement with “unfamiliar others” produces a positive collective social life. For this reason I argue extending care beyond the immediate can be exemplified in the practice of volunteering. From the perspective of geographies of responsibility, it is important to understand the initial motivations of volunteering and the on-going desire to sustain voluntary practices. Clary et al (1998) question why in relation to a stranger, an individual seeks to invest their social, emotional and economic capital through volunteering. To explain the motivation of care towards unfamiliar others, Schervish & Havens (2002) utilise Identification Theory. They argue:

....voluntary assistance derives from identification, identification derives from encounter, encounter derives from relationship, and relationship derives from participation. (50)

Schervish & Havens (2002) recognise human identification develops from the first interrelations with the family and then the expansion outwards into the community. This consequently strengthens one’s attentiveness and receptiveness towards the needs of others. The motivation of care is for ‘those we view as part of us, like us, or like those we love’ and this identification of similarity produces responsibility (50). Schervish & Havens (2002:64) further suggest motivations of care are underpinned by a “moral citizenship”, which is informed by one’s values and driven by the wider demand for care.

Conradson (2003:512) argues the performance of volunteering cultivates relational ‘spaces of care’; a ‘therapeutic environment’ which offers emotional support, active listening and ‘empathic warmth’. As a result of encounters with strangers, Cloke et al (2007:1094) found volunteering within spaces of care has a transformative potential, whereby a volunteer’s initial identification changes into ‘more complex forms’. Similarly, Conradson (2011:454) suggests care has a ‘transformative ethic’, which impacts positively upon our social relations and the lived spaces in which the practice of care manifests. To care is both an ‘embodied practice’ and a personality trait (454-455).

There has been no research which examines the motivations and experiences of detention centres visitors. Thus, the literature review must return to the scarce penal scholarship available, which examines voluntary visiting within prisons. Tewksbury & Dabney (2004), when attempting to establish satisfaction among prison volunteers, found private citizens were strongly motivated by religious values (also see Chui & Cheng 2013) and a desire to help prisoners rehabilitate. Bales (1996:212) suggests participation in voluntary work reflects a ‘social activism’ attitude among volunteers. For this reason, I argue social activism and encountering the “unfamiliar other” can cultivate emotions conducive to political activism.

Chatterton & Heynen (2011) argue all resistances and collective social action initiate from social relations and the desire to oppose the dominant system. Specifically, they emphasise the importance of the ‘banal’, ‘non-emancipating and less spectacular forms of resistance’ in political activism (511), as a means to connect to the ‘ordinary citizen’ (515). Conlon et al (2014), when exposing the everyday resistances of Migrant and Asylum Support Groups (MASGs), found many actions did ‘not explicitly challeng[e] the underlying systems and structures that shape migration enforcement’ (379). Instead, MASGs have utilised ‘tactics’ in order to support migrants as well as to undermine government immigration policy (379). This is resonant of Cohen’s (2003:213) ‘resistance from below’, which he uses to describe political activism against the deportation regime and argues it is the individual campaigning efforts that feed into a wider ‘culture of resistance’ (223).

Tyler (2013), when examining the political resistances of what society defines as ‘revolting subjects’, argues British citizenship is a mechanism utilised to ‘abjectify’ sub-populations (14). According to Tyler, to become abject describes the process by which society imagines a group as unworthy and places them outside the juridical protection of British citizenship. However, she argues that the revolting can in turn revolt and resist the abject label. For example, there has been a proliferation of immigrant protests and political movements by both migrants, who are otherwise defined as abject, and pro-migrant supporters. Tyler suggests the accumulation of resistive acts builds a ‘community of struggle that questions the inclusive/exclusive logic of citizenship’ (102; also see Ellerman 2010).

The literature review has outlined the scholarship surrounding carceral and emotional geographies. Utilising such literature, I argue, will provide a strong framework to answer the research questions and to recognise and theorise the myriad of emotions invested within

spaces of detention. Engaging with the little literature available on visiting within prison primarily documents the experiences of inmates. The relational exchanges during a visit foster an emotional transformation among inmates, which suggests that visiting produces a liminal experience. However, the pain and experience associated with imprisonment also define the experiences of the visitor. I have argued that the nature and the experiences of voluntary detention centre visitors are absent from penal scholarship. Looking back at the research questions, I assert visitors can provide a unique reflection of how detention centres are *felt* and importantly, such empirical research will critique the assumption that carceral spaces are emotionally vacant. Furthermore, I suggest that utilising the literature of geographies of responsibility will academically frame why volunteers choose to visit detainees and support someone who is ultimately a stranger. The next chapter discusses the methodologies chosen in order to empirically investigate the research objectives set.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Qualitative research provides a methodological framework to understand the ‘meaning people attribute’ to their social world (Bryman 2012:399). For this reason I argue it was the nature of the project of attempting to expose the emotions and experiences of visiting that justifies the utilisation of qualitative methodologies. The methodology adopted an *emotionalist* approach, which fosters the ‘intimate contact’ between researcher and participant (Gubrium & Holstein 1997 cited in Silverman 2006:57). Emotionalism stems from the understanding that individuals ‘actively construct their social worlds’ (Silverman 2006:118), which cannot be ‘observed or accommodated’ through quantitative methods (Byrne 2004:182).

The following chapter firstly outlines the interview method selected. Secondly, I acknowledge my ethical responsibilities towards the participants involved, as well as my positionality within the project. I then outline the auto-ethnographic methodology chosen, where I argue such a method embraces my positionality and allows me to think reflexively about my role as a researcher and as a detention centre visitor. The final section outlines the analytical framework chosen to structure the research findings.

3.1 Interviews

Empirical data was primarily gathered from sixteen in-depth, semi-structured interviews. As the experiences of visitors have not previously been investigated, interviewing provided the ‘basic mode of inquiry’ (Seidman 1998:2). By not assuming a predetermined knowledge of the social world under investigation, semi-structured interviews challenge the hierarchal relationship that is characteristic of quantitative methods (Longhurst 2010). I acknowledge the individuals who were interviewed as ‘participants’ to capture their ‘active involvement’ within the research process (Seidman 1998:8)⁵. Interviews were a ‘co-production’ between the participants and myself (Wengraf 2001:3) and therefore, I was an ‘active participant’ in the construction of insight (Holstein & Gubrium 2006:152). Accordingly, the interview style I adopted incorporated open-ended questions to create opportunities for the participant to ‘reflect’ on *their* experiences (Bryman 2012:402).

⁵ Throughout the analysis chapters I use the words ‘participant’ and ‘visitor’ interchangeably.

However, Holstein & Gubrium (2006) warn against romanticising the empirical data produced, and in a similar vein, Silverman (2006:57) suggests qualitative interviews run the risk of privileging ‘emotion’. Byrne (2004) argues an interview can only provide a representation of an experience, not a fact. However, for the purpose of this dissertation, I assert that interviews provide an interpretation of truth as recognised by participants and it is this *subjective* insight I wish to explore. Silverman (2006) also argues control over the interview remains with the researcher, that is, I decided which points ought to be followed up. As a result, there is concern over the validity of empirical findings, where qualitative research cannot be replicated and tested (Bryson 2012).

Nonetheless, it was found that a key strength of semi-structured interviews was that it facilitated the study of diverse and complex social phenomena (Dunn 2010). Interviews were beneficial in that they were flexible to discussion topics and often presented issues that were outside of the interview schedule. I encouraged interviews to veer into tangents, which provided a better understanding into the participant’s social world (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree 2006) and led to the positive outcome of unique ‘thick descriptions’ (Bryman 2012:402).

I designed an interview schedule (Appendix 1) which accommodated a loose format and a pilot study was conducted to test the effectiveness of questions and the interview structure. Interviews were conducted from mid-May to mid-July and ranged from 54 minutes to 2 hours in length. Two of the interviews were conducted with couples, however the participants will be studied separately, as I assert the emotional experiences of visiting are inherently personal. All interviews were recorded using an audio-recorder to encourage a ‘natural conversational’ style (Dunn 2010:119). I also kept an interview diary, where I documented key points and noted potential emerging themes.

I sent a recruitment email to the co-ordinators of MHDVG and Gatwick Detainee Welfare Group (GDWG), which was then emailed to all visitors. In reference to sampling, I placed no restrictions on the length of visiting, which varied between three months to twenty years and all participants were visitors to all-male detention centres. Referring to Table 1, twelve out of the sixteen participants were female, which is an indication of wider gender imbalances of the

total population of detention centre volunteers⁶. I met participants at a place convenient for them and most interviews were conducted in cafés.

Visitor Name	Length of Visiting	Visitor Group
Samuel	3 years	GDWG
Alice	20 years	Asylum Welcome
Bunty	3 years	MHDVG
Ramsey	3 years	MHDVG
Bally	9 months	MHDVG
Evie	3 months	MHDVG
Charlie	3 years	MHDVG
Lawie	1 year	MHDVG
Lily Grant	3 years	GDWG
Sarah	6 months	MHDVG
Serin Davies	15 years	GDWG
Mary	3.5 years	GDWG
Freddy	10 months	GDWG
Hugh	18 years	GDWG
Karma	18 months	GDWG
Marie	2.5 years	GDWG

Table 3.1: Interview Participants

3.2 Ethics & Positionality

I followed the ethical principles documented by Diener & Crandall (1978 cited in Bryman 2012:135), specifically to ensure informed consent was made available and no harm came to participants as a result of their involvement. An Information Sheet was available to all participants in the recruitment email and a copy was provided before each interview commenced. Additionally, I gave each participant an Informed Consent Form, which disclosed the purpose of the research and stated participation was voluntary. Owing to the nature of some of the questions, particularly concerning possible political activism, and the need to not be identifiable by detention centre management, I ensured all participants were anonymised⁷. Finally, as a measure of good practice, each participant will receive a copy of the dissertation.

Birch & Miller (2000) suggest qualitative interviews cultivate an ‘intimate sphere’ (189), facilitating a ‘therapeutic encounter’ (190) between participant and researcher. The interview provides an opportunity for participants to ‘reflect on, reorder and give new meanings to past

⁶ This was mentioned during interviews with Lily (06/06/2014) and Samuel (13/05/2014).

⁷ Each visitor’s name is a pseudonym to protect his or her anonymity.

[and] difficult experiences'. This, I felt, was the case for many of my participants who commented positively on the interview experience. However, I had a responsibility to ensure participants were not negatively impacted from their involvement. Thus, I conducted interviews using an 'ethics of care' framework, which appreciates the relationship between participant and researcher as having 'genuine rapport, honesty, and emotional closeness, while recognising the potential abuses of power' (Hewitt 2007:115). Consequently, I ensured all participants were aware of the nature of the interview before commencing; acknowledging some parts of the interview may evoke upsetting experiences. I was able to gauge when the interview became "too heavy" and I asked participants whether they would like to stop.

Working with emotions inevitably produces ethical concerns over the research methodology. Hubbard et al (2001) argue, when investigating "emotion", the researcher becomes vulnerable to 'emotional relations' with participants (127). For example, strong rapport risks 'over-empathising' with participants (129). Bondi (2005:236) argues adopting methodologies that cultivate intimate and 'interpersonal interactions', unquestionably conjures certain emotions and this should be acknowledged throughout the research. Working from an 'ethics of care' framework encouraged me think reflexively of my position and my emotions and ensured I acted morally, to the benefit of participants. To be reflexive is to be self-aware of one's own biases, values, relationship with others and importantly, one's role in the construction of knowledge (Bryson 2012).

Being a visitor, and having similar attitudes towards the immigration system as many of the participants impacted how they responded to me. This is referred to as 'insider research', which recognises researchers who are members of the population they wish to study (Dwyer & Buckle 2009:58). An "insider" position allows easier accessibility to participants, who may welcome and trust the researcher and the project, than if one was an "outsider". Similarly, I found many of the female participants discussed their gender as a determinant of their visiting experience and this led me to question whether female visitors would have disclosed as much detail had I been a male researcher. Dwyer & Buckle (2009:58) are wary of the "insider position", where they suggest participants *assume* a level of understanding with the researcher and may not explain their 'individual experience fully' as they would have done for an "outsider". I found I needed to negotiate this insider–outsider binary (Hopkins 2007), where I label the 'outsider' position as my role as a researcher. This negotiation motivated me to include an auto-ethnographic piece to acknowledge and reflect upon my position as a visitor.

3.3 Auto-Ethnography

For the purpose of this dissertation, which desires to capture the personal and embodied emotions associated with visiting, I felt it was unfair if I did not include my own narrative. This research was informed by my experiences of visiting Morton Hall IRC and the desire to learn about the experiences of others. I accepted I was ‘more than just the researcher’ (Smith 2005:70), but someone who could relate to participants. Auto-ethnography, I argue, captures my positionality as an ‘insider’ (Smith 2005:68). One of the strengths of auto-ethnography is its ability to bring awareness to the researcher’s body (Spry 2001) and their multiple positionalities, which inevitably influence research (Madge 1993). Thus, I questioned to what extent my identity influenced my experiences as a visitor, namely being a young female, who is British-Indian.

Auto-ethnography ‘accommodates subjectivity, emotionality, and the researcher’s influence on research’ (Ellis et al 2011:274). Whilst conducting auto-ethnography, Ellis et al (2011) recognise the researcher as implicated within a network of (inter)relations, which carries a responsibility towards ‘relational ethics’ (281). Relational ethics ensures the researcher questions the purpose of their study and importantly, what are the potential consequences for the participants involved. For example, it is my responsibility to protect the confidentiality and anonymity of participants or individuals I encountered as a visitor (such as my relations with detainees, Morton Hall staff, and other visitors).

Referring back to penal scholarship, Jewkes (2011; also see Ugelvik 2014) is critical of prison researchers who resist auto-ethnography, arguing that methodologically it has the potential to expose the emotions invested within penal spaces. As described in Chapter 2, carceral spaces are emotive climates and upon entering prisons researchers embody these emotions. Thus, emotion becomes an implicit component in the knowledge production of the researcher. To expose the emotional complexity within carceral spaces is therefore an important motivation and strength for utilising auto-ethnography.

However, Delamont (2009) provides a critical account of auto-ethnography. Based solely upon the experiences of the researcher rather than an investigation of the social world, Delamont (2009:60) asserts, the method prevents an analytical reflection. Thus, the auto-ethnographic method is described as ‘antithetical’ to social research (60). For this reason, the

analysis chapters are centred on the data collected from interviews and my auto-ethnographic work is designed to complement empirical data and acknowledge my position as a visitor.

3.4 Analysis

Interviews were transcribed as verbatim texts. The transcription process formed the 'initial analysis' stage (Kvale 2007:94), where I was able to interpret emerging themes. In the analysis chapters, interviews were quoted verbatim, except when edited for the purpose of readability, in order to ensure participant narratives remained intact (Bryman 2012).

To start analysis, I established a coding system which followed a Thematic Analysis approach. As Bryman (2012) asserts, a limitation of conducting research within a qualitative framework is the subjective nature of the researcher and the lack of transparency in regards to how the analysis has been developed. To tackle this problem, Thematic Analysis identifies repeated patterns within empirical data (which includes the interview diary, transcripts and auto-ethnographic work), in order to develop codes into themes (Liamputtong 2013). Codes were based on either specific experiences, for example relationships with security guards, or the use of key words or phrases, such as the descriptions of claustrophobia. I produced a colour-coded mind map outlining themes and sub-themes. Following Cope's (2010) two-tiered coding system, I firstly coded each transcript according to theme and secondly, provided an analytical reflection in the margins. By manually coding and repeatedly returning to the transcripts, I became familiar with themes and the personalities of participants.

The following two chapters are designed to capture of the emotions invested within the visiting practice, whilst critically engaging with the literature presented in Chapter 2 and beyond. Chapter 4 specifically examines the different stages of, what I have labelled as the 'emotionality of visiting'. Chapter 5, entitled 'geographies of responsibility', examines how visitors perceive their relationship with detainees, which examines themes surrounding responsibility and motivations to care. I would like to note that the following chapters of analysis capture a small sample of the empirical data actually gathered from participant interviews.

Chapter 4: The Emotionality of Visitation

'I just called it a prison, didn't I? Yeah. It is a prison.' (Freddy, 01/07/2014).

I have entitled this chapter 'emotionality of visitation' to capture the powerful experiences expressed by participants. What is examined is an act which volunteers *feel* emotionally, far beyond the visiting room. Documented below are the experiences of 'going to visit', being in 'the visiting room' and 'beyond the detention centre'. I sought these three themes to fully embrace the nature and experience of visiting someone in detention.

4.1 Going to Visit

This section describes visiting from the entrance of the detention centre up to the visiting room. All participants made a reference to the "prison-like" environment of detention centres. This was mentioned in relation to physical architecture and the anticipation of detention centres to be like prison:

I've been to prison before [...] and I was told to expect all [of those] descriptions. [...] So for me it was like reliving the experience of the prison, where they lock every door behind you. They just walk with you with a bunch of a hundred keys [and] so in a sense it wasn't much of a shock. But it was still a shock to notice this was a detention centre, with this barbed wire. [...] That I thought was really excessive, because not even in the prison I saw that. (Sarah, 11/06/2014).

You know I have never been in a prison before. [...] It was [a] very sort of sterile, hostile environment to enter. (Freddy, 01/07/2014).

Figure 4. 1

Many participants *felt* the prison environment was shocking and to uncover why such emotions were felt, I refer to the literature of "affective atmospheres". The term "atmosphere" represents a space constituted by the impersonal and transpersonal '*intensities*' between bodies (Anderson 2009:78, emphasis added). Affective atmosphere is a subjective account, which constitutes the capacity of each body to understand the space they occupy. To be subjective, the body is both 'self-aware' and receptive of 'being in an environment' (Böhme 1993:120).

Affective atmospheres have the potential to ‘facilitate and restrict particular practices and [...] precipitate particular structures of feeling’ (Bissell 2010:272). Thus, atmosphere determines the body’s emotional capacity to ‘affect and be affected’ (278) within a certain time-space. This is exemplified by the acute self-awareness of one’s surroundings. Architectural design for instance, conjured feelings of intimidation and claustrophobia among visitors⁸. Figure 4.2 illustrates a picture of Morton Hall IRC, where visitors pointedly noted the barbed wire, which was associated with prison⁹.



Figure 4. 2. Entrance to Morton Hall IRC. Source: Photograph by Joe Bream, cited in Morris J (2013) ‘Reflections on Applied Research in Immigration Detention’, (WWW), Oxford: Border Criminologies (<http://bordercriminologies.law.ox.ac.uk/detention-applied-research/#comments>; accessed 20/08/2014).

Physical architecture is implicit within relations of control. Adey (2008) argues architecture can be engineered in order to contour the ‘capacities for the corporeal body to move and be *moved*’ (438). For example, security purposively restricts the possibilities of movement and transgression, where one can only move forward. This strategy of controlling movement was consciously recognised by participants, for example the locking of every door¹⁰. Bunty describes this controlling of movement as a ‘feeling of lack of control’. Utilising the literature on liminality, I argue each door represents a threshold and departure from one’s “outside”

⁸ Interviews with Bunty (22/05/2014); Lily Grant (06/06/2014).

⁹ Interviews with Evie (01/06/2014); Sarah (11/06/2014).

¹⁰ Interviews with Mary (01/07/2014); Ramsey (22/05/2014); Sarah (11/06/2014); Lily Grant (06/06/2014). Author’s diary extract (24/08/2013) documented the linear, undeviating movement through security.

character into a ‘carceral character’ (Comfort 2003:98), to leave one feeling ‘relatively bare’¹¹. Doors signify the ‘betweenness’ of the inside and outside of detention (Moran 2013a:15) and a temporary loss of one’s autonomous “outside” character. Hugh describes the security process as the ‘surrender of oneself into the system’, which captures how visitors experience a myriad of emotions when going through security, including a sense of powerlessness and anxiousness. Architecture cultivates and reflects power relations and the feelings of surrender exemplify how the carceral environment comes to be embodied.

A visitor’s ability to ‘move through’ security (Rodaway 1994:41), I argue is an innately haptic experience. Haptic geographies are a subset of the sensuous geographies each individual possesses (Rodaway 1994:41). It constitutes the bodily capacity to touch and be touched. In this sense, the haptic system is the reciprocal relationship between body and environment and is the primary tool to cultivate an ‘emotional bond’ to a given time-space (44). The anticipation of security and the indifference of this carceral environment produces a heightened haptic sensory. For example, Charlie describes the change in atmosphere when going through the main gate as ‘you feel it gets more austere and you feel like [...] you’re alone amongst all your enemies’¹². The feelings of uneasiness when surrounded by her ‘enemies’ illustrate Charlie’s recognition of uneven power relations with staff and the sense of hostility described in Figure 4.1.

Interestingly, Bally recognises how she has become ‘desensitised’ to the atmosphere of the detention centre and similarly, Ramsey describes his surprise that he ‘got use to [...] all these locks’. This illustrates how the body is able to build rhythm, familiarity and become accustomed to an institutionalised climate. To become ‘desensitised’ could infer a method of ‘emotional management’ in order to cope with the prison environment (Hubbard 2005:122). However, appreciating Lefebvre’s (2004) theory of “rhythmanalysis”, assumes rhythm is not always eurhythmic or harmonic, but can be vulnerable to episodes of arrhythmia. The experiences of going through security represent a ‘passage through the liminal environment’ where ordinary rules are suspended (Jewkes 2005:375). This, I argue, creates an environment conducive to arrhythmia, for example there was consensus among participants to feelings of frustration, when referring to the often arbitrary and inconsistent nature of security rules¹³.

¹¹ Interview with Buntly (22/05/2014).

¹² Buntly (22/05/2014) also recognises the change in atmosphere when entering the main gate.

¹³ Interviews with Freddy (01/07/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014); Mary (01/07/2014); Marie (12/07/2014); Sarah (11/06/2014). Lawie (04/06/2014) specifically provides the example of inconsistent dress-code rules.

The disturbances of rhythm owing to the changing nature of security practices, relate to De Certeau's (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. De Certeau's work describes the complex relationship between strategies, as a tool of the powerful to maintain control, and tactics, as practices of resistance against the powerful. Volunteers have been subject to strategies of control, which govern the ability to provide emotional and practical support to detainees. Most participants, for example, referenced the tensions with staff when wanting to take pen and paper into the visiting room and described the frustration when rules changed week-on-week¹⁴. Mary states 'the bureaucracy of visiting is huge [...] I find the job worthless[ness] irritating'¹⁵. The transpersonal relationship between visitors and staff foster a 'deprivation of autonomy, which engenders feelings of powerlessness' among visitors (Comfort 2003:102). Participants felt that 'you never win, you just give up and go in, because you can always stop yourself going in if you want, [it's] not difficult'¹⁶. Visitors desired good relations with staff, finding it unproductive to argue over security practices¹⁷. To not visit is the ultimate sanction for visitors and is a strategy of control which governs "appropriate" conduct.

4.2 The Visiting Room

Visitors commonly described the visiting room as a space of powerlessness and helplessness¹⁸. Feelings of apprehension and nervousness were still profound after years of volunteering¹⁹. This I argue is partly owing to the visiting room upholding an intense atmosphere. Figure 4.3 describes the physical space of the visiting room:

¹⁴Ramsey (22/05/2014) complained to MHM regarding the inconsistency of the "pen and paper rule". Finally, MHM formally permitted MHDVG to take in paper material, which Ramsey describes as his 'only victory'.

¹⁵Mary (01/07/2014) took in Maths material to help teach a detainee during visits. After several weeks of being able to take this in, it was then denied. The reason was because the material was not blank paper and the result was Mary could no longer teach her detainee.

¹⁶Interview with Hugh (03/07/2014).

¹⁷Interviews with Bally (01/06/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014); Samuel (13/05/2014).

¹⁸Interviews with Bally (01/06/2014); Lawie (04/06/2014); Charlie (03/06/2014).

¹⁹Interviews with Hugh (03/07/2014); Charlie (03/06/2014); Bunty (22/05/2014).

I think it [is] quite oppressive really. It [has] very small windows and it's quite dark in there [...] It's not a particularly pleasant atmosphere [...] they have this system where you have to sit [on] the opposite side of the table to [detainees]. It's very regimented. [...] There is nothing really there. It's very bare, very dark and you know [there is] just so much emotion in that room. [...] It's really hard to explain. It's just a very, *very intense atmosphere sometimes*. (Marie, 12/07/2014; emphasis added).

It is a very dark space. [...] And like the positioning of the chairs, [...] there are three chairs for visitors and one chair for detainees. [...] It's a bit weird that the detainee has to sit in the one chair and you have this almost protection of these other two chairs. [...] I think there is a real conscious effort to *stamp exclusion and difference on people's bodies*. You got the separating of chairs, you got the wearing of a visitor wrist band, a lanyard wrapped around your neck. [...] This kind of visible separation and when you try and cross that boundary and sit in another seat then um they won't accept that at all. (Freddy, 01/07/2014; emphasis added).

Figure 4. 3

The affective atmosphere of the visiting room fosters intense feelings. Marie associates the dark space of the visiting room with feelings of oppression and this is only worsened by the lack of windows, creating a closed and claustrophobic environment²⁰. Figures 4.4 and 4.5, taken from Friend's (2007) *Border Country*, provide illustrations of visiting rooms within IRCs. The pictures below reflect spaces subject to intense carceral and institutional control upon both the detainee and the visitor.

²⁰ Marie (12/07/2014), Freddy (01/07/2014) and Hugh (03/07/2014) all similarly described the visiting room in Brook House IRC.



Figure 4. 4. 'The Visits Room, Haslar IRC'. Source: Friend M (2007) *Border Country*, Belfast Exposed Photography and The Winchester Gallery, P.39.



Figure 4. 5. 'The Visitors' Room, Tinsley House IRC'. Source: Friend M (2007) *Border Country*, Belfast Exposed Photography and The Winchester Gallery, P.29.

The pictures illustrate a ‘bare’ environment²¹, which produces a hostile space that is alien and intimidating for both the detainee and visitor. Moran (2013a:16) argues the visiting room is symbolic of the social constructions of those who occupy it. Figures 4.4 and 4.5 reflect a space which actively cultivates a ‘distinction between [the] detainee and visitor’²². The lone chair exemplifies how the detainee body is moulded into a product of institutionalisation (Hancock & Jewkes 2011) and this regimented control of chairs fosters emotions of deprivation for detainees. Spatial control monitors social interaction and intimacy with visitors, who are forced to sit across a table. Visitors were aware of such implicit guises of exclusion (Figure 4.3)²³ and both the detainee and visitor embody this physical and social boundary.

The spatial layout of the room is a representation of power relations. This is exemplified in Figure 4.6²⁴:

It was clear [detainee name] felt uncomfortable – he was reluctant to talk. He sat at the edge of the chair and then he beckoned me forward – he said he knew the men sitting around us. They were on the same ward as him and he didn’t want to talk near them. [Detainee name] then asked if we could move. The tables to the right were all free. So we moved to the furthest table, away from everyone else. Not two minutes had passed when an officer came up and told us we had to move back – that we were assigned a seat and not allowed to move. [Detainee name] was ready to argue, but I said that we should move back and it was best not to get into trouble. (Author’s diary extract, 18/02/2014).

Figure 4. 6

I argue the experiences of spatial control relate to the work of Sibley (1995) in *Geographies of Exclusion*. The spatial regulation of the visiting room is an illustrative method of social control. The detainee is defined as abject, which intrinsically is an embodiment of exclusion. If appreciating that ‘all micro-forms of discipline are functional to a larger system’ is true (Walzer 1986 cited in Sibley 1995:82), then the regulation of the visiting room is a reflection of society and wider exclusionary social boundaries. The performance of exclusion is an active production of social control and adherence to differential power relations. However, social control is not confined to the detainee - visitors have described asking staff for

²¹ Described in Figure 4.3.

²² Interview with Samuel (13/05/2014). Samuel also described feeling as if he was ‘staring the detainee down’ as a result of seating regulations. Charlie stated that Morton Hall IRC originally designated a hard-seated red chair for detainees, while visitors had a soft blue chair.

²³ Freddy (01/07/2014).

²⁴ Hugh (03/07/2014), Freddy (01/07/2014), Marie (12/07/2014) and Charlie (03/06/2014) all described similar instances of being told to move by staff members after sitting in the “wrong” seat.

permission to visit the toilet²⁵ or for a pen and paper²⁶. Bally says being witness to and a recipient of uneven power relations provides a ‘little insight of how the detainees must feel. [...] You can’t just get up and go’. Below Hugh reflects upon his 18 years of visiting experience:

It used to be a detention centre, now it is more [like a] prison. You know if you move the chair in the visits room, you think ‘what does it matter if I move the chair six inches this way or that way’. But I mean some guards will come up to you and tell you to move it back again and you think ‘you are just being petty-minded’ and you want to say that, but you bite your tongue and say ‘yes’. [...] I don’t understand how people cannot see the impact of what’s happening in front of them to people who are detained for whatever reason. And then be so insistent on such small regulations! [...] I am not saying that there shouldn’t be rules, but I hate, hate the pettiness of it! (Hugh, 03/07/2014).

Figure 4. 7

Hugh’s narrative, particularly having to ‘bite your tongue’, relates back to his sentiments of surrender and ultimately to feelings of powerlessness against these strategies of control. All participants felt spatial regulations were a hindrance to the visit, and strategies conjured feelings of frustration, particularly as it was felt regulations were ‘a classic example of rules for the sake of rules’ and had no merit²⁷.

The majority of participants were female and gender was found to be a major influence in their experience of visiting. Female visitors were wary of the potential for misinterpretation of the purpose of having a visitor²⁸. Charlie described her wariness of a ‘flirtatious dynamic’, which she explained was a concern of an attraction to the visitor or vice versa. There is an assumption that the visiting room is a heterosexual space and moreover, a space vulnerable to the hetero-patriarchal “gaze” of detainees (McDowell 1995)²⁹. I was always aware of a hetero-patriarchal gaze, particularly as I am ‘prospective wife material for some of the guys’, as Charlie states, referring to my Indian identity. Amin³⁰, who I had visited for several weeks, confessed that he was attracted to me³¹. This posed a dilemma as I was unsure whether it was

²⁵ Interview with Bally (01/06/2014).

²⁶ Interview with Ramsey (22/05/2014).

²⁷ Similarly expressed by Mary (01/07/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014); Freddy (01/07/2014) and Ramsey (22/05/2014).

²⁸ Interview with Bally (01/06/2014).

²⁹ McDowell (1995) describes the spaces and social relations that are vulnerable to hetero-patriarchal control and consequently, ascribe women to a ‘heterosexual image’ of femininity (78). Spaces are maintained by an ‘inspecting gaze’ (Foucault 1980:155), which disciplines the body to perform according to the social norms for a given time-space (McDowell 1995:78).

³⁰ Amin is a pseudonym to protect the detainee’s anonymity.

³¹ Author’s diary entry (09/03/2014).

ethical to resume visiting him, but I was also aware MHDVG had a waiting list, which meant Amin was not likely to receive a visit. I chose to continue visiting³², but ensured he was aware that my role remained as a visitor, offering nothing more than a befriending service. Participants were sympathetic of such occurrences, understanding some detainees have been imprisoned for months before being introduced to a visitor³³.

However, the example with Amin, reflects why female visitors form tactics to prevent such occurrences. The anticipation of a hetero-patriarchal gaze had controlled the way female visitors “performed” their visiting experience³⁴. As Foucault (1980:155) asserts, ‘each individual [exercises] surveillance over, and against, himself’, and thus, one constantly monitors body and appearance. This is exemplified when female participants gave accounts of their performance within the visiting room, for example Bally states ‘I am very aware, [...] most couples sit side by side. [So] I always sit opposite’³⁵. Female participants also spoke of tactics to downplay their gendered body through dress and avoid, what Charlie recognises as the ‘boobylicious’ dress³⁶. Taking the interpretation of the ‘sexed body’ (Hubbard et al 2002:113), as the capacity of the body to be seen as desirable in order to attract the “gaze”, I argue female visitors resisted by intentionally *un*-sexing their bodies. The body, instead of being sculpted into an “ideal” notion of femininity, was *un*-sculpted, for example participants described wearing baggy clothes.

Uneven power relations between the visitor and detainee are to be expected³⁷. However, some female visitors recognised that owing to their gender, and the cultural background of the detainees they were not always considered the dominant figure in the relationship:

³² Amin never made me feel uncomfortable and referring him to the waiting list felt to be punitive.

³³ Interviews with Sarah (11/06/2014); Karma (04/07/2014).

³⁴ Male visitors can also be subject to a “gaze”, for example Samuel (13/05/2014) describes a detainee who had touched his leg a ‘little bit too intimately’. However, unlike female visitors, Samuel did not mention any tactics he produced to prevent a future occurrence.

³⁵ This was also noted by Lawie (04/06/2014) and Sarah (11/06/2014).

³⁶ Charlie (03/06/2014); Bally (01/06/2014); Lawie (04/06/2014); Marie (12/07/2014) and I tailored what we wore to counter an anticipated gaze.

³⁷ Serin (16/06/2014) mentioned this was the expectation given during training sessions, which in Figure 4.8 she disputes.

[In] a lot of the cultures people come from, if you are a woman you are not a threat and even more [...] a disabled woman is in no way a threat. That has helped me that they see me as vulnerable. [...] I think they see your vulnerability and part of it is being female and part of it is being blind. I think [it is] those two things [that they feel] they might look after you. That is actually a very good feeling for people to have rather than always [being] on the receiving end. (*Serin Davies, 16/06/2014*).

I think most of the guys would find me really weird because I am 46, I am not married and I don't have kids. So from the cultures that they come from, they will be like 'what?' [...] I guess [...] it's like I am a middle class white woman [and] some of the cultures they come from, [the way] they see women is not that great. (*Lily Grant, 06/06/2014*).

Figure 4. 8

The anticipation of the hetero-patriarchal gaze and the wariness of cultural differences have led some visitors to feel 'barriered'³⁸ in their ability to provide a service to male detainees. Charlie and Lily described their desire to visit women, which they felt would not expose as many concerns. Similarly, coming from a similar cultural background to the detainees I visited, I felt this went against their expectations of "appropriate" conduct for a young Indian woman³⁹. To enter an all-male environment and to *voluntarily* visit men seems unorthodox for ethnic-minority women.

Some female visitors also described how they were perceived as maternal figures, representing relationships of 'trustworthiness' and comfort⁴⁰. This, I argue, reflects how visitors, whether male or female, facilitate "spaces of care" in, what Cloke et al (2007:1092) describe as, 'extra-ordinary spaces'. An important attribute of spaces of care is the role of active listening (Conradson 2003) and what Bunty expresses as being 'fully present' in the visiting room:

³⁸ Interview with Charlie (03/06/2014).

³⁹ For example the detainees I encountered asked whether my family knew I was visiting men in administrative detention.

⁴⁰ Interviews with Alice (15/05/2014); Karma (04/07/2014); Sarah (11/06/2014).

The best thing you can do for someone who is suffering is just literally *be there*, literally and I want to be there [with] 100 percent of me. I don't want to be thinking about 'should I be getting him a drink from the vending machine'. (*Lily Grant, 06/06/2014*; emphasis added).

You need to listen and you need to basically just be with them through that talk and through their feelings. [...] When I was dealing with some of [detainee name's] most difficult times, I would gradually, throughout the visit, get more and more tensed up. [...] It was a response to his agitation. Humans naturally just reflect each other and so I started to [...] breath out and just relax myself. [...] Sometimes using my breath actually relaxed them as well. There were definitely times where I noticed if I relaxed, then they relaxed. (*Freddy, 01/07/2014*).

Figure 4. 9

Figure 4.9 represents the importance of the physical body in defining the relationship with detainees. Participants were aware of their own body and the capacity it has to affect the detainee. For example Freddy describes, it was upon hearing his detainee's trauma that he became aware of his own body "tensing up" and realised that his bodily performance was mirrored in his detainee. The relationship between the detainee and visitor is an embodied and reciprocal experience. Mary also illustrates this reciprocal relationship when she argues her feelings 'replicat[e] a lot of the emotions that the detainee feels'. This and the experiences in Figure 4.9, illustrate the non-material relational nature of a visit, such as the exchanges of feelings, which in turn defines a detainee's carceral experience. By empowering the detainee and *being there*, many participants, like Lily (Figure 4.11), noticed the positive impact of their visit⁴¹. This returns to the liminal nature of the visiting room, which presents opportunities of transformation of detainees (Moran 2013a). The visit was emotionally uplifting and acted as a distraction from the mundane experiences of imprisonment and moreover, it was a chance for the detainee to regain some agency. Serin, I believe, best captures this:

What I use to do very often is [...] I would say 'oh could you get me a cup of tea' and then they would go. [...] It was like [they were] looking after me. They would say 'oh be careful, it is really hot'. You know just little things like that. When [it is time to] leave, I would say 'oh I'm not sure where the door is'. I think its quite good for people to see that they've got [...] a kind of ability [that] I haven't got. [...] They see that I am vulnerable. They feel it you know, and I think that brings something very good out in detainees. (*Serin Davies, 16/06/2014*).

Figure 4. 10

⁴¹ Similarly expressed by Bally (01/06/2014), Freddy (01/07/2014), Karma (04/07/2014) and Marie (12/07/2014).

In a similar vein, Bally asserts the necessity for physical contact with detainees, in the form of a hug or handshake. The need to physically *touch* someone non-hostile ultimately counters the emotions of deprivation inherent within spaces of detention. The body is a tool for ‘exploration of [an] environment’ (Rodaway 1994:30) and accordingly, the detainee, through their haptic senses, can impute a positive meaning to the visiting room when compared to the detention centre.

When I visited Amin he never failed to surprise me with his appearance; every visit he styled a new haircut and wore designer clothes⁴². Thinking back, I wondered whether this was a chance for Amin to present himself as he wished to be seen, rather than as his “detainee” identity. Muedeking (1992) describes the potential transformation within the visiting room, from one’s ‘authentic’ prison identity into an ‘inauthentic image’ (230). This is an opportunity for detainees to control their own ‘social identity’ (230). The visiting room also presented opportunities for subversion of dominant power relations, for example the exchange of jokes between staff and detainees⁴³. This friendly exchange digresses from the regimented experiences of the detention centre and the detainee has the opportunity to regain some autonomy. Such transformative possibilities, however small, have the potential to be ‘emotionally uplifting’ for detainees (Muedeking 1992:231).

The visiting room inherently critiques the sterile image of carceral spaces. A detainee will often talk to a visitor about intimate and traumatic experiences. Charlie describes feeling on an ‘island’ and a ‘little cocoon’, whilst talking to a detainee and expresses the desire for privacy away from staff who are in close proximity to overhear conversations. All the testimonies critique the dynamics of the “casual visit”, depicted by Kotarba (1979:97-98) as characteristically informal and emotionally vacant. For the detainee, the visitor is often the only source available to talk to and as Charlie says ‘they crave having someone to talk to from outside’.

Many of the visitor’s narratives were filled with happy anecdotes of friendships that have developed as a result of visiting within ‘a strange environment’⁴⁴. Visitors fondly recollected the political and religious debates they have had with detainees⁴⁵ and some visits provided

⁴² Author’s diary entry (09/02/2014).

⁴³ Interview with Samuel (13/05/2014).

⁴⁴ Interview with Freddy (01/07/2014).

⁴⁵ Interviews with Alice (15/05/2014); Serin (16/06/2014); Marie (12/07/2014).

opportunities for volunteers to teach, for example Maths and English⁴⁶. Participants described visits as a chance for personal development, for example learning of different cultures⁴⁷, languages⁴⁸, political affairs⁴⁹ and such experiences led visitors to describe volunteering as ‘satisfying’ and having got ‘something out of it’⁵⁰. When asked about their most memorable detainee(s), all participants recalled someone instantly and with affection. The volunteers who had visited the longest described friendships that started from the beginning of their volunteering practice, which still existed today⁵¹. This is a powerful testimony to the strength of detainee-visitor relationships.

The visiting room, as Marie noted above, is invested with both ‘intense’⁵² positive and negative emotions, from the detainee *and the visitor*. Figure 4.11 is a small sample of the total participants who were exposed to hearing trauma during a visit:

[T]here was no anger, just incredibly depressed you know. Incredibly depressed. How does that make you feel? Like Shit. I don’t know what to say to him. [...] It was just really hard. [...] You come away feeling depressed yourself, don’t you? Because you can’t help practically. (*Bally, 22/05/2014*).

[H]e was just really, really depressed and beginning to feel more and more isolated and there was one visit where I did feel totally helpless. I just felt terrible. I wanted to run. I just wanted to get out of there, cus I felt it impinging on me and my feelings. Yeah it was really hard. [...] But even [in] that visit, towards the end, it started lightening up a bit and he was feeling a bit better. You sort of see the impact [of] your visit. (*Lily Grant, 06/06/2014*).

He was suffering from severe depression and post-traumatic stress disorder, you know very, very visibly [...] As things went on, he became extremely suicidal. Most of our visits were just talking about suicide, for about a month or two. [...] It was really difficult. I mean there were a couple of times where I came out and I just wanted to cry. It was just really, really tough visits. You know, the feeling of complete powerlessness. (*Freddy, 01/07/2014*).

Figure 4. 11

The telling descriptions reflect the ‘emotional landscape of the visits room’ (Crewe et al 2013:12). The visiting room presented a space for the detainee to unburden and *semi-escape* the detention environment. However, as a result of material and non-material relations that

⁴⁶ Interviews with Mary (01/07/2014); Serin (16/06/2014).

⁴⁷ Interviews with Freddy (01/07/2014); Karma (04/07/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014).

⁴⁸ Interview with Serin (16/06/2014).

⁴⁹ Interview with Marie (12/07/2014).

⁵⁰ Interviews with Freddy (01/07/2014); Alice (15/05/2014); Marie (12/07/2014).

⁵¹ Interviews with Alice (15/05/2014); Serin (16/06/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014).

⁵² Figure 4.3.

constitute visiting, volunteers were exposed to the pain and nature of incarceration, which were intrinsic to the everyday experiences of detainees. For example, most participants had experienced visiting a detainee who was suicidal or suffered from depression and, as described in Figure 4.11, visiting can become emotionally straining. The wanting to run away and wanting to cry, relate to the feelings of hopelessness, powerlessness and feelings of incompetence⁵³. However, it falls upon the visitor to ‘encourage them to survive the day’⁵⁴ as they are often standing in lieu of a detainee’s family and friends. As will be described in section 4.3, the exposure to trauma is a significant experience of visiting and makes the boundary between volunteering and one’s personal life difficult to maintain.

4.3 Beyond the Detention Centre

The visiting experience is an intense voluntary practice and this intensity was not always a result of negative experiences. For example, visitors described friendships with detainees long after release from detention. However, the biggest negotiation visitors faced was the issue of boundaries and to what extent the role of the visitor extended beyond the detention centre. This negotiation varied greatly between participants, some choosing to keep a rigid boundary between one’s personal life and their volunteering practices, while for others there was no boundary whatsoever.

Visitors varied in the amount of practical support they chose to offer. Participants described feelings of ‘personal responsibility’⁵⁵ towards detainees and as a result, volunteers have helped with immigration cases, namely contacting solicitors⁵⁶, assisting with bail applications⁵⁷, attending court hearings⁵⁸, acting as surety⁵⁹ and have, on occasion, provided money⁶⁰. Visitors have also bought goods, such as clothes⁶¹ and music⁶², whilst detainees were in

⁵³ Interviews with Lily (06/06/2014); Lawie (04/06/2014); Charlie (03/06/2014); Mary (01/07/2014); Bally (01/06/2014); Freddy (01/07/2014). During my visits to one detainee, I felt I could not provide the support the man needed and I left the detention centre feeling inadequate (also expressed by other participants). The man I visited really wanted legal advice, which as a visitor I was not in the position to provide (Author’s diary extract, 31/08/2013).

⁵⁴ Interview with Karma (04/07/2014).

⁵⁵ Interview with Charlie (03/06/2014).

⁵⁶ Interviews with Alice (15/05/2014); Mary (01/07/2014).

⁵⁷ Interviews with Freddy (01/07/2014); Charlie (03/06/2014); Bally (01/06/2014).

⁵⁸ Interviews with Serin (16/06/2014); Freddy (01/07/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014).

⁵⁹ Interviews with Serin (16/06/2014); Alice (15/05/2014).

⁶⁰ Interview with Charlie (03/06/2014).

⁶¹ Interview with Sarah (11/06/2014).

⁶² Interview with Bally (01/06/2014).

detention and when moved to other centres, visitors have continued to visit⁶³. Hugh describes ‘you find yourself doing very strange things’ in order to practically and emotionally support detainees and he argues that this involvement undoubtedly influences a visitor’s personal life⁶⁴. Many visitors, particularly those who have volunteered for several years, have found their boundary of care in need of constant refinement. I argue, the extension of the detainee-visitor relationship beyond the visiting room and exposure to their detainee’s trauma, meant volunteers embodied the pain of incarceration as experienced by detainees. This tended to occur after a traumatic experience regarding a detainee’s immigration case, which resulted in removal or deportation. Ramsey describes:

There is one who grieves me. A Nigerian gay boy. Lovely bloke. [...] He told me what his family had done to him. I can’t, I can’t get my head around what they did and I have never told anybody. He was deported and you know [...] I don’t think he would be alive [sighs]. That hurts, that hurts a lot. So no I haven’t managed my emotions very well. [...] I don’t think I took a long enough break. [...] *There is a cost with being a listener, a befriender [...] you know, some people get to you. They just get to you, don’t they? [...] This vicarious trauma is such a big issue for people doing this job and I don’t think it’s recognised enough.* [...] I cannot believe I am the only one who has heard something horrific. (Ramsey, 22/05/2014; emphasis added).

Figure 4. 12

Ramsey expressed how he was still scarred by the experience of encountering this young man over one year ago. Charlie, who has had a similar experience, states ‘you hear this trauma [and] you can become traumatised yourself’. The visiting experience is clearly a voluntary practice which produces an intense emotional relationship between a detainee and visitor. As a result, visitors experienced ‘burnout’ syndrome, a condition of emotional exhaustion (Maslach 2003:2). During such cases, visitors stated they had become too emotionally involved and this interfered with their personal life. For example, Charlie describes her vulnerability when her detainee was deported and recalls feeling helpless and ‘crying all the time’. Visitors commonly described their feelings of frustration and exhaustion towards the immigration system and the injustices they witnessed within the detention system. Such experiences have led some visitors to ‘detach’ themselves from future detainees by creating an ‘emotional buffer’ (Maslach 2003:4) or having their ‘barriers’ held up⁶⁵.

⁶³ Interviews with Samuel (13/05/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014); Alice (15/05/2014).

⁶⁴ Interview with Hugh (03/07/2014).

⁶⁵ Interview with Charlie (03/06/2014).

As Ramsey states in Figure 4.12, the experience of visiting evokes ‘vicarious traumatization’ among volunteers (Jenkins & Baird 2002:423). Vicarious trauma is defined as the ‘transformation of the inner experience of the therapist that comes about as a result of empathetic engagement with clients’ trauma material’ (Pearlman & Saakvitne 1995:151). As described in section 4.2, visits often evoked traumatic talk and this has led Freddy to state that the visitor often plays a counsellor role. To actively listen and offer emotional support exposes the visitor to vicarious trauma. This exemplifies the necessity of emotional support for visitors. For example, GDWG facilitates group sessions for visitors, who may then talk about their experiences and any problems which have arisen. After 18 years of visiting, Hugh states ‘everybody, no matter how long they have been visiting, still need[s] support’. Visitors described the need to take breaks between visits in order to maintain mental health wellbeing⁶⁶ and others practiced recreational activities which helped counter the stresses of visiting⁶⁷.

To create a separation between volunteering and one’s personal life, some visitors chose not to maintain contact with detainees outside of visiting hours⁶⁸. Lily describes why she chose to maintain minimal contact through mobile phones:

I was seeing a guy who was on hunger strike and [...] psychologically he was not in a good place. I had texts from him [at] Midnight [on] Saturday night, saying ‘help’ or ‘they are taking me’, ‘I don’t know where they are taking me’ and what can I do? It’s awful, it is really awful and there is no one I can call on Saturday night. So that was really a heads up for me. I don’t know if I want to do this by mobile, because you are always available and at times when you can’t do anything and it [feels] too much of a burden. (*Lily, 06/06/2014*).

Figure 4. 13

To be constantly available to offer emotional support can be emotionally demanding for visitors. Sarah described the feelings of impotence when being contacted at home and finding ‘you can’t do anything’ to practically help. Concerns of maintaining contact were also apparent when detainees are released from detention. On occasion, maintaining contact did expose volunteers to problems, for example when ex-detainees have made financial demands or

⁶⁶ Interview with Bunty (22/05/2014).

⁶⁷ Alice (15/05/2014) describes her passion for botanical paintings, while Lily (06/06/2014) and Freddy (01/07/2014) practice Yoga.

⁶⁸ However, Sarah (11/06/2014) expressed her desire to keep all avenues of communication open and therefore, detainees were able to contact on her mobile and through email.

maintained a level of dependency upon visitors⁶⁹. Nonetheless, there have been numerous instances where maintaining contact has proven a positive experience for visitors as well as detainees. Some visitors have actively sought to meet detainees upon release and continue to provide emotional and practical support⁷⁰. Ramsey describes the ‘wonderful feeling’ when meeting an ex-detainee and similarly, Hugh expresses his delight when detainees have phoned him years after release.

The visiting experience, and the emotions which constitute it, are rarely bound to the confines of the visiting room. Thus, Freddy states the importance of striking a balance between one’s visiting role and personal life:

It’s really important for me to create a real separation you know. [...] All the stories I was hearing really, really affected me. It was a strange experience, I was making some food and I was opening a packet of something with a knife and I just cut myself. It wasn’t a bad cut or anything but it was losing quite a lot of blood and I just all of a sudden – literally all these just kind of images [started] like flashing through my mind and just all these stories that people have told me in a space of 20 seconds flooded my mind and I just completely broke down. [...] I realised at that point that I needed to create [a balance]. (*Freddy, 01/07/2014*).

Figure 4. 14

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter was split into three themes in order to encapsulate the nature and experiences of visitors. Utilising the literature on affective atmospheres and haptic geographies illustrates how emotions are ‘felt’ and manipulated within detention centres (Fenton et al 2012:41). Entering a detention centre and going through security was an inherently embodied experience. Visitors described the feelings of powerlessness and frustration in response to the arbitrary nature of rules. There was an acute awareness of uneven power relations with staff, which was marked by the sense of “surrender” among visitors and reflects their temporary transformation into a “carceral character”.

Once within the visiting room, participants described feeling powerless to strategies of social and spatial control and overwhelmingly helpless; frequently questioning what practical support they could offer detainees. The visiting room was clearly a space invested with emotions. Owing to the liminal nature of the room, the detainee was able to regain some

⁶⁹ Interviews with Alice (15/05/2014); Charlie (03/06/2014).

⁷⁰ Interviews with Alice (15/05/2014); Serin (16/06/2014).

agency and control over his carceral experience. Thus, visiting presented opportunities of transformation for detainees and highlights the importance for the detainee to have contact with “outside” relations. Visitors often received communication from ex-detainees upon release or removal, praising the positive experience of having a visitor.

Participants described visits filled with lively debates, personal development, but also traumatic talk. This chapter has criticised the assumption that carceral spaces are emotionally vacant and importantly, has reflected the strength of the detainee-visitor relationship. Emotions were rarely left in the visiting room. Instead, I argue, a visitor experiences an intense emotional relationship with detainees, which can leave visitors vulnerable to vicarious traumatization. The role of the visitor is a personal experience and the extent to which one provides emotional and practical support is an individual negotiation. To participate in this voluntary practice, the visitor clearly negotiates their moral boundaries of care towards detainees, which will be examined in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5: Geographies of Responsibility

‘There are plenty of times you get to the centre and you look at it. This daunting edifice and you think ‘oh no, not this again.’’ (Hugh, 03/07/2014).

The following chapter is entitled ‘geographies of responsibility’, and focuses on how visitors perceive concepts such as responsibility and care. Examined below are the ‘motivations’ behind visiting, ‘thinking through responsibility’ and finally, how the experience of visiting informs one’s ‘political outlook’. Expanding upon Chapter 4, which documented the nature and experiences of visitors, the three themes in this chapter aim to conceptualise how visitors perceive their relations towards “unfamiliar others”.

5.1 Motivations

Many participants described visiting as a ‘fairly natural follow on’⁷¹ from previous experiences of volunteering with vulnerable adults such as refugees and asylum seekers⁷². Some participants also noted they had previously worked or volunteered within similarly high-security environments⁷³, whilst others were involved in the education sector⁷⁴. It was felt these past experiences would be beneficial for the visitor role. However, regardless of experience, the prime motivation for visiting was curiosity and the desire to learn more about the detention environment:

⁷¹ Interview with Bunty (22/05/2014).

⁷² Such as Ramsey (22/05/2014); Bunty (22/05/2014); Samuel (13/05/2014); Charlie (03/06/2014); Freddy (01/07/2014); Karma (04/07/2014).

⁷³ Interviews with Sarah (11/06/2014); Mary (01/07/2014).

⁷⁴ Interviews with Bally (01/06/2014); Serin (16/06/2014).

Meeting people you would otherwise not meet. Meeting people from backgrounds you [would] otherwise not meet. [...] There is a great wealth of stories to be found among detainees. [...] It is like ‘oh what might somebody be like from [...] Mexico, I’ve never met anyone from Mexico’ [...] and it’s terrible really, because it is curiosity. (*Serin, 16/06/2014*).

I’ve always wanted to get involved. [...] For my own personal growth to meet people in there and find out what it’s really like. *You’ve got this hunger to find out how the system works*. Obviously if you go and visit someone, you are finding out about their experiences and you see what it’s like for yourself. I guess it’s a certain element of [...] curiosity with a reason. [...] Then you are better placed to protest about something you know a lot about. (*Charlie, 03/06/2014*; emphasis added).

Figure 5. 1

The rewards of meeting new people, learning from and hearing the stories of detainees were key motivations to continue visiting. Figure 5.1 describes an inherent curiosity about the unfamiliar other and the desire to learn about an environment that is alien to visitors’ everyday lives. Many participants confessed to having no ‘clue’⁷⁵ or being ‘completely ignorant’⁷⁶ of the detention system before visiting. Importantly, Serin states that ‘after the curiosity comes affection’ and this sentiment reflects the desire for friendship with detainees. However, bound up within this motivation of curiosity, is an inherent romanticism associated with volunteering as a visitor:

[I had] this romantic notion [where] I thought [they would be] articulate, intelligent people, who’d resisted in their own country and who’d been forced to flee or have come from a dramatic war situation. Um yeah, that was my own snobbery. Kind of what I wanted from it. I wanted to meet interesting people, who have had interesting life stories. I kind of cringe a bit when I think about that now. [...] Most of these people [...] are just ordinary people, who haven’t necessarily had interesting lives you know, just plain depressing. There is nothing romantic about it at all. [...] These people have been through so much suffering and I think before you start, there is this romantic notion that you are going to form very close relationships with lovely people, who have just had a hard time. (*Lily, 06/06/2014*).

Figure 5. 2

Using this notion of romanticism, Lily describes her perceptions of what she thought visiting would encapsulate and who she thought the “detainee” was. I also fell prey to this romantic perception of visiting, for example I believed I would encounter many asylum seekers in

⁷⁵ Interview with Bunty (22/05/2014).

⁷⁶ Interview with Bally (01/06/2014).

detention, rather than detainees with visa complications. The expectations of who visitors would encounter were based largely on their prior experiences of volunteering and incorporated a desire for fulfilment in their volunteering practices⁷⁷. However, as Lily describes, this romanticism soon disappears once visiting begins.

As stated in Chapter 4, visiting is an intense volunteering practice, which I argue, relates to one's moral consciousness. To be morally conscious is to be self-aware of one's personal character, according to principles of morality. Lily describes having 'always had a real sense of justice and injustice'⁷⁸ and interestingly, Charlie describes the feelings of guilt associated with wanting to visit, where she states 'I am angry about society [and] I don't think I do enough to change it'⁷⁹. However, the visitor essentially provides support to someone who is thought to have no right to remain as defined by the state. For this reason, I argue the visitor's role cannot be considered "civic duty", as the practice is 'outside of state favour' (Conradson 2003:1099)⁸⁰. Capturing these feelings of morality and responsibility, I argue, visitors visibly practice what, Cloke et al (2007) define as "ethical citizenship". Ethics grounds our understanding of "responsibility" and foreshadows the 'impulse of voluntarism' (1092). Cloke et al (2007) make a distinction between 'ethical citizenship', which encompasses the 'ordinary ethics' of 'everyday caring and relations with others' (1099), and 'civic duty' (1095), as one's responsibility within a democratic society (see Anheier & Salamon 1999). Visiting acts as a bridge to 'perform' one's ordinary ethics (Cloke et al 2007:1095).

For some participants the role of faith was an important element of their ordinary ethics and was a motivating factor in volunteerism⁸¹. Faith justified one's boundaries of care towards "unfamiliar others". For example Hugh states that to visit someone in prison is 'one of the principle works of mercy' and similarly, Sarah recognises her faith provides the 'conviction that you [need] to be doing something'. However without sufficient emotional support, as described in Chapter 4, several visitors expressed some doubt that they would still be volunteering in the future⁸². In Figure 5.3, Bally expresses why she continues to volunteer:

⁷⁷ Interviews with Samuel (13/05/2014); Serin (16/06/2014).

⁷⁸ This idea of justice was similarly expressed by Alice (15/05/2014) and Sarah (11/06/2014).

⁷⁹ Part of my motivation for wanting to visit was a feeling of guilt, where I knew I wanted to enter a career promoting migrants' right, yet I still had not helped such a vulnerable population.

⁸⁰ Although, Sarah (11/06/2014) does feel her volunteering is a civic duty and a responsibility as a member within society.

⁸¹ Interviews with Ramsey (22/05/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014); Sarah (11/06/2014).

⁸² Interviews with Buntly (22/05/2014); Ramsey (22/05/2014); Charlie (03/06/2014).

If you said to me, ‘Bally you never have to go back there again’, I would go ‘alright then’. I would happily, quite happily not go back and do it. [...] What made me contact [MHDVG] was because [...] if [I] say I am gunna do something, [then] I do it. I know [MHDVG] is struggling for visitors. I know that we have a waiting list. If I knew we didn’t have a waiting list and there weren’t people waiting...Just the thought of people waiting, I cannot bear that. [...] It’s not enjoyable, is it? [...] It’s not like you go ‘yeah I’m looking forward to my visit this week’. (Bally, 01/06/2014).

Figure 5. 3

Feelings of guilt, commitment and responsibility, namely towards the detainees and the visiting group (especially within MHDVG which has a total of 12 active volunteers) were motivations to continue visiting⁸³. From the experience of visiting, volunteers described that their initial motivations had not changed, but were rather reinforced owing to a ‘strong sense of identification’ with detainees (Cloke et al 2007:1094)⁸⁴. This sense of “identification” could also be due to the number of participants who had previous experience of volunteering within marginalised communities.

5.2 Thinking through Responsibility

All testimonies concerning the motivations behind visiting, relate to material and non-material (inter)relations, which as Massey (2004) argues and as visitors *felt*, carries a responsibility. Section 5.1 demonstrated visitors have consciously thought through their motivations and their ‘ethical responsibilities to care’ according to one’s ordinary ethics (Lawson 2007:1). Whether it was personal or religious commitment, or issues of morality that underpinned why volunteers chose to visit, I argue responsibilities remain based upon how far we perceive our relations extending towards strangers. The relations towards unfamiliar others - the question of why we should care for someone who is ultimately a stranger, arose throughout the interviews:

⁸³ Interviews with Bunty (22/05/2014); Ramsey (22/05/2014); Charlie (03/06/2014); Lily (06/06/2014); Sarah (11/06/2014).

⁸⁴ Interviews with Sarah (11/06/2014); Freddy (01/07/2014).

My daughter has gone to the other side of the world, to Honduras [...] and someone is looking after her, [...] she calls her my Honduran mum. And they have taken her in. [...] My point is you never know when you that stranger and you might need that help as well and its like [...] we are all foreigners somewhere, aren't we? We are all immigrants somewhere along the line, so you never know when you might need a helping hand. (*Bally, 01/06/2014*).

I went travelling around the world and when I came back, [I] kind of had this sense that I had been to lots of different countries and that people had been welcoming [and] I started to feel really bad about the way people who come to this country are treated. (*Marie, 12/07/2014*).

I think I want to give something back and do my little bit. [...] I am very aware I am in the privileged position where I can go and help people. [...] [Detainees] are in this horrible position where they are having to ask for help and that's a demeaning thing for a human. (*Charlie, 03/06/2014*).

Figure 5. 4

Figure 5.4 illustrates visitors' awareness of wider historical and geographical relations, which 'bind' ordinary people together and enforces a responsibility (Lawson 2007:4). Visitors were knowledgeable of uneven relations between people, which justified extending care towards the stranger. Bally's argument explicitly relates to our geographical relations and her argument mirrors Darling's (2010:126) definition of responsibility, as informed by our 'interconnections' that extend across space. The fact that we are all strangers *somewhere*, confers on Bally a responsibility enough to care. She felt a duty to care for someone's child, just as someone cares for her daughter. Several participants also commented on Britain's 'historical and institutional relationships' to other countries (Lawson 2007:3), referring specifically to Colonialism⁸⁵, in order to question the legitimacy of UK detention and immigration systems.

Schervish & Havens (2002) argue that volunteering develops and enhances human identification beyond what is the "familiar". Visitors described having previously encountered different volunteering opportunities⁸⁶ or visited different places which negotiated their relations towards unfamiliar others. For example, Marie (Figure 5.4) recognises her encounters with different cultures encouraged development of hospitality towards migrants, who she argues are treated inhospitably. This was a significant motivation for her visiting. Visitors are therefore attentive to their own 'location within circuits of power' (Lawson

⁸⁵ Interviews with Alice (15/05/2014); Lawie (04/06/2014).

⁸⁶ Interviews with Charlie (03/06/2014); Mary (01/07/2014).

2007:6). This was further exemplified in the recognition of privilege and appreciation of uneven power relations⁸⁷, as a consequence of wider interconnections. I argue this feeling of privilege, and also to some extent guilt, was an impetus to extend one's ethical responsibilities to care.

By thinking through historical and geographical relations and encountering difference, visitors recognised the 'need for care' among detainees (Lawson 2007:3). This framed the visiting room as a 'space of care' (Conradson 2003:508), which is receptive and responsive to the needs of detainees (Darling 2011:410). Accordingly, the visiting room was a space of hospitality and 'responsive, embodied and relational care' (410). However, Darling is concerned with the implicit power relations within the language of hospitality, which assumes the detainee is a guest and recipient of care. Instead, Darling argues spaces of care should be conceptualised as a space of reciprocal relations, for example he describes 'my listening ear and responsive gestures became gifts to others, and their words, thoughts and willingness to talk, a gift to me' (411). This sentiment of reciprocity, I believe mirrors the testimonies of visitors when describing their relationships with detainees.

Figure 5.5 provides narratives of what volunteers considered the visitor role to involve. Participants described the qualities of friendship, which reflects a reciprocal relationship of 'interdependence and mutuality' (Lawson 2007:1). Visitors, as illustrated in Chapter 4, received 'recipient gifts' of 'knowledge, thoughts and experiences' from detainees (Darling 2011:415), while they in their turn provided emotional and practical support. As Samuel describes 'one of the best parts of visiting is sharing stories and learning'⁸⁸.

⁸⁷ For example, Charlie (03/06/2014); Bally (01/06/2014); Alice (15/05/2014) expressed their privilege that they were born in the UK.

⁸⁸ This was similarly expressed by Serin (16/06/2014).

I think at a very fundamental level [visiting] is befriending. It's going to chat to people about whatever they want to chat about and whatever you want to chat about. Then I suppose, as an extension of that, it's emotional support [and] then obviously there are other kinds of practical things that you can do. (*Freddy, 01/07/2014*).

[To be] just the kind of sympathetic listener [...] which is obviously more than just hearing. It is an active role. (*Sarah, 11/06/2014*).

[To say] all British people aren't wanting to get rid of you and even if the state has decided you shouldn't be here. [...] I would like to offer the hand of friendship or hospitality. (*Lawie, 04/06/2014*).

Figure 5. 5

In Morton Hall IRC, the total number of foreign national prisoners (FNPs) is said to have increased⁸⁹. Referring below to Figure 5.8, the Governor of Morton Hall IRC questioned the safeguarding practices of MHDVG. The meeting with MHM made me realise I had (possibly naively) never anticipated I would meet someone “dangerous” or a threat to my personal safety. This led me to question how far the relational capacity of care extended among other visitors. Most participants, including myself, expressed sympathy towards the FNPs visited, often arguing that the detainee had committed a trivial crime⁹⁰ and was unfairly subject to double punishment⁹¹. In fact, participants described having no ‘problem with people having been in prison’ as it was thought, ‘that person is still worthy of some kind of support’⁹². Participants stated the greatest strength of a visitor is to be non-judgmental and offer support regardless of a detainee’s past⁹³. To continue their practice of care, visitors actively empathised with detainees:

⁸⁹ Author’s diary extract (21/02/2014): Meeting with MHM.

⁹⁰ Interviews with Evie (01/06/2014); Samuel (13/05/2014). From my personal experience, Amin never disclosed his crime to me, but he clearly regretted the decisions he had made. He faced deportation after being in the country for over seven years and I felt sorry for him. He had made a mistake, which now would determine the rest of his life (Author’s diary entry, 09/02/2014).

⁹¹ Interviews with Karma (04/07/2014); Lily (06/06/2014).

⁹² Interview with Lily (06/06/2014) and similarly expressed by Bally (01/06/2014); Freddy (01/07/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014) and Samuel (13/05/2014).

⁹³ Interviews with Sarah (11/06/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014).

I just put myself in their shoes and just think well it could actually mean so much if you're in this situation, where you know you've left where you were living before, you've left the support networks of your friends and family. You end up in a situation where you are potentially put in prison for an indefinite amount of time [and] you don't know what is going to happen to you. [...] *I put myself in those shoes and just think well how much could it mean for somebody who is not a part of this system to just basically come into the centre.* [...] To have somebody there who is just a human being talking to another human being and is not there to discredit them. (*Freddy, 01/07/2014; emphasis added*).

Figure 5. 6

This ability to think relationally and empathise with others illustrates the lengths to which a visitor's ethical responsibilities and commitments to care can actually extend in order to support detainees. The next section questions how the experience of visiting and the relational nature of care-giving informs a visitor's political outlook.

5.3 Political Outlook

Most visitors were politically knowledgeable before volunteering, which I argue is another determinant of one's ordinary ethics⁹⁴. This political awareness is best reflected in the establishment of MHDVG, which was set up by a small group of individuals. Charlie, as one of the founding members, describes the motivations behind setting up the visitor group:

Before it opened, a small group of us met. [...] Most of us were linked to the Refugee Forum. [...] All of us [were] concerned about the plight of refugees and asylum seekers in this country. I'd say all of us [...] are against the government policy on how refugee and asylum seekers are treated [and] all of us [were] against the fact that IRCs exist. We all believe they shouldn't exist. [...] Ideally we wanted to stop [Morton Hall IRC] from happening, but in the time that we had, we wanted to support the people that are in there. (*Charlie, 03/06/2014*).

Figure 5. 7

What Charlie expresses relates strongly with one's ordinary ethics which members had developed from previous voluntary work at the Refugee Forum. The volunteers' collaboration grew out of their similar political 'identification' in the context of migration (Schervish & Havens 2002:50). Bosco (2007:545) suggests the 'emotional bonds' between political activists creates a foundation for political activism. I suggest the utilisation of emotional

⁹⁴ For example, Sarah (11/06/2014); Serin (16/06/2014); Marie (12/07/2014) and Hugh (03/07/2014) describe themselves as always either liberally or radically politically oriented.

bonds is also witnessed in the voluntary sector. This is exemplified by Charlie who pointedly refers to the collective of the group where, by repeatedly using the word ‘we’, she reinforces the group’s identification as anti-detention.

Conradson (2011) asserts that volunteering mobilises like-minded individuals to engage in everyday political activism and has the potential to challenge power relations. Thus, volunteerism is transformative and ‘progressive’ for political activism (466). I suggest visitor groups are a political statement against the use of IRCs, a form of political mobilisation and example of a collective solidarity effort. Additionally, I argue the actual presence of a visitor within a detention centre, their physical body, is a site of political resistance to the government policy on detention. This regular bodily presence within detention, articulates ‘solidarity and compassion’ for the detainee (Conlon et al 2014:375). Although visitors described feelings of powerlessness within detention centres, Conlon et al (2014) emphasise the capacity of the body to act as a site of tactics. They further argue the body is a manifestation of ‘material and symbolic acts of defiance’ (375). Similarly, Brown (2014:185) describes the presence of the politically active body as a ‘new kind of visibility’ within acts of resistances. It is important that detention centre staff witness “outside” relations, of which the visitor is one, as it enforces a level of accountability and transparency into the experiences within detention centres.

Recently MHDVG was forced into a position of ‘self-reflection’ (Tyler et al 2014:17), questioning its political position and purpose of the group. Figure 5.8 provides an extract from my auto-ethnographic diary, concerning a meeting I attended with MHM:

Today [visitor name] and I went to visit the Governor of Morton Hall. [...] [Governor name] explained the nature of the meeting – there is an increase of FNPs within the detention centre and she was interested in the safeguarding practices the group had in place to protect visitors. [...] [Governor name] then requested a list of all volunteer names, where she argued ‘I question the motivations of visitors who do not want to be named’. She said unless we provided a list of names, the visitor group faced being banned from entering the detention centre. She asserts it is her responsibility to ensure the safety of all those that enter “her detention centre”, as well as the detainees. [Visitor name] said we are not her responsibility as we are an independent group, to which [Governor name] retorted that we had ‘Morton Hall’ in the group name, which makes it her responsibility... (Author’s diary entry, 21/02/2014).

Figure 5. 8

The relationship between MHDVG and MHM is a clear example of strategies of control and tactics of resistance. Personally, I did not think the meeting was called because of a concern for safeguarding volunteers⁹⁵. Instead, I felt the Governor was unnerved by the thought of the “unknown”, faceless visitor and hence wanted to control the presence of the visitor body⁹⁶. Unlike other visitor groups, MHDVG had resisted providing a list of names, up until the threat of a blanket ban became apparent. Visitors expressed their desire to maintain autonomy and independence from the detention centre⁹⁷ and described the situation as a ‘power-pull thing’⁹⁸. Some visitors suggested that succumbing to the demands of the detention centre might be seen by detainees as an alliance between MHDVG and MHM, and make them feel uncomfortable and even suspicious of visitors⁹⁹. Moreover, having negotiations with detention centre management has the potential to ‘depoliticise resistance’ among visiting groups (Roy 2004:Para.8). For example, visitor groups have had to surrender to the demands of management, such as renouncing any form of political activism under the group name.

Nonetheless, I suggest visiting is still symbolic of Cohen’s (2003:213) ‘resistance from below’, and reflects the capability of individuals to collectively organise and facilitate support for detainees. Leitner & Strunk (2014) argue acts of resistance are assembled under ‘insurgent citizenship’, which recognises ‘active participation in civic and political life’ (3). The interpretation of insurgent citizenship, as identified by Leitner & Strunk (2014), captures the ability for individuals to promote and enact ‘alternative criteria for membership [...] and citizenship’ (3). This consequently expands the inclusivity of liberal democratic citizenship. Although I argue visiting is not a form of civic duty recognised by the state, the practice of visiting is an enactment of political resistance against government detention policy.

Appreciating her relations with detainees, Lily argues that visiting is ‘about being there for other people [...] People who do not have a voice, providing that for them. [...] I think [visiting] just made me more aware’. For a visitor to talk of privilege and be aware of uneven power relations, I propose is an appreciation of citizenship and the rights which constitute it. To provide a voice to the detainees who are without one, owing to their lack of status, exemplifies how the visitor

⁹⁵ Also felt by Charlie (03/06/2014).

⁹⁶ The Governor’s manner during the meeting was overtly controlling. She repeatedly questioned the motivations behind visitors who did not want to provide their names. Interestingly, during this meeting the Governor repeatedly referred to the detention centre as ‘my Morton Hall’.

⁹⁷ Author’s diary extract (05/03/2014): MHDVG monthly meeting.

⁹⁸ Interview with Charlie (03/06/2014).

⁹⁹ Author’s diary extract (05/03/2014): MHDVG monthly meeting.

expands their democratic citizenship to assist detainees. This extension of citizenship is enacted firstly when the volunteer utilises their status as a citizen (or as having a ‘right to remain’) in order to enter the detention centre¹⁰⁰, and secondly when taking advantage of their position on the outside to provide practical support¹⁰¹.

The everyday act of visiting encapsulates Leitner & Strunk’s (2014:5) conceptualisation of ‘proper politics’, which involves the questioning and challenging of the ‘existing order’ in the search for justice and equality. Figure 5.9 demonstrates how visitors have questioned the purpose of administrative detention:

We [should] consider the facts that detention centres don’t reduce the number of asylum applications, they do not deter asylum seekers and they don’t actually increase deportations either. I think really the ultimate function is a kind of tool of state-building. [...] The state and society can define who belongs and who doesn’t belong. [Detention centres] are a very convenient and *powerful means to exclude those who don’t belong and put them somewhere where they can’t cause any trouble.* (Freddy, 01/07/2014; emphasis added).

I think [detention centres] are for punishment, I really think a big part of it is punishment. I think they are to pander to this public assumption and I think its to pander to the bloody tabloid newspapers. [...] It’s a vote winner. To be seen to be tough, tougher on immigrants. What they aren’t is what they are supposed to be, which is administrative detention. [...] People are waiting longer and longer and it’s punishment. [...] It’s a signal to the rest of society that the government is doing what we want it to do. Yeah, not all of us. It’s expensive and cruel. Really, really cruel. (Lily, 06/06/2014).

Figure 5. 9

Freddy specifically refers to the ‘inclusive/exclusive logic of citizenship’ (Tyler 2010:102), which is mediated through the use of detention. Participants described the virtue of citizenship as simply a lottery of birth and taking this interpretation meant that they questioned the entire legitimacy of imprisoning people who are detained owing to their status as a foreign national¹⁰². Visitors described feeling angry about the state of detention within the UK¹⁰³ and frustration towards political parties who have not been able to appropriately discuss immigration¹⁰⁴.

¹⁰⁰ For example, Hugh (03/07/2014) expresses his frustration at the amount of documentation needed to enter a detention centre. He states ‘it is easier to get into a country [through the airport] than into a detention centre!’.

¹⁰¹ Referring back to Chapter 4, this included making contact with solicitors, assisting with a detainee’s immigration case or purchasing goods.

¹⁰² Interviews with Bally (01/06/2014); Alice (15/05/2014).

¹⁰³ Interviews with Lily (06/06/2014); Bunty (22/05/2014); Ramsey (22/05/2014); Charlie (03/06/2014); Hugh (03/07/2014).

¹⁰⁴ Interviews with Alice (15/06/2014); Ramsey (22/05/2014); Bunty (22/05/2014); Mary (01/07/2014).

Importantly, questioning the purpose of administrative detention reflects the awareness of visitors to the wider immigration context. Although most participants did not describe themselves as politically active, they did express their enthusiasm of ‘spreading the word’¹⁰⁵. From the experience of visiting, volunteers described themselves as informed and in a position to raise awareness among the general public¹⁰⁶. Visitors participated in training opportunities in order to learn more about the immigration system¹⁰⁷. Visitors of the GDWG and Asylum Welcome also described their enjoyment in participating in Outreach Programmes¹⁰⁸, which involved speaking about UK administrative detention within local schools¹⁰⁹. Such practices of raising awareness reflect the visitor’s ability to participate in ‘representational strategies’ (Tyler & Marciniak 2013:152). Representational strategies are designed to challenge the dominant public and political discourse surrounding immigration and detention. Again this returns to the transformative potential among volunteers to inform the general public of our geographies of responsibility towards strangers.

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter was split into three themes, which sought to document the geographies of responsibility that encapsulate the volunteering practice of visiting within detention centres. The motivations behind visiting were examined first - participants described past experiences of paid employment or voluntary work that had contributed to their desire to visit. Moreover, there was a recurrent motivation of curiosity among visitors, who desired to meet new people.

Visiting provided an opportunity to perform one’s everyday and ordinary ethics, which was constituted by feelings of responsibility and commitment towards others. Participants were consciously aware of wider historical and geographical relationships, which they felt produced uneven power relations including their own positions of privilege. This relates to Massey (2004) who argues responsibility over our wider interconnections must extend beyond the familiar and geographically local. Thinking through wider interrelations across space and time, visitors have extended their ‘ethical responsibilities to care’ in order to meet

¹⁰⁵ Interview with Lily (06/06/2014).

¹⁰⁶ Interview with Evie (01/06/2014).

¹⁰⁷ For example, Alice (15/05/2014) took the opportunity to undertake training with the Immigration Law Practitioners’ Association and can now provide legal immigration advice to detainees concerning their casework.

¹⁰⁸ Interviews with Alice (15/05/2014); Lily (06/06/2014); Karma (04/07/2014); Serin (16/06/2014).

¹⁰⁹ Also Bally (01/06/2014) provides classes regarding immigration at the school where she is employed and Karma (04/07/2014) utilises social media to pass on information regarding local immigration issues.

the needs of detainees. However rather than the detainee as the sole recipient of care, the descriptions of friendship reflect a reciprocal relationship between detainees and visitors.

The formation of visiting groups, I argue, is a political statement against government detention policy and moreover, the presence of the visitor in a detention centre is an act of resistance. The visitor brings a degree of transparency to detention centre practice and ensures management remain answerable to “outside” observers. Furthermore, I argue, the visitor practices a form of insurgent citizenship, which essentially blurs the ‘inclusive/exclusive’ boundary of citizenship (Tyler 2010:102). This was illustrated in Chapter 4 in reference to the practical support visitors provided, which connected the detainee to the outside. Importantly, the visiting experience left participants better informed about immigration policies and in a position to raise awareness of UK administrative detention among the general public.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

When referring to prison volunteers, Tewksbury & Dabney (2004:181) suggest '[they] hold a unique status as insider/outsider and thus can provide valuable insight into [an] institutional climate'. For this reason, it is surprising that scholars have not empirically investigated the experiences of detention centre visitors, many of whom have visited for as long as 20 years, and as a result, have acquired a wealth of knowledge surrounding administrative detention. This dissertation, which has sought to fill the academic gap, reveals the large void that remains at the heart of detention centre research. Owing to the difficult nature of accessing detainees for research purposes, it is important to open avenues wherever possible, in order to highlight the diverse experiences within detention. Thus, this dissertation sought to 'incorporate the experiences and motivations of detention centre visitors into the wider theories of carceral geographies'. Carceral geographies provided a theoretical framework to capture the experiences of visitors and the impact visiting can have on the experiences of detainees.

Before summarising the main results of the dissertation, I would like to acknowledge the limitations of the research. Although the empirical data produced was incredibly enriching and provided very interesting themes, the number of participants remained small. Thus, the dissertation is not representative of all visitor experiences nor can generalisations be made. The experiences of visiting will vary between detention centres, particularly in reference to the relationship between visitors and management. Similarly, differences may also arise between detention centres that are managed by a private contract firm or the HM Prison Service. Therefore, owing to the small scale of this project, these comparisons between detention centres could not be drawn. Nonetheless, the purpose of this dissertation is to fill the gap in academia, particularly within carceral scholarship of the experiences of detention centre visitors.

Chapter 4 documented the emotions which come to be invested in visiting and exemplifies the importance of utilising emotional geographies to recognise the experiences of carceral spaces. Stepping into a detention centre and going through security was an embodied experience and once within the visiting room, visitors felt it was a space of intense social exclusion. Nonetheless, utilising the theory of liminality demonstrated how the visiting experience has a

transformative potential, presenting opportunities of empowerment for detainees. This renders inaccurate the image of the detainee as a powerless agent against the detention system. The visit was emotionally uplifting and often had a positive impact to a detainee's detention experience. However, the intense experiences of visiting meant participants were often vulnerable to emotional burnout and vicarious traumatization. For this reason, the boundary between one's personal life and volunteering role is in need of constant refinement.

Chapter 5 aimed to uncover the perceptions behind a visitor's geographies of responsibility and the commitment felt towards "unfamiliar others". Thinking through responsibility, visitors were consciously attentive and responsive to their 'location within circuits of power' (Lawson 2007:6). This was represented in the acknowledgment of historical and geographical relationships that have produced uneven power relations. Thinking through responsibility, firstly questioned the legitimacy of the detention of foreign nationals, and secondly provided the justification to extend a visitor's motivations of care towards strangers. As a result of their experience, visitors described feeling informed and in a position to raise awareness of administrative detention.

The visitor's role, I argue, is in itself is a form of political resistance against the government's detention policy. Thus, it is a role that not only provides emotional and practical support for the detainee, but also imposes a degree of transparency into the detention centre. For example, staff and management must witness and be answerable to a detainee's outside relations. For this reason, I suggest the role of the visitor is symbolic of Cohen's (2003:213) 'resistance from below'. Visitors, as both an insider and outsider to the institutional environment, are in a position where they are able to challenge detention centre management, in order to facilitate stronger emotional and practical support for detainees.

It is important to continue research on detention centres through whichever avenues are possible. Opportunities for further research surrounding detention centre visitation might include the influence of gender in visiting. All participants were visitors to all-male detention centres and it was found that female participants were particularly wary of a potential hetero-patriarchal gaze. As a result, some visitors felt the possibility of a gaze affected their ability to provide a befriending service. For this reason, it would be interesting to compare the gender dynamics described in Chapter 4.2, to visitors at the female detention centre, Yarls Wood IRC. Another important finding, which was beyond the scope of this dissertation, but I feel

warrants further research, are the experiences of abruptness within a detainee-visitor relationship. Visitors described the difficulty when a detainee was suddenly moved to another centre or deported, as it was felt there was no opportunity for a friendship to develop. This experience of abruptness I argue reflects a great deal of the wider immigration system and the experiences of those caught within its bureaucracy.

This dissertation demonstrates how the detention centre, as a scar upon the contemporary carceral landscape, is a space invested with intense emotions. All in all, detention centre visitors, who voluntarily enter carceral spaces to provide emotional and practical support, have a fascinating insight into the wider immigration and detention environment. They witness first-hand the impact of government policies among detainees and provide an inspiring account of how we can all care for strangers. If given an appropriate platform within academic and public discourse, visitors can raise awareness of their experiences and contribute to a much-needed discussion on UK administrative detention.

References

- Adey, P (2008) Airports, mobility and the calculative architecture of affective control, *Geoforum*, 39(1), 438-451.
- Aliverti, A (2012) Making people criminal: The role of the criminal law in immigration enforcement, *Theoretical Criminology*, 16(4), 417-434.
- Anderson, B (2006) Becoming and being hopeful: towards a theory of affect, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 24(5), 733-752.
- Anderson, B (2009) Affective Atmospheres, *Emotion, Space and Society*, 2(2), 77-81.
- Anderson, K., and S.J. Smith (2001) Editorial: Emotional Geographies, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 26(1), 7-10.
- Anheier, H.K., and L.M. Salamon (1999) Volunteering in Cross-National Perspective: Initial Comparisons, *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 62(4), 43-65.
- Baer, L.D. and B. Ravneberg (2008) The outside and inside in Norwegian and English Prisons, *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 90(2), 205-216.
- Bales, K (1996) Measuring the Propensity to Volunteer, *Social Policy & Administration*, 30(3), 206-226.
- Bales, W.D., and D.P. Mears (2008) Inmate social ties and the transition to society: Does visitation reduce recidivism? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 45(3), 287-321.
- Berg, M.T., and B.M. Hubner (2011) Reentry and the ties that Bind: An Examination of Social Ties, Employment, and Recidivism, *Justice Quarterly*, 28(2), 382-410.
- Bennett, K (2009) Challenging emotions, *Area*, 41(3), 244-251.
- Birch, M., and T. Miller (2000) Inviting intimacy: the interview as therapeutic opportunity, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 3(3), 189-202.
- Bissell, D (2010) Passenger mobilities: affective atmospheres and sociality of public transport, *Environment and Planning D, Society and Space*, 28(2), 270- 289.
- Böhme, G (1993) Atmosphere as a fundamental concept of new aesthetics, *Thesis Eleven*, 36(1), 113-126.
- Bondi, L (2005) Making connections and thinking through emotions: between geography and psychotherapy, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30(4), 433-448.
- Bosco, F.J. (2007) Emotions that build networks: Geographies of Human Rights Movements in Argentina and Beyond, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 98(5), 545-563.

Bosworth, M (2011) Deportation, detention and foreign-national prisoners in England and Wales, *Citizenship Studies*, 15(5), 583-595.

Bosworth, M., and B. Kellezi (2012) *Quality of Life in Detention: Results from MQLD questionnaire data collected in IRC's Yarls Wood, Tinsley House and Brook House*, Research Report, University of Oxford.

Breen, J (2010) Secondary Effects of Imprisonment: The New Direction of Prison Research, *Irish Probation Journal*, 7, 46-64.

Brown, M (2014) Visual criminology and carceral studies: Counter-images in the carceral age, *Theoretical Criminology*, 18(2), 176-197.

Bryman, A (2012) *Social Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 4th Edition.

Byrne, B (2004) Qualitative Interviewing, in Seale, C (Ed) *Researching Society and Culture*, London: SAGE Publications, Second Edition, 179-192.

Chatterton, P., and N. Heynen (2011) Resistance(s) and Collective Social Action, in Del Casino V.J., M.E. Thomas., P. Cloke., and R. Panelli (Eds) *A Companion to Social Geography*, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 508-525.

Chui, H., and K.K. Cheng (2013) Self-Perceived Role and Function of Christian Prison Chaplains and Buddhist Volunteers in Hong Kong Prisons, *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 57(2), 154-168.

Clary, E.G., R.D. Ridge., A.A. Stukas., M. Snyder., J. Copeland., J. Hague and P. Miene (1998) Understanding and Assessing the Motivations of Volunteers: A Functional Approach, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(6), 1516-1530.

Cloke, P., S. Johnson., and J. May (2007) Ethical Citizenship? Volunteers and the ethics of providing services for homeless people, *Geoforum*, 38(6), 1089-1101.

Codd, H (2007) Prisoners' Families and Resettlement: A Critical Analysis, *The Harvard Journal*, 46(3), 255-263.

Cohen, S (2003) *No one is Illegal: asylum and immigration control past and present*, Stoke on Trent: Tretham Books.

Comfort, M.L. (2002) 'Papa's house' The prison as domestic and social satellite, *Ethnography*, 3(4), 467-499.

Comfort, M.L. (2003) In The Tube at San Quentin: The "Secondary Prisonization" of Women Visiting Inmates, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 32(1), 77-107.

Conlon, D., N. Gill., I. Tyler., and C. Oeppen (2014) The Tactics of Asylum and Irregular Migrant Support Groups: Disrupting Bodily, Technological, and Neoliberal Strategies of Control, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 104(2), 373-381.

Conradson, D (2003) Spaces of care in the city: the place of a community drop-in centre, *Social & Cultural Geography*, 4(4), 507-525.

Conradson, D (2011) Care and Caring in in Del Casino V.J., M.E. Thomas., P. Cloke., and R. Panelli (Eds) *A Companion to Social Geography*, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 454-471.

Cope, M (2010) Coding Transcripts and Diaries, in Clifford, N., S. French, and G. Valentine (Eds) *Key Methods in Geography*, London: SAGE Publications, 440-452.

Crang, M., and N. Thrift (2000) *thinking space*, London: Routledge.

Cresswell, T (2004) *Place: a Short Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Crewe, B (2007) The sociology of imprisonment, in Jewkes, Y (Ed) *Handbook on Prisons*, Devon: Willan Publishing, 123-151.

Crewe, B (2011) Depth, weight, tightness: Revisiting the pains of imprisonment, *Punishment & Society*, 13(5), 509-529.

Crewe, B., J. Warr., P. Bennett., and A. Smith (2013) The emotional geography of prison life, *Theoretical Criminology*, 0(0), 1-19.

Damasio, A (1999) *The Feelings of What Happens: Body and Emotion in the making of consciousness*, London: William Heinemann.

Darling, J (2010) A city of sanctuary: the relational re-imagining of Sheffield's asylum politics, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35(1), 125-140.

Darling, J (2011) Giving space: care, generosity and belonging in a UK asylum drop-in centre, *Geoforum*, 42(4), 408-417.

Davidson, J., L. Bondi., and M. Smith (2005) Introduction: Geography's 'Emotional Turn', in Davidson, J., L. Bondi., and M. Smith (Eds) *Emotional Geographies*, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 1-16.

De Certeau, M.D. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Delamont, S (2009) The only honest thing: autoethnography, reflexivity, and small crises in fieldwork, *Ethnography and Education*, 4(1), 51-63.

DiCicco-Bloom, B., and B.F. Crabtree (2006) The qualitative research interview, *Medical Education*, 40(4), 314-321.

Dunn, K (2010) Interviewing, in Hay, I (Ed) *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Third Edition, 101-138.

Dwyer, S.C., and J.L. Buckle (2009) The Space Between: On being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(1), 54-63.

Dyer, I (2011) Embodied Life, in Del Casino V.J., M.E. Thomas., P. Cloke., and R. Panelli (Eds) *A Companion to Social Geography*, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 346-361.

- Ellerman, A (2010) Undocumented Migrants and Resistance in the Liberal State, *Politics & Society*, 38(3), 408-429.
- Ellis, C., T.E. Adams., and A.P. Bochner (2011) Autoethnography: An Overview, *Historical Social Research*, 36(4), 273-290.
- Farrington, K (1992) The modern prison as a total institution? Public perception versus objective reality, *Crime & Delinquency*, 38(6), 6-26.
- Fenton, N.E., C. Shields., M.K. McGinn., and M. Manley-Casimir (2012) Exploring Emotional Experiences of Belonging, *Workplace: A journal for academic labor*, 19, 40-52.
- Foucault, M (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, (Trans. Gordon, C.), London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, M (1991) [1975] *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, (Trans. Sheridan, A.), London: Penguin Books.
- Friend, M (2007) *Border Country*, Belfast Exposed Photography and The Winchester Gallery.
- Gatwick Detainees Welfare Group (2012) *'A prison in the mind': the mental health implications of detention in Brook House Immigration Removal Centre*, London: Gatwick Detainees Welfare Group.
- Gill, N (2009) Governmental Mobility: The power effects of the movement of detained asylum seekers around Britain's detention estate, *Political Geography*, 28(3), 186-196.
- Gill, N., D. Moran., and D. Conlon (2013) *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*, Surrey: Ashgate.
- Goffman, E (1961) *Asylum: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*, Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Gregory, D., R. Johnston., G. Pratt., M.J. Watts., and S. Whatmore (2009) *The Dictionary of Human Geography*, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Griffiths, M (2013a) Living with Uncertainty: Indefinite Immigration Detention, *Journal of Legal Anthropology*, 1(3), 263-286.
- (2013b) Frenzied, Decelerating and Suspended: the Temporal Uncertainties of Failed Asylum Seekers and Immigration Detainees, *Centre on Migration, Policy and Society*, Working Paper 105.
- Hall, A (2007) Border Country, in Friend M (Ed) *Border Country*, Belfast Exposed Photography and The Winchester Gallery, 55-56.
- Hancock, P., and Y. Jewkes (2011) Architectures of Incarceration: The spatial pains of imprisonment, *Punishment & Society*, 13(5), 611-629.
- Hasselberg, I (2013) *An ethnography of deportation from Britain*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Sussex.

- Hewitt, J (2007) Ethical Components of Researcher-Researched Relationship in Qualitative Interviewing, *Qualitative Health Research*, 17(8), 1149-1159.
- Holstein, J.A., and J.F. Gubrium (2006) The active interview, in D. Silverman (Ed) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, London: SAGE Publications, 140-161.
- Home Office (2014) 'Immigration Statistics, October to December 2013', (WWW) London: Home Office (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-statistics-october-to-december-2013/immigration-statistics-october-to-december-2013#detention-1>; accessed 25/08/2014).
- Hopkins, P.E. (2007) Positionalities and Knowledge: Negotiating Ethics in Practice, *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographers*, 6(3), 386-394.
- Hubbard, G., K. Backett-Milburn., and D. Kemmer (2001) Working with emotion: issues for the researcher in fieldwork and teamwork, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 4(2), 119-137.
- Hubbard, P., R. Kitchin., B. Burtley., and D. Fuller (2002) *Thinking Geographically: Space, Theory and contemporary Human Geography*, London: Continuum.
- Hubbard, P (2005) The geographies of 'Going-Out': Emotion and Embodiment in the Evening Economy, in Davidson, J., L. Bondi., and M. Smith (Eds) *Emotional Geographies*, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 117-134.
- Jenkins, S.R., and S. Baird (2002) Secondary traumatic stress and vicarious trauma: A validation study, *Journal of traumatic stress*, 15(5), 423-432.
- Jewkes, Y (2005) Loss, liminality and life sentence: managing identity through a disrupted lifecourse, in Liebling, A., and S. Maruna (Eds) *The effects of Imprisonment*, Devon: Willan Publishing, 366-388.
- Jewkes, Y (2011) Autoethnography and Emotion as Intellectual Resources: Doing Prison Research Differently, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 18(1), 63-75.
- Jones, O (2005) An Ecology of Emotion, Memory, Self and Landscape, in Davidson, J., L. Bondi., and M. Smith (Eds) *Emotional Geographies*, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 205-218.
- Kotarba, J.A. (1979) The accomplishment of Intimacy in the Jail Visiting Room, *Qualitative Sociology*, 2(2), 80-103.
- Kvale, S (2007) *Doing Interviews*, London: SAGE.
- Lawson, V (2007) Geographies of Care and Responsibility, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 97(1), 1-11.
- Leerkes, A., and D. Broeders (2010) A Case of Mixed Motives? Formal and Informal Functions of Administrative Immigration Detention, *British Journal of Criminology*, 50(5), 830-850.

Lefebvre, H. (2004) [1992] *Rhythmanalysis: Space, time and everyday life*, (Trans. Elden, S. and G. Moore), London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Leitner, H. and C. Strunk (2014) Spaces of Immigrant Advocacy and Liberal Democratic Citizenship, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 104(2), 348-356.

Liamputtong, P (2013) *Qualitative Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Fourth Edition.

Liebling, A., and S. Maruna (2005) Introduction: the effects of imprisonment revisited, in Liebling, A., and S. Maruna (Eds) *The effects of Imprisonment*, Devon: Willan Publishing, 1-29.

Light, R (1993) Why Support Prisoners' Family-Tie Groups? *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(4), 322-329.

London Detainee Support Group (2009) *detained lives, the real costs of indefinite immigration detention*, London: London Detainee Support Group.

Longhurst, R (2005a) Fat bodies: developing geographical research agendas, *Progress in Human Geography*, 29(3), 247-259.

(2005b) Situating Bodies, in Nelson, L., and J. Seager (Eds) *A Companion to Feminist Geography*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 337-349.

Longhurst, R (2010) Semi-Structured Interviews and Focus Groups, in Clifford, N., S. French, and G. Valentine (Eds) *Key Methods in Geography*, London: SAGE Publications, 103-115.

Madge, C (1993) Boundary Disputes: Comments on Sidaway (1992), *Area*, 25(3), 294-299.

Martin, L.L., and M.L. Mitchelson (2009) Geographies of detention and imprisonment: interrogating spatial practices of confinement, discipline, law, and state power, *Geography Compass*, 3(1), 459-477.

Maslach, C (2003) *Burnout: The cost of caring*, Los Altos, CA: Malor Book.

Massey, D (1993) Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place, in Bird, J., B. Curtis., T. Putnam., and L. Tickner (Eds) *Mapping the futures: local cultures, global change*, London: Routledge, 59-69.

Massey, D (2002) Globalisation: What does it mean for geography? *Geography*, 87(4), 293-296.

Massey, D (2004) Geographies of Responsibility, *Geografiska Annaler: Series B Human Geography*, 86(1), 5-18.

McDowell, L (1995) Body Work: Heterosexual Gender Performances in City Workplaces, in Bell, D., and G. Valentine (Eds) *Mapping Desire: geographies of sexualities*, London: Routledge, 75-95.

McGinley, A (2011) *Immigration Detention: A Handbook For Visitors*, 7th Edition, Association of Visitors to Immigration detainees.

McWatters, M (2013) Poetic Testimonies of Incarceration: Towards a Vision of Prison as Manifold Space, in Gill, N., D. Moran., and D. Conlon (Eds) *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*, Surrey: Ashgate, 199-217.

Mears, D.P., J.C. Cochran., S.E. Siennick., and W.D. Bales (2012) Prison Visitation and Recidivism, *Justice Quarterly*, 29(6), 888-918.

Michalon, B (2013) Mobility and Power in Detention: The Management of Internal Movement and Governmental Mobility in Romania, in Gill, N., D. Moran., and D. Conlon (Eds) *Carceral Spaces: Mobility and Agency in Imprisonment and Migrant Detention*, Surrey: Ashgate, 37-55.

Moran, D (2013a) Carceral Geography and the Spatialities of Prison Visiting: Visitation, Recidivism and Hyperincarceration, forthcoming in *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 1-33.

(2013b) Between outside and inside? Prison visiting rooms as liminal carceral spaces, *GeoJournal*, 78(2), 339-351.

Moran, D (2014) Leaving behind the ‘total institution’? Teeth, transcarceral spaces and (re)inscription of the formerly incarcerated body, *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, 21(1), 35-51.

Muedeking, G.D. (1992) Authentic/Inauthentic Identities in the Prison Visiting Room, *Symbolic Interaction*, 15(2), 227-236.

Murray, J (2005) The effects of imprisonment on families and children of prisoners, in Liebling, A., and S. Maruna (Eds) *The effects of Imprisonment*, Devon: Willan Publishing, 442-462.

Pallot, J., D. Moran., and L. Piacentini (2009) Lipstick, lace and longing: Constructions of femininity inside a Russian prison, *Environment and Planning D Society and Space*, 27(4), 700-720.

Pearlman, L.A., and K.W. Saakvitne (1995) Treating Therapists with Vicarious Traumatization and Secondary Traumatic Stress Disorders, in Figley, C.R (Ed) *Compassion Fatigue: Coping with Secondary Traumatic Stress Disorder in Those Who Treat the Traumatized*, London: Brunner-Routledge, 150-177.

Philo, C (2012) Security of geography/geography of security, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 37(1), 1-7.

Pile, S (2010) Emotions and affect in recent human geography, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35(1), 5-20.

Pogge, T.W. (2006) Relational Conception of Justice: Responsibilities for Health Outcomes, in Anand, S., F. Peter., and A. Sen (Eds) *Public Health, Ethics, and Equity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 135-161.

- Robjant, K., I. Robbins., and V. Senior (2009) Psychological distress amongst immigration detainees: A cross-sectional questionnaire study, *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 48(3), 275-286.
- Rodaway, P (1994) *Sensuous Geographies: Body, Sense and Place*, London: Routledge.
- Roy, A (2004) Help that hinders, *Le Monde Diplomatique*, November 2004.
- Schervish. P.G., and J.J. Havens (2002) The Boston Area Diary Study and the Moral Citizenship of Care, *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 13(1), 47-71.
- Seidman, I (1998) *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education & Social Sciences*, New York: Teachers College Press, Second Edition.
- Sibley, D (1995) *Geographies of exclusion: Society and difference in the West*, London: Routledge.
- Silverman, D (2006) *Interpreting Qualitative Data*, London: SAGE, Third Edition.
- Silverman, S., and R. Hajela (2012) *Immigration detention in the UK*, The Migration Observatory Briefing, University of Oxford: COMPAS.
- Silverman, S.J (2012) "Regrettable but Necessary?" A Historical and Theoretical Study of the Rise of the UK Immigration Estate and Its Opposition, *Politics & Policy*, 40(6), 1131-1157.
- Silverman, S.J., and E, Massa (2012) Why Immigration detention is unique, *Population, Space and Place*, 18(6), 677-686.
- Smith, C (2005) Epistemological Intimacy: A Move to Autoethnography, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 4(2), 68-76.
- Smith, D.M. (1998) How far should we care? On the spatial scope of beneficence, *Progress in Human Geography*, 22(1), 15-38.
- Smith, M., J. Davidson., L. Cameron., and L. Bondi (2009) *Emotion, Place and Culture*, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.
- Spry, T (2001) Performing Autoethnography: An Embodied Methodological Praxis, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), 706-732.
- Stumpf, J (2006) The Crimmigration Crisis: Immigrants, Crime, and Sovereign Power, *American University Law Review*, 56, 367-419.
- Sykes, G.M. (1958) *The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Tewksbury, R., and D. Dabney (2004) Prison Volunteers: Profiles, Motivations, Satisfaction, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 40(1-2), 173-183.

- Thien, D (2005) After or beyond feeling? A Consideration of affect and emotion in geography, *Area*, 37(4), 450-454.
- Thien, D (2011) Emotional life, in Del Casino V.J., M.E. Thomas., P. Cloke., and R. Panelli (Eds) *A Companion to Social Geography*, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 309-326.
- Tronto, J.C. (1993) *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*, London: Routledge, Chapman and Hall.
- Tyler, I (2013) *Revolting Subjects: Social Abjection and Resistance in Neoliberal Britain*, London: Zed Books.
- Tyler, I. and K. Marciniak (2013) Immigrant protest: an introduction, *Citizenship Studies*, 17(2), 143-156.
- Tyler, I., N. Gill., D. Conlon., and C. Oeppen (2014) The business of child detention: charitable co-option, migrant advocacy and activist outrage, *Race & Class*, 56(1), 3-21.
- Ugelvik, T (2014) Prison Ethnography as Lived Experience: Notes from the Diaries of a Beginner Let Loose in Oslo Prison, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(4), 471-480.
- Wengraf, T (2001) *Qualitative Research Interviews*, London: SAGE Publications.
- Wilsher, D (2004) The administrative detention of non-nationals pursuant to immigration control: International and constitutional law perspectives, *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 53(04), 897-934.
- Young, I.M. (2004) Responsibility and global labor justice, *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 12(4), 365-388.

Appendix 1 - Provisional Interview Schedule

- Ease participant
 - How long have you been visiting?
 - Where do you visit?
 - What do you think is the purpose of a detention centre?
- What motivations were there for wanting to start visiting?
 - MHDVG- many started the group- what was the need and how did it develop?
 - Describe who a visitor should ideally be
 - Who did you imagine you were going to visit?
- How do you find the process of visiting?
 - Waiting
 - Security – security clearing
 - The staff
- What is the visiting room like?
 - What things are discussed? How do you break the ice?
 - Could the space be better?
 - Do you give your mobile number?
 - How do you feel about visiting? Does it ever get tiring?
 - How do you keep yourself motivated?
 - How do you build trust?
- Describe to me the most memorable detainee you have visited?
 - What makes him or her memorable?
 - How long were you visiting?
 - What support was given?
 - Was the detainee released?
- Who are you visiting?
 - Does it matter who you are visiting?
 - Has anyone ever acted inappropriately?
 - How do you think your characteristics help build relationships?
- The visiting group
 - Does the group provide sufficient support and advice?
- Outside the visiting room
 - How far do you maintain contact outside of the detention centre?
 - Do you contact a detainee's legal representative, family/friends?
 - Upon release/removal do you maintain contact?
- Political mobilisation
 - Has visiting detainees changed how you view politics?
 - Have you become more politically mobile?
 - Have you taken extra training in order to provide support?
- Concluding remarks
 - Thanks
 - Other people who may be interested?
 - Contact information